HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 24, 1955.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Acts:—Physiotherapists Act Amendment, Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment, Industrial Code Amendment (Pensions), Appropriation (No. 2), Metropolitan Milk Supply Act Amendment, and Sewerage Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING SHORTAGE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It was recently reported in the press that the Housing Trust had forecast difficulty in meeting the housing shortage that would arise as a result of the increase in population from migration and natural causes. Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government has considered requesting the State Bank to engage in a group home building scheme similar to that in operation about three years ago to assist to meet the impending emergency?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I did not see the article referred to, but will obtain a report and let the honourable member have it in the near future.

ST. PETERS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. TRAVERS—Some residents of St. Peters have pointed out that the water pressure in some areas of the district has not been satisfactory. Can the Minister of Works indicate what steps, if any, are being taken to rectify that situation?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Following upon representations made by the honourable member and other residents at College Park and East Adelaide in regard to an adequate water supply during periods of peak demand, investigations show that these areas are supplied through a network of 3in. mains laid many years ago. These mains are now badly corroded and are incapable of giving an adequate supply to these fully built-up districts. To improve the supply, the Engineer-in-Chief has prepared proposals involving the enlargement of mains in the following streets:—Harrow Road (from Payneham Road to Eighth Avenue); Eighth Avenue (South Street and Tenth Avenue as far as Winchester Street); St. Peters Street; Walkerville Road; Park Street and Richmond Streets, Hackney; Marlborough Street, College Park; College Street and Player Avenue (5½ chains of new main to connect dead-end). These proposals have been considered by the Government and Cabinet has given approval thereto. The work which will be commenced early in the new year will mean that new 8in. and 6in. feeder mains will be laid connecting with the trunk mains in Payneham and Hackney Roads. When the enlargements have been effected and dead ends connected up, the other mains in the area will be cleaned. The estimated cost of the work approved by Cabinet is £25,600. I hope this will improve the position in what has been a bad area. I thank the people there for their tolerance in putting up with the nuisance so long.

SINGLE UNIT FARMS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—From time to time responsible authorities have stated that the Government has no power to write down the cost of a property purchased under the single unit farm system. I have always believed that any property issued under that system has exactly the same rights as a property allotted under any Government scheme. If the statements I have referred to are correct will the Minister of Irrigation indicate what provision of the War Service Land Settlement Act denies the Government the right to make an adjustment on a single unit farm property if the Government believes that adjustment should be made?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—In regard to single unit farms that have been purchased for returned soldiers under the Commonwealth scheme, there is only one exception where a writing down can take place: that is where the State does some development on that purchase. Where a single unit purchase has been made of a completely developed property the Commonwealth Government has informed us that there can be no writing down.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The Minister of Irrigation did not answer my specific question. He said he had been informed by the Commonwealth Government that the State could not write off any costs of a single unit farm. As the bureaucrats in Canberra have always been wrong so far as single unit farm purchases are concerned, there is a possibility they are wrong in this respect. Can the Minister inform me what part of the War Service Lands Settle-

ment Act denies the Government the right to take whatever steps it thinks necessary in adjusting costs on a single unit property? If he has not that information available, will he get a report?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—As I said earlier, there is an exception, namely, a property partly developed by the State. We have the right to write that down. I think the honourable member may have overlooked the fact that at present there are agent States and principal States. Principal States have the right to do as they choose in respect of single unit farms or other properties, but agent States have not. I have discussed this matter with Federal officers who have advised that there can be no writing down of single unit farms, except in the circumstances mentioned.

REDESIGNING OF VICTORIA SQUARE.

Mr. LAWN—I have received a letter from the New Adelaide Central Traders' Association which states:

It has recently been reported in the press that serious consideration is being given to the redesigning of Victoria Square, which if carried into effect will block traffic flow through King William Street. A similar and equally important restriction will occur in regard to traffic flow through Grote and Wakefield Streets. In view of the findings of the Royal Commission on Transport to the effect that additional north-south roads are necessary, is it the intention of the Government to interest itself in this matter either directly or through the Transport Advisory Committee?

Can the Premier answer that question?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know of no proposals under consideration by the Government for any alteration to Victoria Square.

HAMPSTEAD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Education a further report following on the question I asked yesterday about the time the Hampstead Primary School will be ready for use?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The school will open at the commencement of the 1956 school year, when it is expected that six class rooms and a playroom will be available, and that about 300 children will be enrolled.

WALLAROO CHILDREN'S PLAYGROUND.

Mr. McALEES—For some time people at Wallaroo have been trying to get the children's playground fenced in. A letter was received some time ago asking the committee to try to get tenders for the job, but up to now it has failed to get one. Can the Minister of Education do something to have the playground fenced in?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Because of the persistence of the honourable member and the eloquent pleas he has made, I have decided as a special favour to him and to the very important district he represents to accede to his request.

FINDON HIGH SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL ZONING.

Mr. FRED WALSH—It has been reported in the press that the Tramways Trust intends to continue the route of the Findon bus service as far as Tapley's Hill Road. In view of the number of times I have raised the question of the inconvenience to the children who will be required to attend the new Findon High School, particularly at the opening of the next term, in respect of transport, will the Minister of Education take up with the Tramways Trust the matter of its continuing the route still farther down Grange Road to Grange to remove some of the inconvenience I have referred to previously?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so. Earlier the honourable member asked me a question on high school zoning. I have given the matter careful and anxious consideration, and obtained reports from the head masters of the Henley Beach and Lockleys schools, but I cannot say that I feel any severe hardship will be caused. I admit there is inconvenience, but I feel I cannot relax the zoning system, although, as I promised the honourable member, I will be pleased to consider individual cases of hardship.

SOUTH-EAST DEEP SEA PORT.

Mr. CORCORAN—On behalf of the District Council of Millicent I have made representations to the Premier for further consideration to be given to the proposal to establish a deep seat port at Rivoli Bay. When I last sought information the Premier, although he indicated the Government might not continue its investigations into the possibility of establishing a deep sea port there, said he proposed that at an appropriate time, in company with an officer, to visit the locality in order to further consider the matter. Has he any additional information?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I propose to go to the South-East next month in connection with other projects, and I hope I will be able at that time to fulfil my promise in this respect.

COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Works any further report regarding a water supply for Manoora, Waterloo and Black Springs?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Engineer-in-Chief has supplied me with details of the economics of a water supply following an investigation thereof. The cost of using cement-asbestos pipes, which are considerably cheaper than cast-iron, is estimated in round figures at £400,000. The annual working expenses are estimated at more than £23,000, while the revenue at present rating would be approximately £5,000 per year. It is therefore difficult to evolve a basis of rating that would return a reasonable amount to the taxpayer on the expenditure involved, and at the same time make the proposition an economic one from the point of view of the landholder. I also point out that the water would have to be pumped through from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and the cost of pumping, inclusive of interest, on this line is now 2s. 8d. per thousand gallons. However, the whole proposal will be considered by Cabinet at an early date in the light of the further investigations that I intend to make in regard thereto.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Works a reply regarding the proposed extension of the Clare water supply to the Penwortham, Watervale and Leasingham areas?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes. The present-day cost of this scheme, using asbestos pipes, would be £52,000. Annual charges including interest would be approximately £4,500. Income based on 1½ times ordinary rating with the price of water at 2s. 6d. per thousand gallons for rebate and 1s. 6d. a thousand gallons for excess (which is the scale applying to Clare) is estimated at £1,370. The Engineer for Water Supply points out that the districts which would be supplied by this scheme are in a high rainfall area where there are possibilities of underground supplies; and having regard to all the circumstances the Engineer-in-Chief cannot recommend the scheme under existing circumstances. However, the matter will be further looked into and submitted to Cabinet for final decision.

WOODVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on November 16 about the need for improvements to the playing ground at the Woodville primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received the following report from the Deputy Director of Education:—

In the rear portion of the assembly area the work has been completed, that is, filling, grading and asphalting. At the infant school, 6,000 sq. yards have been completed in asphalt. The oval is the most difficult project, however, but plans are being prepared by the Architect-in-Chief and I understand they will be submitted to the Education Department for consideration in a few days time.

I will endeavour to expedite this latter part of the project as soon as the plans and specifications have been prepared.

SWIMMING POOL FOR PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Some weeks ago the Legislative Council members for the Northern District and I, at the instance of the Peterborough Corporation, forwarded to the Premier a joint letter asking that consideration be given to affording some financial assistance to the corporation to establish a swimming pool there. Has the Premier had time to investigate this matter, and will he be able to reply soon?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the proposal falls within the scope of a Cabinet decision made a few weeks ago in which it was decided that the Tourist Bureau vote could assist to the extent of £1,500 in each case. I will give the honourable member further advice in the course of a few days.

HECTORVILLE SCHOOL.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I have been asked by the Hectorville Progress Association to ascertain whether the Minister of Education can say which part of the new Hectorville school will be open to receive students next year.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received a report from the Architect-in-Chief who states:—

Four classrooms, staff room, staff toilets, headmaster's office, bookstore and conveniences will be ready for occupation in February, 1956. It is intended that the school will be used from the beginning of the school year, and it is expected that approximately 200 children can then be accommodated. As it is expected that there will be about 275 children to attend the school when it is completed this means that, for a time, some children will have to continue to attend their present schools.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

Mr. STEPHENS—I desire from the Minister of Education some information about school libraries, particularly those in primary

schools. Is it the duty of the school committees to provide and maintain libraries, or is that done by the department, or are the libraries subsidized by the Government?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—They are provided partly by the Government and partly by way of subsidy. There are well over half a million books in the 660 school libraries throughout the State. About 60 per cent of the books in the primary school libraries are lighter reading and about 40 per cent heavier, and in the high school libraries the percentages are the reverse. I think that in the last five years the Education Department has paid out about £125,000 in subsidies to school libraries.

PORT AUGUSTA-QUORN ROAD.

Mr. RICHES—Some time ago the Premier undertook to approach the Commonwealth Government for a special grant for work on the Port Augusta-Quorn road. I think he suggested a grant of £100,000 in two allocations, each of £50,000. Can the Premier say whether he has been successful in his approach?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not yet had a reply to my last communication on this matter.

MYPONGA RESERVOIR.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the Myponga reservoir scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—This is an extensive scheme that has been reported on by the Public Works Committee. Following a letter dated May 12, 1955, from the chairman of the Public Works Committee that the committee had resolved to recommend the proposed Myponga project, steps were taken to implement a planned programme so that the work could commence as early as possible. This planned programme included the completion of the detailed plans and specifications by the end of February, 1956, so that tenders could then be called with the object of commencing the actual construction of the dam itself in October, 1956. Work has proceeded in accordance with this plan and the detailed pencil plans of the dam, spillway and outlet works have been completed and they are now being traced. A draft specification is under way and a brochure is being prepared for the information of intending tenderers. It appears that the plans and specifications will be ready very close to the planned date. Although the Public Works Committee have not yet submitted a final report they have forwarded an interim report in which they recommend the Myponga project. Approval for the necessary expenditure will shortly be sought so that the work can proceed as planned, but it will not be in this year's Estimates. We can go no further in the matter. I thank the Public Works Committee for its assistance in facilitating the preparation of preliminary plans.

OUTER HARBOUR TUG.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my question of last week concerning the berthing of large vessels at the Outer Harbour wharf?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—From memory, I think the size of the vessel referred to by the honourable member (the *Iberia*) was about 29,000 tons. It appears that the report that there was 40 minutes' delay in its leaving the harbour was by no means correct. The last line was cast off at 1.15 p.m. and the vessel was clear of the berth at 1.30 p.m. The harbourmaster is of the opinion that this was a normal departure in the circumstances, viz., wind westerly, velocity 45 to 54 miles an hour. The Harbours Board did not receive any application for the services of their tug *Tancred*, probably because when tugs were ordered it was not considered necessary for her to be in attendance. The tug company states that its new tug is expected to be in commission early next year. This vessel will have approximately 25 per cent more power than the *Tancred*. I hope we have heard the last suggestion that vessels are not calling at South Australia because of a lack of tug capacity. That may have been an excuse, but it was never a reason.

SEWAGE FARM FLY NUISANCE.

Mr. JENNINGS—On numerous occasions I have taken up with the Minister of Works the matter of fly nuisance at the Islington Sewage Farm, and I have received replies indicating that everything possible was being done by spraying and other methods to overcome it. I have, however, continued to receive numerous complaints. Will the Minister again have the matter investigated to see whether more effective and permanent relief can be afforded?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The only permanent relief, in the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief's Department (and I think of the Government), is the removal of the farm. That involves a huge expenditure and is now being investigated by the Public Works Committee. If anything further can be done to alleviate

the unpleasant conditions I will ask that it be done, but I doubt whether anything has been conceived that would have better results than the methods already tried.

CHAMBER LIGHTING.

Mr. QUIRKE—In the early 1940's I brought up the matter of lighting in this Chamber. In those days the globes in the antique lampholders were of clear glass, and, although a different type of globe has been installed, by no stretch of imagination can the present system of lighting be called modern for there is still a tremendous strain on the eyes of all members. Indeed, when a member is speaking the lamps cut across his eyes. Members commonly complain about this matter. In another place the lighting is modern and not detrimental to eyesight as it is here. I appreciate the value of these antique suspended lights, which date back to the days of gaslight, but I do not think that the system of lighting should be as antique as the light holders. Will the Minister of Works investigate the possibility of installing modern lighting in this Chamber?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will take up the matter with the Architect-in-Chief. Generally speaking, I think members will agree that what has been done is a considerable improvement on the more glowing lights, but if anything further can be done I will obtain a full report on what is involved in indirect lighting of the Chamber.

The SPEAKER—This matter has come up before and the present lighting in the chamber has been reported on by the Architect-in-Chief's Department and, at the request of the Premier, by the Electricity Trust. It may be possible, at very great additional cost, to improve the lighting by five per cent, but the amber globes were installed recently on the advice of the authorities I mentioned. By talking about the glare and the resultant disability members would not be fair in indicating that they were worse off here than are people working in other places with regard to lighting and glare. According to advice we have received, the glare under the present set up is at the minimum.

HORTICULTURAL INSTRUCTOR.

Mr. WHITE—Some time ago I requested that a horticultural instructor be stationed at Murray Bridge to deal with horticultural problems in that district, including the orchard area at Mypolonga. The Minister of Agriculture said that there was not sufficient work to justify a permanent officer in the area. Last night I received a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of the Mypolonga branch of the Australian Primary Producers Union. It contains three sections as follows:—

1. That the horticultural instructor who, at the present time, lives at Belair make regular visits to Mypolonga at intervals of two or three months.
2. That his visits to that settlement be advertised in the local paper.
3. That settlers who wish to have the services of the horticultural adviser when in the district, leave their names at the Agricultural Office in Murray Bridge.

Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to investigate this matter with a view to assisting the horticultural advisory work in that area?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I shall be glad to try to arrange more regular visits of the instructor, if not as frequently as desired. I point out that he has a large district and his work is not confined to horticultural matters.

KINGSTON BROAD GAUGE RAILWAY.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Works the promised reply on the Government's intention regarding the broadening of the railway gauge between Naracoorte and Kingston?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have no further detailed reply, but it is the firm intention of the Government to proceed with the work. I will obtain a report from my colleague and will reply personally to the honourable member if the Minister of Railways does not do so.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yesterday I asked a question concerning an amount of £30,000,000 which the Commonwealth Government had made available to the various States under the War Service Homes Act. I have been credibly informed that only £2,500,000 has been spent. The Premier apparently thought my question related to money made available to the States through the Commonwealth Grants Commission, whereas it was directed to money made available for the specific purpose of providing War Service homes. I understand that no returned soldier has any hope of having an application for a home considered in less than 16 months. I have been informed that the Housing Trust has provided almost £500,000 for homes for returned soldiers, and has not been repaid, a position which affects its ability to build houses for civilians. Can the Premier say whether the information I have received is correct and, if so, what does he propose to do about it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Western Australia is the only State to which the Commonwealth supplies money for building soldiers' homes. The Western Australian Housing Commission, apart from its civilian housing project, undertakes the construction of houses for the War Service Home Commission. In every other State the War Service Homes Commission carries out its prescribed functions—building and selling houses to soldiers and financing the purchase of houses by soldiers. It is correct that at the present time the commission has a considerable number of houses which have been purchased on behalf of soldiers for which immediate payment has not been made. I would think that there would always be a fairly substantial amount outstanding.

Mr. Macgillivray—Would you think over £400,000 reasonable?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—We would prefer it to be less. On the general question of whether the commission has spent the money available to it, although I have no direct information, I believe it would probably have overspent.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That it be an order of this House that all papers and other documents ordered by the House during the session, and not returned prior to the prorogation, and such other official reports and returns as are customarily laid before Parliament and printed, be forwarded to the Speaker in print as soon as completed, and if received within two months after such prorogation, that the Clerk of the House cause such papers and documents to be distributed amongst members and bound with the Votes and Proceedings; and as regards those not received within such time, that they be laid upon the table on the first day of next session.

Motion carried.

WOODLANDS PARK TO TONSLEY RAILWAY BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to provide for the construction of a railway from Woodlands Park to Tonsley.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a railway Bill in the usual form authorizing the construction of a railway from a point near the Woodlands Park railway station on the Brighton line to the proposed new station of Tonsley, which is in the suburb of Mitchell Park. The railway will serve the important works to be constructed by Chrysler Australia Limited in this area, as well as the general public. The route of the railway, as proposed in the Bill, is in accordance with the most recent recommendation of the Public Works Committee, which has been laid before Parliament. The construction of a railway along this route will involve as little disturbance of existing houses as is reasonably possible and is economical from the point of view of land acquisition. The Bill contains an appropriation clause providing for the payment of the cost of the railway out of the Loan Fund.

The measure has been somewhat delayed because of the need to find a route that would cause as little inconvenience as possible and at the same time provide reasonable access to the area to be served. The matter has been before the Public Works Committee and has been the subject of two reports. I believe the latest recommendation has been accepted by the Marion corporation and the people in the area as the one to cause the least disturbance to property owners and to provide reasonable access to the area concerned.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—It would have been better if a plan showing the route of the line had been submitted to Parliament with this Bill, but it may be that the Government Printer has a rush of work. The fullest information on the proposal should be given to members. I support the second reading, but several matters need attention. In the last few days notices have been sent to certain people that portions of their land are required for the purpose of constructing the proposed line. I do not intend to deal at length with the first report of the Public Works Committee on this matter. As a result of registered letters sent to landholders in West Street, Ascot Park, in the first week in September a meeting of protest was held and the motions carried were given much publicity. I attended that meeting. The people concerned expressed their opinions forcibly, and they were pleased that the press drew con-

siderable attention to the question. The Premier said a few moments ago that he believed the Marion Corporation and the residents concerned would raise no objections to this measure, but the corporation has not yet had an opportunity to ascertain whether the ratepayers are sympathetic towards it. Not even the people concerned know what the proposal is, but it seems that at least one house owner and several landowners will be affected. Some of the landowners intended to build; in fact, some have commenced building.

Three Austrian couples have commenced building, and the footings of one house had just been completed when the owners received notice. Two other couples have been on their blocks at week-ends making cement bricks and blocks. Another couple was living in temporary accommodation on a block while making cement bricks and blocks. According to a letter I received from the Minister of Railways and a reply given to my question yesterday on this matter, it seems that the Government will be prepared to purchase the whole of a building block if at least a part of it is required for this railway, but I do not know how much land the Railways Commissioner will require in order to construct the line, for I have not seen a map of the proposed route. The Minister informed me that he would do his best to see that the widow whose house is to be demolished will receive adequate compensation and he will endeavour to find another suitable home for her. I have spoken to this woman and have found that over many years she has tried her utmost to make her property freehold. If there is one thing she desires to avoid it is to live in a rented home. It was her firm desire to continue to live in her freehold property, and I commend her for that.

I had long consultations with the Town Clerk of the Marion Corporation in regard to the route of the Tonsley spurline. It seems that no provision will be made to cater for traffic from beyond Ascot Park to Willunga to enter from that direction into Tonsley. It seems that the proposal will be for one-way traffic only, that is, any traffic from Adelaide to Woodlands Park will be able to branch off at the junction and proceed to Tonsley. I assume that the Railways Commissioner drew up the original plans and estimates for submission to the Public Works Committee, through the Minister of Railways. The proposal that was most favoured by the Marion Corporation and me was to take the spurline from a point just beyond the Marion railway station. It would then proceed through land which I believe has been purchased by the Housing Trust, and which is now being used for growing stone fruits and grapes. There would have been no need to demolish any houses, and such a route would have avoided crossing a creek that starts beyond the South Road and flows over the Marion Road. A further loop could have been constructed off the proposed spurline to give entry for traffic coming from beyond the Marion Station. Most of the land concerned in the Marion Corporation's proposal is vacant, but many houses will be built there when Chrysler's factory at Tonsley has been established. The residents will have to either use their own conveyance to get to work or depend on bus services, unless the company and the Railways Commissioner come to some arrangement to provide a further railway line from Tonsley to a point beyond South Road and Marion Road. When the Town Clerk of the Marion Corporation submitted its proposal he stressed the likelihood of the future development of that area.

The railway will have to cross Sweetman's Road, but the stormwater drain has been enclosed to avoid danger to pedestrians. Furthermore, the traffic on that road will increase greatly, and there will be an open crossing where the railway passes over it. Another road will be constructed in that area to take some of the traffic that would otherwise use Sweetman's Road. It will be constructed in a northerly direction to First Avenue, Ascot Park. That means there will be an open crossing on Sweetman's Road and another one over the Brighton line at Ascot Park about 200yds. away. A suggestion was made by the Highways Commissioner to erect a bridge over the Brighton line at Marion Road. I believe there was considerable merit in the proposal put forward by the Marion Council that the line should be constructed from a point near the Marion railway station, and the length of the route would be shorter.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The corporation was not very enthusiastic about that when it gave evidence to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The enthusiasm displayed by some members of the corporation at a certain meeting showed that they viewed it very favourably. I was not present when the corporation's representatives submitted evidence to the Committee, but if the Railways Commissioner had consulted the corporation before submitting any plans to the committee

he would have had different proposals drawn up. I emphasize that the Government should have displayed a map showing the route of proposal No. 4. Further, less hardship will be imposed on home owners under the revised scheme. I trust that a severance allowance will be made in respect of portions of building blocks acquired. Moreover, an allowance should be made for any building materials to be used. I know of one migrant who has spent more than £1,500 and used much of his spare time on building a home in the area, and his financial commitments should be safeguarded. I am pleased to know that only one house is to be demolished. Although it is in an unsatisfactory state of repair, I believe it could be repaired by a master builder.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—One or two points raised by the member for Goodwood (Mr. Frank Walsh) should be clarified. Firstly, in examining the two proposals the Public Works Committee considered what would be best for the State's finances, both as regards the initial cost and the maintenance costs. Obviously, some property owner must be hurt in a matter of this kind, but not necessarily a home owner. The honourable member now makes a plea for building block owners, but whether a block had a house on it or not, appropriate compensation would be paid by the Railways Department to the dispossessed owner. There is no suggestion that financial suffering will be imposed on those people. In fact, the lucky ones will be those whose property will be acquired by a Government department, because they will be able to cash in on the sale, and resite their homes on other blocks.

An outcry took place when it was first learned that a number of home owners would have a line passing their back yards, but I point out that the committee did not decide lightheartedly that those people would have to put up with such conditions. The Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fargher) assured the committee that his department would be willing to take over and use those properties as homes for employees. The people to be dispossessed of their homes had to elect to sell the whole of the property, and I believe they would have done so because of the ample compensation involved. I am as sympathetic as any other member towards a person who builds his own home in his spare time, but I point out that the Housing Trust undertook to house anybody whose home was to be acquired.

Certain considerations brought the committee to its final decision that the Railways Department's alternative was preferable to the other routes examined. Firstly, fewer people would be dispossessed of homes and fewer homes would be demolished. Under the first proposal certain homes would have been demolished because of the necessity to build access roads, and although the committee was apprehensive about that aspect, the Railways Department could find no answer to the problem. Later, however, it submitted another proposal which was adopted by the committee.

Secondly, the major level crossing now involved on Sweetman's Road cannot be avoided, because the line must cross that road somewhere. Under the old proposal, however, a dogleg crossing was involved, and that did not appear to be satisfactory to the committee. I do not complain that the departmental officers did not go thoroughly enough into the matter before giving evidence; indeed, the Commissioner still feels that people will ask sooner or later, "Why wasn't the line put straight through?" The department realizes such a line would interfere with a number of home owners, but in the interests of the community generally it feels that such a line is still preferable. The committee heard evidence from Mr. Synnett (Chairman of the Marion District Council) and Mr. Bradley (District Clerk), and both frankly admitted that all they wanted to do was to have the route further considered. They said their proposal was only a sketch plan executed by a council officer.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Financial provision."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am not concerned with possible expenditure on land acquisition, but has any specific amount been mentioned of the likely cost of constructing this railway?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—According to the certificate of the Railways Commissioner which has been tabled, the estimated cost of construction is £157,000. The estimated returns, based on projected freight and passenger business, are:—In 1960, for freight £138,000 and for passenger trade £23,000, a total of £161,000; and in 1965, for freight £173,000 and for passenger trade £31,000, a total of £204,000.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Premier say whether any charge is being made against Chrysler (Australia) Limited for the installation of sidings? Are they contributing to the cost of

the construction of this line? When other industries apply for railway sidings or deviations of existing lines they are frequently called upon to bear the whole cost. What is the general policy in relation to the establishment of railway extensions and sidings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Before the Railways Commissioner agreed to extend a service to the area he discussed the question of the total tonnages the company would be using with its representatives. As far as I know the Railways Commissioner's responsibility ceases at the point of entry to the premises of the firms concerned. No concession is granted in respect of the construction of lines and sidings within the premises of the company.

Clause passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This amendment is necessary in order to correct a clerical error. Paragraph (*a*) shows the plan prepared by the Chief Engineer of Railways as numbered 150/23, whereas it should be 53/120; and the Legislative Council's amendment corrects this error. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 23. Page 1753.)

New clause 10—"Alternative remedies."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I ask leave to withdraw new clause 10. I wish to insert another new clause to accomplish my purpose.

Leave granted. New clause withdrawn.

New clause 8a—"Alternative remedies."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move to insert the following new clause 8a—

Section 69 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (2) (b) the following:—"Provided that failure to give notice within the said period shall not be a bar to the maintenance of the action if the court finds that the failure was occasioned by mistake, absence from the State, or other reasonable cause."

Section 69 of the principal Act relates to alternative remedies. A workman who has been injured may claim damages at common law for an injury received if there is a sufficient degree of negligence. There is provision for the action to be commenced within 12 months and for notice of intention to proceed to be given within six months of the receipt of the first payment of compensation following the accident. The Premier objected to my new clause 10 because he said it would mean, in effect, that a workman could take action at any time within six years following the accident. That was not my intention. Under this new provision a workman will be enabled to give notice within 12 months if the court considers his reasons for not giving notice within six months are fair and just.

New clause inserted.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION (GRASSHOPPER DESTRUCTION) BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider a further Supply being granted to Her Majesty.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move:—

That towards defraying the salaries and other expenses of the undermentioned department the following additional sum during the year ending June 30, 1956, be granted.—Minister of Agriculture, miscellaneous £150,000.

Resolution agreed to, adopted in Committee of Ways and Means, and agreed to by the House. Bill introduced by the Treasurer and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to appropriate from the General Revenue of the State the sum of £150,000 for the destruction of grasshoppers, and to provide for the manner in which that sum may be expended. At present expenditure on the destruction of grasshoppers is being financed by advances out of the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Payments of two kinds are being made, namely, payments to councils for insecticides purchased by the councils and distributed among landowners, and payments for measures undertaken by the Minister of Agriculture. The Government desires to recoup to the Governor's Appropriation Fund the amount of the advances, and, at the same time, to authorize future payments for expenditure incurred by councils and the Minister on the

destruction of grasshoppers. Approval is sought for the appropriation of £150,000 for these purposes. Clauses 2 and 3 provide for the issue from the General Revenue of £150,000 and the application of that sum to destruction of grasshoppers. Clause 4 enables the Treasurer to make payments out of that sum to councils to meet expenditure incurred by the councils on the purchase of insecticides distributed among landowners, and to meet expenditure incurred by the Minister of Agriculture on the destruction of grasshoppers. Clause 5 enables the Treasurer to recoup the Governor's Appropriation Fund from the amount appropriated by the Bill.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I agree with the purpose for which the money to be provided by this Bill will be expended. Excellent work has been done in minimising the effects of the grass hopper infestation, and if that work is continued by the Minister and his staff, with the co-operation of councils and landholders, further good results will be achieved. Furthermore, valuable lessons will be learned that will assist in the more effective control of any future infestations. I do not know whether £150,000 will be sufficient to meet the total cost of the campaign against the grasshoppers.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—I think so.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The Minister should know. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

Later the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 1725.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The size of the Bill and the number of its clauses suggest that it is of some consequence, but it is not as important as it at first appears, though it will be of particular importance to certain officers who will benefit from it. It gives the right to certain railway officers, who were precluded from exercising an option under a previous amendment of the Act, to take out additional units of superannuation. They could not exercise that option previously because the tribunal concerned did not grant the salary increases long enough before the expiration of the period in which they could exercise their option. In certain cases the period had expired by two days before the new salaries were approved. Not many officers will be affected by the Bill, and the additional cost to the superannuation fund will not be great.

I agree with the provision that removes the differentiation in the amounts of pension paid to widows of contributors. Under the Act there is a provision that the pension paid to a widow who was a second wife of a pensioner shall be reduced on the basis of the difference between her age and that of the pensioner at the time of his death. The Bill rectifies this anomaly. I believe the Government should have also made provision for widows of pensioners who marry after the age of retirement. At least two cases have been brought to my notice recently where considerable injustice may result. In one case the second wife of a pensioner married him shortly after his first wife had deserted him. If the pensioner dies, despite the fact that he was employed by the Government for many years and contributed substantial sums to the fund, his wife will not be entitled to any pension. In another case an estimable gentleman married after reaching the retiring age, and should he predecease his wife she will not get any pension. I realize that in 1926, when the Act was passed, Parliament thought that a young woman might marry an elderly contributor and receive a substantial pension for many years if he predeceased her. However, such a situation could be adequately covered if her pension was reduced on the basis of the ages of the contributor and his wife.

Officers who have been retired on a breakdown pension may be employed later at a salary not less than 75 per cent of the salary they were receiving when they were retired. Does that mean 75 per cent of the salary they were receiving when retired, or 75 per cent of the salary they would be receiving if they had remained in the department on their original status?

The Hon. T. Playford—The first case.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is unjust. Because of the substantial reduction in the value of money in recent years considerable salary increases have been granted to public servants. A man may have gone out on pension six or seven years ago when his salary was £400, but the salary for that job would be £800 or £1,000 now. It is unjust to force that man to work in a department for £300 a year when he should receive £700.

The Hon. T. Playford—That was not the intention. I will examine that point for the honourable member.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Exemption from taxation for superannuation contributions of up to £200 a year is granted under the Federal laws. That exemption was fixed some time ago, but it is not adequate today because officers receiving fairly high salaries are not encouraged to take out additional units because their contributions may total more than £200 a year. Perhaps the Premier will take up that point with the Commonwealth authorities to see whether the exemption can be increased. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Employee restored to health."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Leader of the Opposition asked whether the "three-quarters" referred to in the clause meant three-quarters of the sum being paid to the officer at the time of his retirement or three-quarters of the salary now being paid to the occupant of that position. For instance, if the salary paid to the officer at the time of his retirement were £800, but the salary now fixed for that position were £1,200, the intention would be that the three-quarters should apply to the £1,200. If that is not provided for I shall have an amendment moved in another place to carry out the intention.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is satisfactory.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later: Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 1723.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—At the outset I record an emphatic protest at the Government's action in introducing a Bill of such magnitude at such a late hour of the session. After all, it makes some important amendments and in one or two respects breaks new ground. We have a State Traffic Committee to advise the Government on these matters, and surely with the co-operation of that committee the Government could have introduced the Bill in time for members to consider it more fully before being asked to vote on it. I realize the Treasurer introduced it last Thursday, as he said, to enable members to consider it over the weekend, but copies were not available until Monday afternoon, owing no doubt to the congestion of work in the Government Printing Office; but that should have been foreseen earlier, especially as on Tuesday members took part in a visit to Radium Hill and Port Pirie. I have barely had time to read the Bill, which has 29 clauses. Its second reading explanation was given yesterday afternoon and ran into 12 pages. The position might not have been so bad had the Government given us the opportunity given to all schoolboys of doing our homework last night, but members were kept in until the early hours of this morning, and I did not feel disposed to start doing homework at 1 a.m.

The Bill provides for some differentiation in the use of limited and general traders' plates. Limited traders' plates may be used, under the Bill, by persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of machinery that is motivated by its own power. The Bill also provides that a primary producer may drive his unregistered tractor over roads for 25 miles instead of the distance of 15 miles permitted at present. As I understand the law, such vehicles will not be insured; consequently no protection will be afforded any road user who may meet with an accident as a result of one of these vehicles being on the road. I realize that the excuse given will be that they travel so slowly that there is little or no danger from them, but they present a hazard. In fact some slow vehicles have been run into from behind.

Another important subject on which new ground is broken is the legal sanction to be given to zebra crossings. I had some experience of these crossings overseas a few years ago, and I think they are an advantage; but much educational work will be required before the proper co-operation of the public and the motorists can be expected to ensure their completely safe and smooth working. In several cities I saw a flashing light system associated with these crossings so that motorists and pedestrians would know whose turn it was to use the track. I foresee difficulty if pedestrians are allowed to enter these crossings without some restrictions, because it may result in a continual flow of pedestrians holding up motor traffic for a considerable time. I understand that in Edinburgh the right of way to pedestrians only applies to the pedestrian who is in the zebra crossing when the motor vehicle is approaching, and that the pedestrian waiting on the footpath has to give

the motor vehicle an opportunity to go over the crossing before he enters it. That is a satisfactory solution to the problem there. I point out that the streets of Edinburgh are considerably narrower than our streets and what might work admirably there would not work so satisfactorily here. When zebra crossings are installed—particularly in our busier thoroughfares—consideration may have to be given to providing some type of warning lights in association with them. Zebra crossings should not be permitted in King William Street, particularly while trams are operating therein. There are traffic lights at all intersections which should be sufficient for vehicular and pedestrian traffic. If zebra crossings were placed midway between each two adjacent intersections there would be a continual process of stopping and starting by vehicular traffic. We could experiment with zebra crossings in the busier thoroughfares leading from the city, but we should have more information and experience before we go in for them extensively.

I favour the proposed new speed limits for heavily laden motor vehicles. Clause 27, which amends section 174 of the principal Act states:—

(1) No person shall drive on any road outside a municipality, town or township any commercial vehicle whether with or without a trailer at any speed in excess of those hereinafter prescribed:—

(*a*) if the aggregate weight of the vehicle and of every trailer drawn thereby does not exceed seven tons—forty miles an hour;

(*b*) if the aggregate weight of the vehicle and of every trailer drawn thereby exceeds seven tons but does not exceed fifteen tons—thirty miles an hour;

(*c*) if the aggregate weight of the vehicle and of every trailer drawn thereby exceeds fifteen tons—twenty miles an hour.

I agree with those speed limits on roads outside built up areas. However, subclause (2) states:—

No person shall drive on any road within a municipality, town or township any commercial motor vehicle whether drawing a trailer or not at any speed in excess of those hereinafter prescribed:—

(*a*) if the aggregate weight of the vehicle and of every trailer drawn thereby does not exceed seven tons—thirty miles and hour;

(*b*) if the aggregate weight of the vehicle and of every trailer drawn thereby exceeds seven tons—twenty miles an hour.

While there are three classifications relating to the laden weight and speed of vehicles on roads outside built-up areas there are only two classifications for vehicles travelling on roads inside built-up areas. I think that may lead to some confusion.

Mr. Pearson—Why not remove the 20 mile an hour limit on vehicles of over 15 tons on roads outside built-up areas?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I would not agree to that because I have had experience of trying to pass heavily-laden vehicles. If they were permitted to travel at 30 miles an hour one would need a helicopter to pass them. I cannot understand why there is a distinction in the limits.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—My introduction of the Bill gives the distinction.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The relevant part of the introduction states:—

The scale proposed for roads outside built-up areas is as follows:—For vehicles from 3 to 7 tons, 40 miles an hour, for vehicles from 7 to 15 tons, 30 miles an hour, for vehicles over 15 tons, 20 miles an hour.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I suggest the Leader read the paragraph commencing, "Moreover, it is confusing—"

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I am reading the relevant portion of the report and it continues:—

Inside built-up areas the proposed speeds are 30 miles an hour for vehicles up to 7 tons, and 20 miles an hour for vehicles over 7 tons. Perhaps the most important change in the new speed is that the permissible speed of vehicles weighing from 7 to 11 tons outside built-up areas is increased from 25 to 30 miles an hour, and that of vehicles weighing from 11 to 15 tons, from 20 to 30 miles an hour.

Here again a new classification is introduced in the Minister's explanation, because there is nothing in the Bill relating to vehicles weighing between seven and 11 tons. There is confusion concerning this clause, but no doubt it will be sorted out. I would have preferred, while dealing with this matter of the speed of commercial vehicles, a provision relating to a load limit. The majority of our country roads are not built to carry very heavy loads.

Mr. Pearson—There is a load limit of eight tons per axle.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, but one only needs sufficient axles and wheels and he can carry a 40-ton load.

Mr. Pearson—If it were well distributed it would not matter.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think it would. Some heavy commercial vehicles are extremely long and there is a continual pressure on the

road for a lengthy period until all the wheels attached to all the axles have passed over that section and, therefore, the down-thrust on the road surface is greater than it is with an ordinary four-wheeled vehicle. In England there are severe loading restrictions applying on most roads. In fact, on many English roads—which appear to be better constructed than most of ours—there is a load limit of 12 tons. The Federal highways in America are constructed of the best materials at enormous cost. To build a road in South Australia according to the specifications used for those roads would cost approximately £100,000 a mile. If all our road funds were devoted to constructing such roads only a low mileage would be built annually. We should view this matter realistically. Until we can afford to build roads to carry heavy traffic we should insist on a load limit. Apparently heavily-laden vehicles, even though their speeds are to be further restricted, will be permitted to cruise along and do inestimable damage to our roads. As a matter of fact, so far as roads outside built-up areas are concerned, the general experience is that speed limits are more recognized in the breach than in the observance. We cannot have a policeman on every road chasing every vehicle and thus it becomes a matter of honour with the driver of the vehicle to keep his speed down. While some drivers are excellent men and courteous on the road there are others who are not.

In England provision is made that heavily-laden vehicles must travel a minimum distance apart. They cannot bank up one behind the other as is permitted in South Australia. Although I do not know the exact figures, I believe they must remain about 100 yards apart. That affords oncoming traffic an opportunity to pass. In England convoys of road transports travel enormous distances. Frequently 10 or 12 vehicles loaded with bricks are travelling from Peterborough to London. Other vehicles travel from the heavy industries in the Midlands to Newcastle and, in some cases, Glasgow, with heavy machinery for the shipbuilding industries there. The minimum distance provision works excellently in England and the drivers there are particularly courteous. On winding roads a driver invariably assists oncoming traffic. If the road is clear he signals it to pass, but if it isn't he signals it to remain behind.

I have mentioned some matters which we should consider in a Bill of this nature, but as we have no time at this juncture I must reluctantly support the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I support the second reading, but I believe the Government could have shown greater consideration to members by introducing this measure earlier. We are once more faced with the rush—typical of this Government—of passing legislation as the session draws to a close. I do not know whether we will conclude this sitting tonight or tomorrow morning, but I think it would be an excellent idea if the House sat no later than 11 o'clock on any night. Clause 19 deals with the slowing down of motor vehicles when approaching railway crossings. The chairman of the State Traffic Committee told me that it is desirable to have road signs in connection with this matter so as to achieve uniformity throughout Australia. If a motorist is expected to slow down 100 yards before reaching a railway crossing to a speed of not more than 20 miles an hour, it will be necessary to improve some of the present road signs. At some crossings the signs are easily seen both at night and during the day, but in many instances that is not so. I shall have more to say about this matter in Committee.

The provisions of clause 20 cover the railway crossing at Emerson, which should not have been constructed as it was. Sufficient evidence was tendered to the Railways Commissioner to prove that a grade separation crossing was essential. There have been several opinions whether there should be such a crossing. I tried to prove that one was necessary. Now legislation is introduced to cover the blunder that was made in estimating the traffic congestion at the crossing. I believe there is no other crossing like it in Australia. Four main roads cross double railway tracks. There was enough trouble when there were single railway tracks, but the position is now much worse. Considerable work has been done at the crossing but railway gates have not yet been installed. The preparatory work still goes on. Earlier today we passed a Bill providing for a railway spur line to Tonsley where a major secondary industry is to be established. The Premier said that it will have an earning capacity. Goods manufactured at the Tonsley factory will have to go to Mile End, and that will mean additional railway traffic over the Emerson crossing. Despite all the work done, there is still tremendous traffic congestion, particularly about 4 p.m. The position is aggravated if there is a race meeting at Morphettville, because of the increased traffic along both the South and Cross Roads. If

a grade separation crossing had been installed at Emerson both the Railways and the Highways Departments could have met some of the cost. I favoured an underground roadway there, but the Public Works Committee would not agree. Under the Bill, will additional traffic lights be installed on Marion Road where it is crossed by the Brighton railway line? I have been told that there will be an overhead separation there for the line. Then there is the position where Marion Road crosses Sturt Creek. If the course of the creek were altered and a bridge erected over it, the road could be used to a greater extent and much of the present South Road traffic could be diverted to it. This work, and the construction of a grade separation crossing at Emerson, should have been done, but although I have made representations to the Government for about 15 years I have not yet succeeded in getting it to see that the work is necessary. Maybe it could not find the necessary funds because of the importance of other projects.

Clause 22 deals with zebra crossings. The Unley Corporation has displayed more interest than any other local government body in the installation of such crossings. There are several in front of the Black Forest school. Most motorists adhere to the restricted speed limit. The children have been instructed how to use the crossings. Although the corporation had no real authority to provide zebra crossings, the work done has been of great value. Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, chairman of the State Traffic Committee, may be able to supply some information on this matter. Road signs should be erected as warnings to motorists that they are approaching zebra crossings. At such crossings sometimes a speed of 25 miles an hour is dangerous. There should be warnings to approaching motorists that they must reduce speed. The motorist should be warned of traffic hazards by means of adequate signs. I am concerned about the extra cost to industry involved in the delay caused to road traffic at level crossings, such as Emerson, because the consumer must eventually pay for such delays.

Why should we have to pass legislation to protect a person alighting through the offside door of a vehicle? I would have thought it a matter of commonsense that such a person would look both ways and not leave the door open. Any agitation on this matter has been misdirected. Every effort should be made to keep our roads in a satisfactory state, but we must remember that many of them were not constructed to carry the heavy loads they are called on to carry today. The buses of the Tramways Trust are doing much damage to some of our roads, but even if those roads were reconstructed to carry heavy traffic, heavily loaded vehicles fitted with twin tyres would still probably damage them and increase the cost of their upkeep.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Duty to register."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Treasurer say how many tractors and other motor vehicles will be covered by this clause?

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Traders' plates."

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—Will vehicles to which traders' plates are attached be covered by insurance?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I believe that under the Act vehicles carrying traders' plates must be insured, and there would be no difference in this case.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Disqualification of drivers."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Does the Treasurer expect this provision to deter potential offenders?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government feels that a conviction made 10 years ago for a venial offence should not be held against a driver convicted again today; therefore, a period of three years has been prescribed.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—"Lights on motor vehicles."

Mr. STEPHENS—Subparagraph (*b*) refers to a light being visible 200yds. to the rear of a motor vehicle, but subparagraph (*c*) mentions a figure of 60ft. Can the Premier explain the difference?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The first provision relates to lights being visible 200yds. away and the second to figures on the number plate being visible 60ft. away.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Crossing railways."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have no objection to a provision which requires traffic to slow down when approaching railway crossings, but adequate warning signs should be erected to

indicate the presence of a railway crossing. I have conferred with the chairman of the State Traffic Committee concerning the height of various signs. When stop signs were erected they were of a height appropriate to the type of cars then travelling on the road, but the lights of modern vehicles are lower slung and as a result those signs are not so easily discernible. Unless a person is familiar with an area he will not know of the presence of a railway crossing if signs are not erected.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—There is much in what the member for Goodwood says concerning the height of various signs. The State Traffic Committee has referred the suggestion that signs be lower in certain circumstances to the Australian Standards Committee which examines these matters. The signs being used by the Adelaide City Council to indicate traffic islands conform to the honourable member's suggestion. American handbooks on standard practice indicate that the height of warning and other signs is considerably less than in Australia. Mr. Walsh contends that motorists should have due warning of the nearness of a crossing. There are standard signs designed to indicate that a crossing is ahead, but whether or not they are to be installed is not a matter to be discussed under this Act. It is a matter for the authorities who can and should install them where necessary.

Mr. HAWKER—I understand that the provision that a person must travel at a speed not exceeding 20 miles an hour over the last 100yds. before a crossing was inserted at the request of the Railways Commissioner. I cannot see that it will be of any use. It will be completely impossible to police and the provision will be honoured more in its breach than in its observance and will bring the law into disrepute. I would prefer the clause to be deleted.

Mr. TRAVERS—A speed limit of this nature is frequently responsible for more accidents. It is no advantage for a motorist to slow down 100yds. away from a railway line. If a vehicle is equipped with regulation brakes it can be brought to a standstill within one-third of that distance. If we attempt to compel people to commence slowing down when they are well back from a railway line, the provision will be ignored and treated with contempt. If a man is brought before the court for travelling at 25 miles an hour when 95yds. away from the railway line the magistrate will probably dismiss the matter as trivial. The provision will serve no useful purpose. I place it in the same category as railway bells which ring when trains are about two miles away. People are forced to stand needlessly by a railway line waiting for a train to pass. They get impatient. After waiting about five minutes while the bells are ringing and noticing that the train is some distance away, they move on and as a result accidents sometimes happen. This is a wrong approach to remedying an evil. We should prescribe some proper distance back from the line at which people should stop and ensure that the penalty for non-observance is such that they will stop and that the court will not suggest the law is unreasonable. This clause should be remodelled. I agree that we have no time for remodelling now and we are faced with either passing a provision which, to my mind, is just so much nonsense or voting against it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I agree with Mr. Hawker that it would be difficult to police this matter, and with Mr. Travers who said the proposal should be further considered. As there seems to be no assurance that there will be provided adequate warning signs of the need to slow down I move:—

To delete subsection (2a.)

Mr. HAWKER—I have not heard of many crossing accidents, but I can remember two. In one a vehicle travelling at not more than 10 miles an hour drove into the side of a shunting goods train and the driver was prosecuted for not taking due care. In the other a man was killed. On first going over a crossing he had noticed a fairly large bump in the roadway and when coming back slowed down to cross it comfortably and was hit by a diesel train. I think the suggestion to redraft the clause should be accepted. Incidentally we should have more time to consider this important matter. I support the amendment.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Hawker said that in two instances accidents had occurred because of slow speed and I assume the implication is that in order to avoid accidents at railway crossings motorists should speed up and get across as quickly as possible. The provision is necessary if we are to avoid accidents. Most railway accidents of this kind have resulted from vehicles running into trains because they have not slowed down sufficiently. In Victoria there has been heavy loss of life from such accidents. It is better for motorists to slow down than to have accidents.

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not oppose the clause because I think there is a need to slow down, but because of the possibility of a motorist being charged with an offence without his knowing anything about it. There should be adequate road signs when a railway line is being approached.

Mr. TRAVERS—We all agree that it is advisable for a motorist to slow down when approaching a railway line, but the thing is to slow down at the relevant place, and it is not 100 yards back from the line. It should not be more than 50 yards.

The Hon. T. Playford—Move an amendment along those lines, and I will raise no objection.

Mr. TRAVERS—I will.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I would not have moved to delete subsection 2a if I had been given the information I sought earlier. There should be adequate warning signs that a railway crossing is being approached. Will the Premier insist on such signs being provided?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I intended to answer the honourable member's query, but Mr. Geoffrey Clarke said the matter was before the Standards Committee of Australia. As far as possible steps will be taken to provide adequate warning signs. I do not think any magistrate would convict a motorist for a breach of the provision in this clause if it were proved that there were not adequate warning signs. If Mr. Walsh will withdraw his amendment, I will accept another making the distance 50 yards instead of 100 yards. It is necessary to get motorists into the habit of reducing speed when approaching railway lines.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—If the amendment to insert "fifty" instead of "one hundred" is accepted I think Mr. Frank Walsh's criticism will be met because all rail crossings are marked and it will be possible for any alert motorist to see the sign from 50 yards. It may not be necessary in most cases to have a sign, and I am opposed to cluttering up the countryside with additional signs. It is not good policy to describe in a Bill where a sign shall be placed, for the circumstances have a great bearing on the matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In view of the information given about warning signs I am prepared to withdraw my amendment. I am deeply concerned about the safety of the motoring public, and I am sure most motorists take all precautions to avoid accidents, but adequate warning signs should be provided at rail crossings. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. HAWKER—The Premier came into the Chamber while I was speaking and apparently thought I said that the faster a motorist travels across a railway line the smaller the chance of an accident, but I did not say that. I said that it will be impossible to police the proposed speed limit of 20 miles an hour when approaching a railway crossing. I pointed out that travelling slowly does not avoid all chance of an accident.

Mr. TRAVERS moved—

In proposed new subsection (2a) of section 122 to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Pedestrian crossings."

Mr. HAWKER—The principle of this clause is good, but its success will depend on how it is administered. Much will depend on where pedestrian crossings are placed and how they are marked. The Highways Code of England advises pedestrians, unless there is a police officer to control traffic at a pedestrian crossing, that they have the right of way, but it also tells them to be sensible and wait for a suitable gap in the traffic before crossing so that motorists will have time to give way. If pedestrians think they can walk off the kerb at any time and expect all motorists to be able to stop for them they will find themselves in serious trouble. England's highway code tells road users that they must give way to pedestrians at uncontrolled zebra crossings. These crossings in England are well marked at night with a light so that motorists can see them easily. I understand that the Standards Association lays down certain rules for marking zebra crossings, and if they are not followed there may be serious accidents because if traffic is heavy it is hard to see the crossings.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I agree that it is necessary to give warning of the proximity of a marked foot crossing, and model regulations have been drafted by the Australian Traffic Code Committee. The procedure under this clause is on all fours with the amendment of the Local Government Act last year for setting out traffic islands. After a council has decided where it thinks a marked foot crossing should be placed it will submit the proposals to the Highways Commissioner, and if the

council is not satisfied with his decision it may appeal to the Minister of Local Government. Marked foot crossings in themselves will not save lives. There must be an intelligent approach by the council, and a reasonable use of the crossings by pedestrians and also by motorists. Western Australia has marked foot crossings which are stringently policed, but there has been a big increase in pedestrian accidents there between 1951 and 1953. Forty-one pedestrians were killed in that State in 1951 and 52 in 1953. We must not assume from that that foot crossings were responsible for the increase in the accident rate, but those figures show that foot crossings in themselves will not prevent fatalities. Care must be exercised in marking foot crossings because a rash of such crossings broke out in Victoria recently and many prosecutions for offences were launched, but later it was found that the crossings did not comply with the standards laid down, and the prosecutions had to be withdrawn.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Leader of the Opposition said he opposed zebra crossings on roads such as King William Street.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Could it be provided that councils shall erect signs to warn motorists approaching zebra crossings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The purpose of the zebra crossing is to indicate to both pedestrians and motorists that the crossing exists. In any built-up area where the crossings will be placed the traffic limit is 35 miles per hour, and motorists should not exceed that speed, at any rate.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have seen flashing lights used on zebra crossings in London and other cities. While the lights are flashing the motorist must not go over the crossing, and when they are not flashing he has the right of way. I would not like to see crossings placed between intersections in King William Street, which is fairly heavily taxed at present. Will flashing lights be installed at zebra crossings in the city?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If flashing lights are installed there is no need for zebra crossings. I do not visualize such crossings at the Rundle Street-King William Street intersection, because there are lights there. The purpose of the zebra crossing is to eliminate the necessity to stop traffic unless there are pedestrians waiting to cross. I would think a zebra crossing would be placed near a school where children must cross a main road. I cannot see the advantage of zebra crossings where lights are installed.

Mr. HAWKER—At zebra crossings in London a Belisha beacon flashes at night and on dull days to warn the motorist that the crossing is there. It does not matter what sign is used so long as it can be easily seen by the approaching motorist so that he will look out for pedestrians. This is a matter for regulation.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I did not say, as the Premier suggested, that zebra crossings should be placed at intersections in King William Street. I said I hoped zebra crossings would not be placed between intersections. The beacon referred to by the member for Burra (Mr. Hawker) flashes only at intervals to give the pedestrian right of way, and when it is not flashing the motorist has the right of way.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Almost all the points raised by members are dealt with in the recommendations of the Standard Traffic Code Committee. Those regulations are printed and obtainable by councils that may wish to install zebra crossings after approval by the Highways Commissioner. One regulation states:—

The parallel lines should be supplemented by the erection of a circular picture sign at each end of the foot crossing, and where necessary, by the erection of diamond-shaped picture signs as prescribed by the Standards Association of Australia. The committee recommends the increasing use of flashing lights to supplement and draw attention to signs.

Almost every feature of the marked foot crossings have been discussed; standards have been arrived at based on the best world experience available to the Traffic Code Committee, which is a highly representative and Australia-wide body; and members may be assured that when the regulations are drafted the best information possible will be available to the Government.

Mr. FLETCHER—I was surprised to hear Mr. Clarke speak of the increase in accidents in Western Australia because I was impressed with the traffic control in Perth. Did the accidents occur in Perth or in the whole of the State? In Hindley and Rundle Streets about 9 o'clock in the morning it seems as though a lot of sheep are crossing the streets and they are a menace to motorists. The position would be better if the pedestrians were compelled to cross in proper places. I think the clause is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I cannot say whether the accidents occurred only in Perth. From 1951 to 1953 there was a marked increase in the number of pedestrian deaths through road accidents in Western Australia. The provision of zebra crossings will not save life unless they are used properly by motorists and pedestrians and put down in an intelligent way by the Highways Department and councils.

Clause passed.

Clause 23—"Speed in certain circumstances."

Mr. HAWKER—How can a motorist know the accommodation of the school omnibus he is passing? The Government has provided many buses in the country for the conveyance of school children and I have not seen any with "Caution—School bus" on them.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—We have not had it before. This is a new provision.

Mr. HAWKER—What advantage is to be gained by having the word "Caution"? I think "school bus" would be sufficient. I move—

To delete paragraph (*a*) and to delete "Caution" from paragraph (*c*).

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—School children ride in miscellaneous types of vehicles and it would be difficult to say whether or not they were in an omnibus and paragraph (*a*) only makes the provision more stringent. I oppose the deletion of "caution" because it means that extra care must be exercised by motorists. The drafting of the clause has been well considered.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Mr. Hawker is under a misapprehension. The purpose of the clause is not to enable passing motorists to determine whether or not the vehicle comes under the Act but for the purpose of determining whether the vehicle is entitled to carry the sign. Much research work was undertaken by the State Traffic Committee on this matter. Evidence was given by the Transport Officer of the Education Department following on the suggestion to the committee that every school pick-up place should be marked. We found there are about 3,000 places in the State where school buses stop twice a day. I am opposed to the State being cluttered up with signs if a better suggestion can be followed. The marking of the school bus follows the practice adopted in America. If the bus is moving it is regarded as a bus, but when it is still it is regarded as a school and the motorist must pass it at the same speed as if he were passing a school.

Mr. HAWKER—I do not see the need for the word "Caution," but as members appear to be against me I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment withdrawn; clause passed.

Clause 24—"Opening doors and alighting so as to cause danger, etc."

Mr. FRED WALSH—I think paragraph (*b*) of new section 136a is not necessary. How many persons do not get out of a car on the driver's side?

The Hon. T. Playford—Plenty.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Almost every driver gets out on the driver's side. This provision will provide business for lawyers because it will be difficult to decide whether a driver caused danger to other persons using the road or impeded the passage of traffic on the road. I drive a car a great deal and I always see, before alighting, whether or not I am in a busy thoroughfare and likely to cause danger. I think the situation is already fully covered.

Mr. Shannon—The Bill deals only with inconsiderate drivers.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, but why is there any need to have two provisions on this matter?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—It will be an offence only if anyone opens the door of a motor car thereby creating a danger. The clause was inserted because the State Traffic Committee was informed that three cyclists in the last few years had been killed by people negligently opening the door of a motor car.

Clause passed.

Clause 25—"Loads on vehicles."

Mr. HAWKER—Do only the ends of projecting loads have to be covered with white material, or the whole load?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Only the projecting ends.

Mr. STEPHENS—There is little difference between the wording of the clause and the wording of section 141. Both were badly drawn, and we have made the Act far too complicated. Section 141 has never been policed. Only last week part of a load was dropped on the Port Road because it had not been properly stacked and tied.

Mr. Shannon—Do you suggest that because the offender is not always caught we should not have such a provision as this?

Mr. STEPHENS—I do not think there has ever been a prosecution for such an offence.

The Hon. T. Playford—Section 141 applies only when a load projects outside a vehicle, but the clause applies to the load inside the vehicle as well.

Mr. STEPHENS—This is a serious matter, and unless the provision is policed properly someone may be killed. The Act says that if a vehicle is not properly loaded the person concerned shall be guilty of an offence, but that has not been included in this clause, which says that projecting loads shall be covered with white material, but the size of the covering is not stipulated. I have seen timber or pipes covered at the end with white material only the size of a lady's handkerchief, and sometimes the material is not even white.

Mr. Shannon—On the other hand I have seen covering material so large that it obscured the view of the load.

Mr. STEPHENS—That is all the more reason why the provision should be properly worded and the size of the white material stipulated. A certain distance at which the material must be visible should also be stipulated.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member said no offence was created and there was no penalty, but that matter is covered by sections 157a and 158.

Mr. FRED WALSH—This provision is too open, and members should listen to the advice of the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Stephens) who has had much experience in this matter. The object of the clause is good, but how often does a driver secure his load only to find that it has shifted and possibly he has lost some of it before driving far?

Mr. TRAVERS—The man who is driving does not commit an offence merely because his load shifts. The offence, if one is committed, is in the manner the load was secured initially. If the employer secured the load in the first place he must pay the penalty; if the employee did the securing I suppose he and the employer would be liable. The offence is complete in itself when the securing has been done; the mere fact that the load shifts or falls off is merely an indication of insecurity. In reply to the member for Port Adelaide, there is no question of putting up some insignificant cover that one cannot see, because a cover must be put on that indicates the presence of a projection; then the driver behind will see it.

Mr. Stephens—How far away?

Mr. TRAVERS—A reasonable distance. There is no point in being able to see it two miles away, and there is every reason why it shall be seen so as to prevent another vehicle running into it. Indeed, the object of the clause is to save people from running into the back of a loaded vehicle, and the man with the loaded vehicle must cover the load so as to indicate the presence of a projection.

Mr. DAVIS—I disagree with the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) about the security of a load. Has the honourable member had any experience in trying to make a load secure? It is possible for a rope to stretch and become insecure, and some of the load may be lost. If chains are used it is possible for the switch stick to break and the chains to work loose. The driver of a vehicle should be protected.

Mr. Pearson—He could get out and have a look occasionally.

Mr. DAVIS—That is a most foolish suggestion. Should he get out every mile or half mile? A man driving a lorry in the country would seldom get out to look at his load. Both the public and the driver should be protected.

Mr. FLETCHER—I am more interested in what is hanging over the side of the truck. In my district I have seen lorries taking pine waste from a mill, and because the load has not been tied on, the road from the mill to Mount Gambier has been top dressed with pine waste, which constitutes a menace. It is difficult to secure a load in such a manner that it will not shift. If a driver is obliged to make frequent swings around corners he should check to see that his load has not shifted. I have known of instances where timber has fallen from loads and struck cars. I cannot understand why serious accidents have not happened in those circumstances. I support the clause, which I hope will be strictly enforced.

Clause passed.

Clause 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Speed limit on heavy vehicles."

Mr. PEARSON—I move—

In subsection (1) (*b*) to delete the words "but does not exceed fifteen tons."

The effect of my amendment will be to provide for a general speed limit of 30 miles an hour on roads outside built up areas for vehicles weighing over 7 tons. If accepted paragraph (*c*) will be redundant and I will move for its deletion. I have advocated for many years that the permitted speed limit of heavy vehicles is unrealistic. I have driven trucks and trailers for about 30 years and have some knowledge of the difficulties of operating such vehicles. It is physically impossible to operate a heavy transport economically at the speeds hitherto permitted. Unless a driver is prepared to crawl along at

a speed which makes it impossible to mount a rise without getting into lower gears, he is forced to travel at faster speeds than are permitted. The effect of the present limit has been for drivers to ignore the law. My amendment will provide that vehicles of gross weight of over seven tons will be allowed to travel at 30 miles an hour. I do not suggest that vehicles should travel at speeds dangerous to the public. There are provisions in the Act relating to persons who drive to the danger of the public. It is no use our enacting laws that people cannot be expected to observe. Most vehicles on the roads—even those operated by semi-governmental authorities—are culpable in respect of the present speed limit.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I oppose the amendment, which increases the speed limit on heavy vehicles to 30 miles an hour on roads outside built up areas. The amendment is dangerous. I agree that 20 miles an hour is an unrealistic speed limit. I suggest we compromise and provide for a general speed limit of 25 miles an hour for vehicles exceeding seven tons. I have had experience of endeavouring to pass heavy vehicles on country roads. They are responsible for much damage to our roads. I suggest that 25 miles an hour would be an adequate speed limit.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This clause is not based on a recommendation of the State Traffic Committee, which recommended a speed of 25 miles an hour. The Government took the view that as we have a limited amount to spend upon roads we should insist that the traffic be of a type our roads can carry. I point out that this speed limit will apply to all roads. What may be a perfectly safe speed in some parts of the State would be an excessive speed in other parts. It is extremely difficult to secure convictions when vehicles are within five miles an hour of the limit. Unless a driver is travelling substantially faster than 25 miles an hour it is almost impossible to secure a conviction against him. I oppose the amendment which will result in greater damage to our roads. Heavy vehicles are severely damaging our hills roads at present speeds. I would not object to a 25-mile an hour limit if it were clearly understood that it is the absolute limit and if the penalties were sufficient to ensure the observance of the law.

Mr. BROOKMAN—We should be realistic in considering speed limits. A speed limit of 20 miles an hour for any vehicle over 15 tons is absurd. I realize that the present load limit is lower, but I point out that the vehicles which are damaging our roads are not those travelling at 20 or 25 miles an hour but those travelling at speeds exceeding 40 miles an hour. In Australia there are big distances to cover and road transport is increasing to a great extent. If we impose restrictions of this sort that transport will be seriously hampered. In 1954 the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee recommended a speed of 35 miles an hour for vehicles of over 7 tons but not over 13 tons outside built up areas, and 30 miles an hour for vehicles over 13 tons. That is a realistic speed. How can people cover distances like those between Adelaide and Melbourne or Adelaide and Port Lincoln at a speed of 20 miles an hour? We should support Mr. Pearson's proposal.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I cannot follow the reasoning of Mr. Pearson and Mr. Brookman. They have supported a speed limit of 35 miles an hour for motor cars, yet Mr. Brookman wants motor trucks and trailers to travel at the same speed.

Mr. Brookman—Thirty.

Mr. FRED WALSH—There is a need to protect our roads and to ensure safety for people who use them. Accidents have occurred through drivers travelling far in excess of a proper speed. There should be heavier penalties to prevent drivers from breaking the laws in regard to speed and weight of loads. I hold no brief for road hauliers who run in direct competition with the railways. Mr. O'Halloran's suggestion should be adopted.

Mr. HEASLIP—I try to be realistic in my approach to this legislation, but as it stands the clause is not realistic. If modern heavy transport had to keep down to a speed of 20 miles an hour it would mean that seldom would top gear be used. If they can travel at 30 miles an hour they will do no more harm than in the past, because they have travelled at that speed. We have not been able to implement the present legislation. We cannot compel drivers of heavy road transport to maintain low speeds, so let us be realistic and increase the speed limit and prosecute the drivers if they break the law. We have penalties for dangerous driving and if drivers go through the hills at a dangerous speed they should be prosecuted, but why restrict the speed on the open road?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. O'Halloran wants vehicles of up to 15 tons to travel at 30 miles an hour, and those over 15 tons at 25 miles an hour.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is so.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I would agree to that if the following were accepted at the end of the clause:—

(*b*) By adding at the end of subsection (5) thereof the words "and not withstanding section 180 of this Act shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not less than £25 and not more than £100."

We have had cases of speed limits being broken and only insignificant fines being imposed. A fine of £25 for a speeding offence of this type would not be unreasonable.

Mr. Pearson—If the penalties are increased the speed limit should be 30 miles an hour, not 25.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The provision is a much bigger concession than the honourable member realizes because a man usually has a full load one way only. When he has unloaded his vehicle he may travel at more than 30 miles an hour. At various times we have attempted to police the Act on the open roads. This is very expensive, but we have often found a magistrate imposing such a trumpery fine that it is no deterrent.

Mr. DAVIS—I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, and I agree with the Premier's remarks about the penalties. Heavy vehicles have caused much damage to our roads. It cost £500,000 to put the Bordertown road in good order, and if heavy vehicles are damaging that road the owners should be penalized. Vehicles weighing up to 40 tons sometimes travel at high speeds when travelling to the rocket range, and this has damaged that road. I disagree with other members who say that heavy vehicles do not damage the roads when travelling at high speeds.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I would like to see a higher upper speed limit in this clause, but I rise to correct an impression given by interjection by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee was a road hauliers' committee, but I will give the names of the committee members. The chairman was Mr. T. G. Paterson, who is also chairman of the Australian Road Safety Council. The representative from New South Wales was the secretary of the Department of Motor Transport; the Victorian representative was the superintendent of the Police Department; the Queensland representative was also from its Police Department; the South Australian representative was Mr. H. B. Walker, formerly Registrar of Motor Vehicles; the Western Australian representative was from the Police Department; the Tasmanian representative was the Administrator of Road Transport; the Australian Capital Territory's representative was an inspector of police; and the Northern Territory's representative was a member of the Department of Territories. There were also representatives of non-Governmental organizations. They were Mr. B. H. Boykett, general manager of the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia, one representative of the Australian Road Transport Federation, one representative of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, and the other representative was Mr. J. P. Horan, who is Federal Secretary of the Transport Workers' Union of Australia. It can be seen that this committee was not a road hauliers' committee. It represented all interests, including national safety.

Mr. HAWKER—This is a difficult subject to discuss because we have such a variety of conditions in South Australia. In many ways the Act is better than the clause because it had two sets of speed limits, one for vehicles not drawing trailers, and one for vehicles with trailers, whereas the clause has two separate speeds, one for built-up areas, and the other for country districts. We must consider two factors: damage to the roads caused by heavy vehicles travelling at high speeds, and safety. A vehicle drawing a trailer is not as safe as one without a trailer because trailers sway and cut corners to some extent and they do not have brakes. Vehicles with trailers should travel more slowly, but the Bill does not provide this. I do not think that a speed limit of 30 miles an hour for a modern transport is too high, though I favour increasing the penalties for offences.

Mr. PEARSON—It is obvious that I have no hope of having the speed limit raised to 30 miles an hour for heavy vehicles, but this is necessary in order to operate modern vehicles conveniently and efficiently. The opposition to my amendment is based on the viewpoint not of the people who operate these vehicles, but of other people who, if I may say so, know little about operating them.

Mr. O'Halloran—But we all know something about the damage they do to the roads.

Mr. PEARSON—I do, too, because I often travel over 400 miles from here to my home over our country roads. The Premier said he would agree to raising the speed limit by five miles an hour, but the higher penalties he proposes are not quite fair. If I am forced to accept the limit of 25 miles

an hour, then the Treasurer should not persist with his penalty clause, because I feel that the temptation to exceed a speed so far below the reasonable operating speed of the vehicle will be to great and the penalty should not be unduly severe.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move—

In paragraph (*c*) after "twenty" to insert "five."

Amendment carried.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I move—

After new subsection (2) to add new subsection (3) as follows:—

> (3) This section does not apply to any vehicle the aggregate weight of which and of any trailer joined thereby does not exceed three tons.

I do not expect any opposition to this amendment because the Bill brings utility vehicles within the speed limits imposed in country areas. The utility is a car-like vehicle and it does not seem reasonable to restrict its speed to 40 miles per hour in country areas.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not object to this amendment. It covers only the lighter type of vehicle that should not be subject to any speed limit.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have taken some note of the statements by the member for Flinders (Mr. Pearson) about penalties, and as a result I move:—

After proposed subsection (2) to add the following paragraph:—

> (*b*) By adding at the end of subsection (5) thereof the words "and notwithstanding section 180 of this Act shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not not less than ten pounds and not more than fifty pounds."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Bill was returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

REGISTRATION OF BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 885.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I have given this Bill a cursory glance. I believe it is quite sound in principle and I therefore give it my wholehearted support.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

THE NATIONAL TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 1638.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I support the Bill, which creates an entirely new body—the National Trust of South Australia. The Bill was introduced at the request of persons interested in the preservation of certain historic buildings and places of scientific interest. At times there is a desire to retain old buildings. I can remember when some at Henley Beach were retained. There has been a desire also to keep in existence the old Legislative Council building which was renovated for the Royal visit. I am anxious to know whether rules made by the trust at its annual meeting altering rules contained in the schedule to this Bill will have to be approved by Parliament.

The Hon. B. Pattinson—All the rules are subject to the will of Parliament.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—With that assurance I support the second reading.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—In common with many others who feel that our heritage in things of beauty and historical interest should be preserved, I welcome the introduction of this Bill. Perhaps I may be forgiven if I take a little personal pride in the realization of what has been to me something of a pet hobby. In 1948 I had the privilege of suggesting to the Government in this House that a National Trust should be established. If I may again be forgiven I will quote from *Hansard* what I said some seven years ago:—

> I suggest that as a long range view the Government may consider setting up a permanent National Trust to administer historical gifts which may be given to the State. In England a National Trust has done outstanding work in preserving historic buildings and places of scenic beauty and traditional significance. Our own history is so short that we need to preserve the milestones that we have . . . We should preserve the State's physical treasures in the same way as the Archives preserves its documentary history. We have a number of enthusiastically and competently staffed bodies anxious to preserve South Australian historical landmarks and a National Trust could be set up comprising members of these bodies with great advantage to the State.

It is therefore with great satisfaction that I support this Bill. The recognition of a number of public bodies by providing that they shall appoint members to the trust is most satisfactory. The present Bill is, I

believe, the outcome of conferences between several groups of enthusiasts who have until recently sought to achieve their objective of a National Trust by different means. I believe that the Bill takes the best of the proposals which have been put to the Government.

I do not want to cover the ground covered by the Minister who referred to the splendid work of the National Trust of England which has existed since 1895. Should any member wish to see a very concise story of its achievements I will be pleased to make available a short publication on that trust's work and constitution. It will, I imagine, be necessary for an approach to be made to the Federal Government to obtain exemption from estate duty on gifts. It should be understood that the purpose of the trust is neither to keep out nor take out of production properties which might be left to the trust. For example, should an historic property come into the trust's possession as part of say a mixed farm, then the trust would continue to farm it. The trust will take expert advice on the artistic and historical worth of properties which might be willed or transferred to it. It should be made quite plain that a property is not valuable merely because it is old. It must have some historic, architectural or aesthetic value. The trust would determine too such question as whether the remnants of Sturt's cottage are really worth saving or are now so dilapidated and have so little of the original left that the expense of restoration (if indeed it could be done) is not justified.

I would like to correct an impression which may have arisen from something which was said in another place. The purpose of the National Trust should not be to hold documentary material. The Archives of the State are the place for such matters. Then, too, there may be places which have some historical worth but which compared with overwhelming economic considerations must give way to something new. I believe that a sensible balance between two extreme points of view will be achieved.

It should be emphasized here that concurrently with the preservation of places of natural beauty and historic interest the history surrounding these things must also be preserved. A notable accession recently to the Archives of South Australia, the papers of Governor Gawler, have opened up a completely new page of Australian history, and a paper lately written by Mr. Travers Borrow, a vice-president of the Pioneers' Association, and more recently a lecture by Major-General Symes before the Royal Geographical Society have raised Governor Gawler to a new stature as an administrator of skill and ability, whose laudable ambitions were thwarted by jealousies and even conspiracies by his detractors. That, however, is by the way.

The trust will be able to do a great deal, with generous public support, in preserving open spaces. What are known as restrictive covenants may be made which prevent future owners of property from carrying on other than prescribed activities on certain lands. Thus, a present owner could place a covenant on his property which would ensure that a subsequent owner could not cut it into building blocks. This would appear on the title and prospective purchasers would take that into account when fixing a price. Then, too, a stand of trees or a geological feature could be preserved in the same fashion. We have not the architectural treasures which exist in the Old Country, but there are some outstanding examples of Georgian and colonial architecture which should be preserved.

The State would indeed be extraordinarily fortunate if Martindale Hall, the home of the late Mr. J. T. Mortlock, should ever come into the hands of the National Trust. Few people have the slightest conception of this fine specimen of Georgian architecture, and the *objets d'art* which it contains. Then, too, there is Austral House, the former home of the Ayers family, which, situated where it is on North Terrace, would provide a perfect setting for an historical museum. There are among South Australians many who have for a long time thought that an historical museum is overdue.

A few weeks ago I saw some of the grim relics of Port Arthur's penal settlement in Tasmania. These grim reminders of the past are mouldering into decay in a small privately owned annexe to a grocer's shop. We have been more fortunate here in having years ago set up our excellent State Archives. The formation of the National Trust is a firm step forward. I believe that I speak for many South Australians in making a plea for an historic museum. Whatever the Government's view on this I do trust that such places as Austral House will not be demolished. Indeed I think the Premier once said to interested people that no action towards that end would be taken without conferring with them. I do

hope that is so. I commend the Government for introducing this Bill and I do urge that all who may be interested in the preservation of things of natural beauty and historical significance will give their support to the trust by becoming members of it, by making gifts to it, and, perhaps equally importantly, seeing that the march of progress does not destroy for all time irreplaceable treasures which should be held for the enjoyment and education of posterity. I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I support the Bill with some personal pleasure, but I cannot take the pride that the member for Burnside (Mr. Geoffrey Clarke) can in being one of the early promoters of the movement for a national trust. However, I have always been interested in what might be called the better things of life which have little monetary value, but great intrinsic value, particularly as time goes by. I commend the Government for bringing down this measure. The best way to encourage public-spirited people to make available documents and other material that may be of value to posterity is by relieving them of the liability to pay certain State rates and taxes, and I think it will be necessary later for the Federal Parliament to take similar action.

There will be adequate representation on the trust of various institutions in which the Government is concerned, so I do not think that the member for Goodwood (Mr. Frank Walsh) need have any fears about the wisdom of giving the trust wide powers. I emphasize that all regulations are subject to Parliament's approval, though I hope Parliament will not unnecessarily impede the trust in the management of its affairs by trying to intrude sectional interests. The member for Burnside said that the Bill was the result of a number of attempts to form a national trust, but they were not successful for a long time because there were some people at cross purposes. Certain people thought certain interests should be represented on the trust, whereas other people thought others should be represented, but the two major movements finally conferred and reached substantial agreement.

The preservation of matters of historic interest is of great importance. The member for Burnside said the Archives Department can care for many documents, but I shall suggest another method by which we may encourage people to preserve and exhibit valuable documents, photographs or albums. A new Australian at Lobethal, Mr. J. Vanagas, started a movement to gather evidence of the early history of that town. I saw the document he has prepared and showed it to the Minister of Education. I suggest that we get people of the right type who are interested in this field to form local committees for collecting and exhibiting old records and photographs. Then people would come forward with valuable material because they would know it would be well looked after. The Institute Committee at Lobethal has made a room available for housing and displaying exhibits. The Government should do everything possible to foster such movements. Local collections would be augmented because people would gladly bring forward valuable documents if they knew they would be exhibited in their own area.

The SPEAKER—Does this concern the Archives or the National Trust?

Mr. SHANNON—Material would be brought forward that would not come within the sphere of the Archives Department. Many people have articles of historic interest, and if they thought they would be preserved in their own area where they could be seen by their own friends and relations they would more readily make them available. The Bill gives the National Trust wide powers. I agree with this, but I hope it will encourage the establishment of local collections of articles and documents of historic interest. This would also assist the tourist trade.

I make those suggestions because I believe we can trust these people to do the right thing. I am happy about the proposed set-up and merely advance these proposals to indicate what may be done to ensure the preservation of historic relics that increase in value every year. I commend the Bill to members because I believe the Government has taken a wise step in setting up a trust on lines similar to that which has been so successful in the Mother Country.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—This Bill, which provides for a National Trust, is very timely and I give it my full support. The need for a National Trust was first felt in England in the middle of the 19th Century. As in England so it is in this country; industrial expansion, prosperity, and improved transport bring about a great development, and of course every encouragement and assistance is given to any undertaking promising industry on an economic basis. Common lands in England were often lost under industrial expansion. Old historic buildings are often threatened with extinction such as has happened in

England through this expansion, and also the more drastic taxation that has forced old country homes on the market. So there came into existence there the trust in 1895—an incorporated company not trading for profit. But before this there were forces at work, and people thinking along the same lines on which the trust was formed.

The Romantic movement had drawn attention to the beauties of uncultivated nature. John Ruskin, John Stuart Mill, T. H. Huxley, William Morris, and other wellknown men finally helped to bring into being the Commons Reservation Society in 1865, and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings in 1877. The Commons Society served to rouse a strong public feeling against the further enclosure of commons, by the defence of many places, such as Hampstead Heath, Birkhamstead, Wandsworth, Epping and Ashdown forests.

Cases arose where historic buildings could be saved by one means or another, and as the years go by this will undoubtedly come to pass in our country too. Many projects in England which the trust have undertaken are self-supporting. Others, where it is not possible to derive an income, are kept by the proceeds of public appeals. I believe that will be followed here. The set-up of the governing body, or trust committee, I feel, must be fully representative in order that the interests and rights of our people will not be over-ridden, or become subjected to any form of dictatorship. The rules of the National Trust, contained in the schedule to the Bill, state:—

Each of the bodies or persons hereinafter named may appoint one member to the council of the National Trust as follows (that is to say):—

The Council of Royal Society of South Australia:
The Council of Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (S.A. Branch) Inc.:
The Council of the University of Adelaide:
The Committee of the Institute of Architects in South Australia:
The Committee of the Youth Hostels Associations in South Australia:
The Committee of the Adelaide Bushwalkers:
The Committee of the Country Women's Association:
The Board of the South Australian Museum:
The Board of Governors of the National Gallery of South Australia:
The Trades and Labor Council in South Australia:
The Council of the Pioneers Association of South Australia:
The Council of the Royal Zoological Society:

I suggest that agencies of the trust could be set up in country districts to further the aims of the trust and to police its interests, or in an advisory capacity on local conditions and knowledge, depending on the nature and type of the undertaking in the vicinity. This would also tend to enlist the interest of country people and prevent the trust being vested in the city, with consequent conflict of opinions.

Preservation of aboriginal camping grounds and burial places should receive early attention. I hope the wishes and ideas of Major-General Symes can be achieved. He said in an article in the *Advertiser* of July 7, 1955, that he wished to emphasize at the outset that the sponsors of the trust are most anxious to avoid controversy over any aspect of its aims and objectives. He also said:—

The new trust is anxious to co-operate with everyone, from individuals to Governments in preserving notable buildings, sanctuaries, and beauty spots for posterity.

This, I agree, is a worthy and estimable objective. I reiterate that I am 100 per cent in favour of the trust and its objects, providing the rights of our people are not subjected to dictation, through over-enthusiasm of members of the trust. Being a young nation, with a comparatively early start on these lines, much can, and I believe will be, accomplished for posterity by judicious and careful consideration of all its aspects.

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—I support the Bill, which will create a body that will cater for a long-felt need and preserve places of historic interest and beauty spots. Further, it will protect our natural flora and fauna. These are worthy objects. South Australia is a young community and it is still possible to obtain relics of practically the whole of our history up to the present. I am concerned that the trust shall preserve some of the remaining links with the early Murray shipping days. At one time 150 paddle steamers operated along the Murray, but they have disappeared over the years. Murray shipping played an important part in the early economic life of the State, and there are still relics such as old paddle steamers tied up at the wharves, which steamers I hope the trust will preserve. In this way future generations will be able to learn more of the early days on the Murray. I do not want to disparage the work already done in this connection, as I realize that some district councils have interested themselves in it, but the Trust should take an interest in this matter.

Further, the flora and fauna of South Australia comprise a subject of extreme interest, and I hope the trust will preserve some existing species. From conversation I have had with members of the public I believe the National Trust movement will receive wholehearted public support and that from bequests finance will be made available for its valuable work. I was pleased to note that certain exemptions had been provided for in respect of rates and taxes on buildings taken over, and also certain succession duties concessions, which should encourage gifts.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6, and 8 and 9 passed.

New clause 7—"Exemption from rates and taxes."

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I ask the Committee to agree to new clause 7, suggested by the Legislative Council.

New Clause inserted.

Schedule and title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 25. Page 1221.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill proposes three important amendments to the Mining Act, and I am entirely in agreement with the principles expressed in all of them. The first proposal—that the Mines Department shall have power to conduct research and investigations and otherwise assist in the development of our mineral resources—has the wholehearted support of the Labor Party. This proposal represents one more step by the Government in the direction of providing essential services to the public and, as such, is in complete accordance with Labor policy. Actually, the particular functions which we are now being asked to authorize by legislation have been performed by the Mines Department for some years; and it is only because the Auditor-General has thrown some doubt on the legality of some of these activities that we are considering this amendment.

It is pleasing to see the growth and development of the Mines Department that has taken place in recent years; for it proves beyond doubt that, in these matters, State enterprise is not only desirable but essential. It is not so long ago that the Mines Department was an insignificant branch of the Public Service—one might say, the Cinderella of the service—specializing in and limiting its activities to such things as the registration of claims, leases, etc., conducting assays of samples submitted to it and collecting royalties. As an indication of the enormous expansion that has taken place, I quote the following expenditure figures:—

Year.	Expenditure. £
1938-39	21,600
1945-46	51,600
1950-51	479,300
1951-52	704,000
1954-55	595,000
1955-56 (estimated)	683,000

Since 1938-39, the staff of the department has grown from a handful of officers to over 300. Most of this expansion has, of course, been due to the entry of the department into the actual business of mining. Whether the greatly increased expenditure has been all for the good of the State is a matter for the Government to answer.

The second proposal in the Bill is that ordinary mineral leases may be granted for uranium and thorium; such leases to be for a period of twenty years, with a right of renewal. Some time ago when circumstances were different the Mining Act was amended to provide for short term leases for the purpose of encouraging individuals to prospect for these minerals in the ordinary way. The intention then was that the Government should take over completely where promising deposits were discovered. It is not proposed to abolish these leases, so that individuals may still go on prospecting with their geiger counters, but if uranium or thorium is discovered by any person, he will not be granted a mining lease to work the claim unless he can guarantee that he is in a financial position to do so. This, incidentally, implies that the costs involved in developing a uranium mine are considerable—and the expenditure figures I have quoted demonstrate that fact. Thus, failing the development of a deposit by the Government itself, a lease will be granted to some large-scale organization having vast financial resources and, of course, the know-how and equipment necessary for such an enterprise. In this respect, it would appear that the Government has come to the end of its visible resources and does not consider itself competent to undertake such further mining activities itself.

Although the provisions contained in clauses four and five are general and wide enough to apply to any future worthwhile discovery, the Government is at the moment more particularly concerned about the development of the Crocker Well and Mt. Victoria Hut deposits on which it has already spent a considerable amount of public money. The Government probably has in mind some large company prepared to take over these deposits and work them on terms to be arranged between it and the Government. In this connection, the only point to consider is whether the Government is going to safeguard the State's interests sufficiently in the conditions prescribed in the proposed new leases. That, of course, is the responsibility of the Government, and much will depend on how it interprets the provisions contained in clause 5 and how it exercises its discretion in arriving at any particular set of conditions to be observed by a lessee.

In developing the deposits at Mount Victoria Hut and Crocker Well the Government might consider a partnership. In other words, it might find 50 per cent or more of the necessary capital and private enterprise the balance. The developmental work could be done by private enterprise in co-operation with the Government. That is my idea of co-operation in developing our natural resources. The Government could see that there was no exploitation of workers in the industry and of the community at large, which really owns the valuable deposits.

There is, however, another consideration arising out of the encouragement of uranium mining that these provisions are intended to offer, and that is the implication of the provisions contained in clause 6. It proposes to empower the Government to purchase from a lessee the produce of his mining and other activities; and this is perhaps the most important provision in the Bill. We are not told whether any such lessee will have to sell his produce to the Government or whether he may sell it elsewhere if he can get a better price. It is not perfectly clear who will be the master in any situation that might arise, such as if other avenues of disposal than by sale to the Government are created. These are matters which ought to be more specifically prescribed. We should be told the extent to which we are committed in purchasing the production of privately owned uranium mines under this legislation, and whether we could sell the product of those mines at a profit in any part of the world.

Earlier I quoted expenditure figures showing how our Mines Department had expanded; but, of course, that is only one side of the picture. For some years now the expenditure has averaged between £500,000 and £600,000, about 10 times the average expenditure before the big expansion took place, but the revenue has not shown a corresponding increase. Last year it was only £97,500 and this year, owing to increased royalties which the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Limited has agreed to pay on iron ore, the estimated revenue is £207,000. It will be seen, therefore, that so far the Government's business enterprise has been all one-sided; and that makes it all the more desirable that some proportionate return should be forthcoming in the not too distant future. We have a considerable amount of capital tied up in uranium mining and processing, and we should therefore make sure that under any system of co-operation that the Government proposes should be undertaken between it and a private company due consideration should be given to that fact.

I support the second reading, but much will depend on the way the great power presented to the Government under the Bill is exercised. This valuable uranium should be used only in the interests of peace. We are told that the problems associated with the production of atomic energy are being solved and we should see that we are in a position to take advantage of this great source of power for peaceful purposes.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 25. Page 1220.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the Bill. It provides that boys under 18 years of age and girls under 16 years of age shall not, in effect, be capable of contracting a valid marriage. It is undeniable that in the overwhelming majority of cases where a marriage takes place betwen a boy under 18 years of age, or a girl under 16 years of age, and another person the reason is not so much one of mutual attraction but something else. The two main reasons for such marriages are that the girl in the case has been with child or that the boy has been under threat of action by the police or the Crown Law Department for carnal knowledge, and a marriage has been the only way out. No one can deny that marriages contracted under those circumstances

are wholly undesirable. Marriages of convenience seldom work; in fact a large portion of the cases that come before the divorce courts are those in which the first child of a marriage was conceived out of wedlock. It is far better for such children to be adopted or placed in a home than that their unhappiness be increased by a marriage that will not work, but that does not mean there will not be rare cases in which such marriages would work.

The Bill contains a provision for the legitimation of children that would otherwise be not capable of being legitimated. In other words, legitimation of a child born out of wedlock cannot normally take place where there is a bar to the marriage at the time of birth. Some such marriages may work, and because of this the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has placed an amendment on the file. I will support the amendment because it will provide for those rare cases.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—The subject matter of this Bill is of grave importance because we are considering a complex relationship of fundamental importance to our way of life. It has been well said that the family is the basis of our national life. Therefore, when we are considering Bills such as this we should do so with great caution.

I accept the general principle of the Bill that a girl under 16 or a boy under 18 should not be capable of contracting a valid marriage, but I have some misgivings because it imposes a restriction on the freedom of the individual. The purpose of the Bill is to protect young people from the possibility of unhappy marriage. The Minister said that marriages of convenience are often forced upon the parties by the parents of the girl concerned. As he said, such marriages frequently fail, but they often fail irrespective of the ages of the parties. The Minister suggested that young mothers often become a burden on the State. That is most regrettable, but the Bill will not help the position; in fact, it will make it worse because the parties will not be able to set up a home to look after their children. There is provision for the subsequent legitimation of a child by a subsequent marriage, but in many cases that marriage will not take place.

What will be the position in the meantime? Will the mother and father live apart, or live together unmarried? The latter is more likely, and it is most undesirable that such a liaison should be necessary. The Bill could be improved by allowing some discretion to meet the exceptional case where a marriage would work, but under the Bill there is no discretion. It states that a girl under 16 or a boy under 18 cannot marry under any circumstances. Under the Act boys and girls under 21 cannot marry without the consent of their parents. In other words the discretion is left with the parents, and they are just the people who would best know whether a marriage was desirable. If parents withhold consent unreasonably the Minister may override their decision, but under the Bill girls under 16 and boys under 18 will not be able to marry under any circumstances. This means that Parliament thinks it knows better than parents what is best for their children. Whether or not two people should marry depends on the personalities and the maturity of the parties.

In most cases girls under 16 and boys under 18 are not ready for marriage, but there will be exceptional cases. Unless we provide some discretion for them we shall be doing a real and unnecessary injustice to some people. Certainly the Minister in his second reading explanation did not suggest that all marriages of very young people are failures. He said that such marriages frequently fail. He also said that they are not usually satisfactory; he did not say they were never satisfactory. Therefore, provision should be made for the exceptional case.

What are the effects on a pregnant girl of her non-marriage? If she is not permitted to marry and has a child, which under this Bill would be illegitimate, her chance of a subsequent happy marriage is materially reduced. She may have made only one mistake, but for it she may be penalized for the rest of her life. That has an adverse effect. That is the attitude that has been taken in most other places where there is legislation of this nature. In Great Britain, however, it is not the case; there neither girls nor boys under 16 may marry. The only other Australian State that has legislation similar to this Bill is Tasmania where the ages are 18 years for boys and 16 for girls, but under the Tasmanian Marriage Act a discretion is given. Although it is not the same discretion as that proposed in the amendment on members' files, the Tasmanian Act states:—

> If after such inquiry as he thinks necessary the Registrar-General or Police Magistrate is satisfied that for some special reason it is desirable, he may make an order dispensing with the requirements of subsection (1) hereof.

None of the other States has similar legislation. If we are to enact this legislation some discretion should be provided. The New

Zealand Marriage Act contains rather different provisions, but there, too, a discretion is given. In Committee I shall move a certain amendment. I support the second reading.

Mr. TRAVERS (Torrens)—I am not very happy about the Bill. The position would be greatly improved if we left it without interference. The unduly early marriages envisaged by the Bill are frequently doomed to failure, but we must bear in mind two things: firstly, biologically at any rate, early marriages (assuming satisfactory economic conditions) are apt to be more successful than late marriages; secondly, an alarming percentage of all marriages are coming to grief these days, and one wonders whether we should not take special precautions about early marriages because of that.

Does the Bill remedy any mischief? I do not think so; indeed, I think it will produce greater mischief. I have always been a great advocate for the common law of England, and short of any satisfactory proof of good reason for departing from it, I have always been conservative about departing from it. What is the position at English common law? At common law marriages were valid if celebrated between males of at least 14 years of age and females of at least 12 years of age. Those ages shock one's ideas in view of present day tendencies in these matters. In England they departed from those ages in 1929 by substituting in the Marriage Act a provision that a marriage was void if either party was under the age of 16 years. It is not without significance that in England the age of consent that provides a defence for sexual interference between a male and female is 16 years, which coincides with the age at which they can legally marry. It seems to provide a consistent and reasonable situation that they commit a crime if they have sexual relations before reaching that age, and after that age they are at liberty to marry if they wish.

This Bill, however, does not face up to that situation, and it is therefore lacking in that respect. It serves no useful purpose beyond the fact that it saves the Chief Secretary from some extremely embarrassing situations, because under the present law people who find themselves in circumstances in which they wish to marry because of some sexual indiscretion, but cannot obtain a parent's consent, are surrendered into the hands of the Chief Secretary, who must decide whether or not they may marry. In my view (and it is a definite view) those duties, although unpleasant, should be vested in the Chief Secretary, and he should discharge them.

Mr. Shannon—You prefer the Minister to a court?

Mr. TRAVERS—I do not mind, but somebody should be responsible. I am happy about the jurisdiction of the courts because I have complete faith in their competence and fairness, but I will have equal confidence in the Chief Secretary. The Bill does not vest the matter in the court. It simply creates a situation in which one or two things will inevitably happen in most cases: it will compel either bastardy or abortion. It is one or the other, and we should not be a party to doing anything that will produce either.

Mr. Davis—Couldn't the parties go to another State to marry?

Mr. TRAVERS—It depends on the marriage laws in the other State. From time immemorial British law has looked on the position of the unborn child as being of prime consideration and we should not depart from that principle. The unborn child is entitled to consideration. These sexual indiscretions are indications of what human nature will do, and it is no use being superior or highbrow about the matter. They do happen, and we should not throw to the wolves the interests of the unborn child. If the unborn child can be legitimated, well and good; this business of reserving the right to have *ligitimatio per subsequens matrimoniam* may be all very well, but people too often do not marry after the event. I do not close my eyes to the fact that many of these marriages are unhappy, but we should not close our eyes to the fact that 50 years ago very early marriages were the order of the day and the things that have led us out of that situation have in the main been economic conditions. Clause 4 states:—

> A marriage celebrated after the commencement of the Marriage Act Amendment Act, 1955, between persons either of whom is—
> (*a*) a boy under the age of 18 years; or
> (*b*) a girl under the age of 16 years,
> shall be void.

In England the Marriage Act of 1929 creates a situation in which it is a criminal offence for youngsters of less than 16 years to have sexual intercourse but once past that age they may marry. That is consistent, but section 55 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in South Australia provides that intercourse between a boy under the age of 17 and over the age of 16 with a girl in that age group

(if the intercourse occurs with consent) is not a crime. Between the ages of 16 and 17 years there is an open sexual season. They cannot marry, but they commit no crime. It is an extremely unsatisfactory position. Either they should be held to be committing a crime if they have sexual relations, or, if not committing a crime, why should they not be allowed to marry? In England they have things dove-tailed properly. The age of 16 is the age of consent, and it is also the age of marriage. The amendment suggested by Mr. Millhouse is a sound one. We should not take any step to force illegitimacy on the one hand or abortion on the other.

Mr. SHANNON secured the adjournment of the debate until December 8.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT ACT.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LAND AGENTS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 1642.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the Bill. It is a good thing that these land agents provisions have been overhauled because undeniably there have been abuses of the practice of land agents. A certain amount of it has arisen from the fact that whereas the legal profession is strictly and closely controlled, even after the institution of the Land Agents Board land agents have not been so strictly controlled. Moreover, while the legal profession is subject to all sorts of restrictions in the mode of its practice, such as not being able to advertise, land agents are not in the same position. The only difference between solicitors and land agents, apart from the contentious matter of drawing documents, is that legal practitioners may draw documents under seal, that is, deeds; otherwise land agents can draw any document at all and charge for it. This includes legal documents which solicitors have had to study for years in order to draw them competently. This has led to a number of practices by land agents that would not be allowed in the legal profession. It would be better for us not to have land brokers under the Law of Pr[illegible] Act. Land brokers were instituted in this State under the original Torrens title system because some members of the legal profession at the time objected to the institution of Torrens titles. The legal profession has had to suffer from the institution of land brokers. Because land agents who are land brokers have taken over what would otherwise be the province of legal practitioners certain things have happened. The practice of land brokers must come within matters that only lawyers are adequately trained to handle. Certainly the Torrens title system made the task of land agents much more simple, but the proper drawing of documents, and the proper dealing with land business, is more a matter for experts in property law than for untrained or semi-trained persons acting in the capacity of land brokers. It would be better if we had land agents and solicitors rather than land agents some of whom are land brokers, and land brokers who do not act as land agents, and solicitors.

Mr. Riches—This Bill does not interfere with that position.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. It tightens up the position a little as between land agents and land brokers, and to that extent is beneficial, but it does not cope with the situation I have outlined. It still keeps the institution of land brokers, which I think is an anomalous institution. There is one feature of the Bill with which I am not entirely happy. The licensing of land agents and the dealing with objections to licences, or renewals of them, have been placed in the hands of the Land Agents Board. I am not happy about having a tribunal which is, in effect, prosecutor and judge at the same time. There are objections to the practice of the courts in administering licences under the Act, but they are not as great as those that can be raised to a system where the board makes an investigation, decides to take action with respect to a licence, and then sits in judgment on the licence. There is a safeguard because an appeal may be taken to the court, but it shall not act in the normal manner of an appeal court. That is to say, it would not determine whether or not the original tribunal had come to a decision on the evidence. It would be a rehearing on the appeal and that is a safeguard, but it would be better to have the court and not the board as the original tribunal.

At present there is a practice to which I have referred previously in this House. It is most undesirable amongst some land agents in this city. It is not the case with all land agents for there are many reputable land agents and land brokers who have a high regard for their duty to the fellow members of their association and to the public at large. Some land agents make a contract with a prospective purchaser and take from him a deposit. The contract is expressed to be subject to the consent of the vendor, but that

consent is not endorsed on the contract. They then use the contract, regardless of the fact that a deposit has been paid for the purchase, to get a higher price from someone else, and never get the consent of the vendor. When they have got the higher price from someone else the man who thought he had bought the property is told that the vendor did not consent to the price. That is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. It is not a rare practice, but a constant one on the part of some land agents in this State. The unfortunate prospective purchaser who paid the deposit has, under these circumstances, no remedy except to get his deposit back.

Mr. O'Halloran—If he can.

Mr. DUNSTAN—He gets it back because if he did not the land agent would appear before the court almost immediately. The land agent would have to hold the money in trust and the trust account is subject to audit. Nevertheless the prospective purchaser does not get the property he thought he had bought. The provisions of the Bill cover the general situation adequately. Under the Bill we will have a better and tighter control of land agents. Land agents are allowed to advertise to an extraordinary extent. I can remember seeing advertisements in the windows of land agents saying "All legal documents prepared." That is a most undesirable situation. On one or two occasions the attention of the Attorney-General has been drawn to the matter and action has been taken. Land agents may advertise that they prepare wills in return for a fee, but no land agent, unless he has done a course in law is competent to draw anything but the most simple will. A will is a tricky document to draw. Of course, the legal profession has, on occasions, reaped a harvest from the mistakes made by amateurs in drawing wills. I have seen wills drawn up by people in my district who were not qualified to draw them. They were extraordinary documents, and had the testator died leaving such a will his heirs and successors would have been placed in such a position that most of the money in the estate would have been absorbed in legal processes. I hope this will not be the last legislation we shall see to control people who are not qualified to do legal work, but who advertise that they are prepared to do it for a fee.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill. I listened with great interest to the member for Norwood, and I agree with him on some points. Part II deals with the establishment of a Land Agents Board, and the member for Norwood said that the licensing or registering of land agents should be done by a court. I agree with him up to a point. Part III deals with the licensing of land agents, Part IV with registration of land salesmen, and Part V with the nomination and registration of managers. The authority to be established will deal only with the licensing or registering of three classes of people engaged in this business. Whether we agree that the licensing authority should be the board or the court, I believe it should be able to license or register all people engaged in this line of business. Valuers are licensed or registered by the Appraisers Court, business agents by courts under the Brokers Act, and auctioneers by the Chief Secretary or the Under Treasurer. All these people could well be licensed by the board or the court. The secretary of the Land Agents Board will be required to keep a register of all land agents, land salesmen and business managers, so the board will be thoroughly conversant with the people with whom it is dealing and will know their qualifications. Therefore it will be well qualified to handle the registration or licensing of people engaged in this line of business. I am concerned chiefly about clause 63, which deals with the preparation of instruments. It states:—

(1) In this section "instrument" means any conveyance, mortgage, lease or other deed relating to any estate or interest in land or any instrument within the meaning of the Real Property Act, 1886-1945.

(2) If a land agent—

(*a*) not being a land broker, prepares; or

(*b*) causes or permits any person, not being a legal practitioner or a land broker to prepare,

any instrument relating to any transaction in which the land agent is directly or indirectly concerned or engaged, the land agent shall be guilty of an offence.

Penalty: Fifty pounds.

This clause seems to deal only with land agents, and the member for Norwood said that certain land agents had been guilty of malpractices in the past, but these malpractices had not been attributable only to land agents. Land brokers have also been guilty. Most land agents are quite reputable. Some of the businesses in my district were established in 1893, and they have prepared many documents, which brings in much of their income. In the early days it was not necessary for these people to become qualified as land brokers to draw up instruments, but they have

become thoroughly efficient. One firm that was established in 1893 has not had one document returned by the Registrar-General of Deeds. It also compiles income tax returns and handles deceased estates. It has built up a good reputation, but clause 63 will deprive it of much business.

Last week we passed a Bill regarding qualifications for health inspectors, and we agreed that officers holding such a position at present should be given certificates. Such a principle applies in many professions. When the Local Government Act was amended to require town clerks to hold certificates the town clerks in office were able to get them without examination. That also applied to physiotherapists, dentists and other professional people. I appreciate that there is a need for tightening up the licensing of land agents, but they should be given the opportunity to qualify as land brokers so that they may continue to draw up documents and receive a fee for it.

Therefore, I have placed an amendment on the file which I will explain at the appropriate time. One land agent's business in my district employs four or five people full-time on land sales, the compilation of taxation returns, the preparation of various documents, and the administration of deceased estates. If it is deprived of this business it will result in great hardship on the firm and the employees. Therefore, the owner should be given time to qualify as a land broker.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 46 passed.

Clause 47—"Renewal of registration."

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move—

In subclause (3) to strike out "for registration."

This amendment is of a drafting nature only. Clause 47 provides that, on an application for renewal of a land salesman's registration, a receipt for the renewal of the land salesman's current fidelity bond may be delivered to the board instead of a new fidelity bond. It is intended that it should be possible to renew both the fidelity bond delivered on the original application and also any bond delivered on a subsequent application for renewal. However, this is not made clear in the clause at present, and this amendment makes the necessary alteration to the clause to clarify the point.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 48 to 62 passed.

Clause 63—"Preparation of instruments."

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—I move—

In subclause (2) before "If" to insert "After the 30th day of June, 1957."

This amendment will delay the application of this clause until June 30, 1957, and will give those land agents who do not hold brokers' licences an opportunity to study and qualify for them.

Amendment carried.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—I move—

After subclause (2) to add the following passage:—

> Provided that this subsection shall not apply if the instrument is before being lodged for registration in the Lands Titles Registration Office certified as correct for purposes of the Real Property Act, 1886-1945 by a legal practitioner.

Under the clause as it stands, a land agent will not be permitted to prepare instruments or receive fees for them as he previously has been able to do. Many land agents have derived a good portion of their livelihood from the preparation of instruments, and after all, that is part of a land agent's business. Many have had 20 or more years of experience in this type of work, but will now overnight be deprived of a portion of their livelihood notwithstanding the fact that in the years of preparation of instruments they have met all the requirements of the Registrar-General of Deeds. This amendment will enable them where they do not desire, or for other reasons do not qualify for a land broker's examination, to prepare instruments, but provides a safeguard.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I oppose the amendment, which would really mean that the document would have to be certified correct by a solicitor, as required by the Real Property Act, although an unqualified person unknown to the solicitor had prepared the document. The amendment will simply mean that the subclause will not apply.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I must agree with the member for Norwood that the amendment takes us back to where we were before and takes all the value from the clause. It may well be described as a compromise amendment. The amendment provides that a land agent who is not a landbroker shall not be guilty of an offence against clause 63 if a Real Property Act document prepared by him is certified correct by a legal practitioner. This amendment would enable land agents to prepare Real Property Act documents, but would provide protection against fraud and incompetent preparation since the documents would be required to pass through the hands of a

legal practitioner. It is therefore not inconsistent with the principal objects of the clause. The Real Property Act provides that that certificate, which he or any other legal practitioner signs on a Real Property Act document, is a serious business.

Mr. Riches—Is there any cost to it?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—No. It has serious legal repercussions for the person who signs it. I do not think it is all that would be desired by the legal profession, but it is a reasonable compromise—at any rate for the time being—and I recommend that the Committee accept the amendment.

(*Midnight.*)

Mr. DUNSTAN—The Minister indicated that this provision would provide protection against fraud and incompetent drawing. It would be a protection against incompetent drawing of documents, which is essential, but I do not agree that it would be a protection against fraud. If someone brings a person a document to certify, it is difficult for that person to ensure that fraud is not practised upon him. Under the clause the only person who may prepare a document is a broker or solicitor, but under the amendment any unqualified person may draw a document and so long as it is certified by a legal practitioner it is acceptable. Who is to say what representations are to be made to the legal practitioner? How can a legal practitioner—when the document has not been prepared subject to his own supervision—say that there has been no fraud practised? I cannot see that the mere certification by a legal practitioner will be any effective protection against the frauds at which the clause was originally aimed. I oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment—

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins (teller), McIntosh, Millhouse, Pattinson, Pearson, Playford, Shannon, Travers, and White.

Noes (14).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan (teller), Jennings, Lawn, Macgillivray, O'Halloran, Quirke, Stephens, Stott, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir George Jenkins. No—Mr. Hutchens.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I move—

In subclause (3) to delete "who is a licensed land broker."

As a result of the previous amendment these words are now redundant.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 64 to 71 inclusive passed.

Clause 72—"Provisions as to bonds."

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I move to insert subclause (4), suggested by the Legislative Council.

Subclause (4) inserted; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 73 to 105 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Continued from November 23. Page .)

Bill read a second time.

Mr. O'HALLORAN moved—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider an amendment to provide for the right of commissioned officers to appeal to the Police Appeal Board.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Deputy Commissioner."

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

After "Governor" in subsection (1) of new section 9 to insert "on the recommendation of the Commissioner."

I want to give any officer not appointed Deputy Commissioner the right to appeal against the appointment. I also want all police officers appointed by the Governor to have the right of appeal against appointments. It is against the Commissioner's recommendation that I desire the right of appeal. At present a large number of police officers of the rank of sergeant and below have the right of appeal, but I think there are 29 senior officers who do not have it. I do not know what causes the Governor to make appointments but I believe it is on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police. If that is not the position, it should be provided because he is the only person competent to recommend appointments to the senior ranks. A test vote will be taken on

this amendment. If it is defeated I will not proceed with my other amendment to this clause. It has been said that there should not be an appellate tribunal for commissioned officers as for the rank and file of the police force, but I think all police officers should have the right to appeal to the same tribunal.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—If the amendment is accepted subsection (1) will read as follows:—

The Governor on the recommendation of the Commissioner may from time to time appoint a Deputy Commissioner of Police who shall assist the Commissioner generally in the superintendence of the police force.

I cannot accept the proposals of the Leader of the Opposition. That completely overrides all constitutional practice, which is that the Governor acts on the advice of his Ministers. If the amendment is carried the Chief Secretary will cease to have any place in the administration of the Police Force. Instead, the Commissioner of Police will be instructing the Governor.

Mr. O'Halloran—So you don't believe in the right of appeal?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not believe in breaking down constitutional practice. The Acts Interpretation Act provides that the Governor must act on the advice and consent of the Executive Council. The Ministers are responsible to Parliament, but under the amendment the Government would be subservient to the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. TRAVERS—I oppose the amendment, which completely alters the system laid down in the Act relating to the Police Force. In the absence of the Commissioner the person who usually carries out his duties is the Senior Superintendent of Police. That is a right for which superintendents may strive. Yesterday I criticized this clause because it omits the vested right of the Senior Superintendent of Police to be the person to be appointed Deputy Commissioner, but the amendment goes further and says that the Governor must act on the recommendation of the Commissioner. If he recommended a junior officer the Governor would have to appoint him, and I will not have a bar of that.

Mr. O'Halloran—Isn't the purpose of the amendment to give right of appeal?

Mr. TRAVERS—If it is it is cunningly concealed. I subscribe to a right of appeal, but I oppose this amendment.

Mr. O'Halloran—If you don't think the amendment is essential in order to give right of appeal you should draft an appropriate amendment.

Mr. TRAVERS—It is a bit late to ask that now. The Senior Superintendent should be appointed Deputy Commissioner, but the amendment will place the appointment in the hands of the Commissioner. That is entirely wrong. My work has brought me in close contact with the administration of the Police Force and there is no doubt that the Senior Superintendent should be appointed Deputy Commissioner, but the amendment will prevent his appointment unless the Commissioner recommends him. A second amendment strikes out "from time to time" but that of itself does not matter much because the same situation applies under section 37 of the Acts Interpretation Act, which says:—

Power given by any Act to do any act or thing, or to submit to any act or thing, or to make any appointment, shall be capable of being exercised from time to time, as occasion requires, unless the context, or the nature of the act or thing, indicates a contrary intention.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I believe that the Senior Superintendent, Mr. Walsh, who has acted as Commissioner during the long and regrettable absences of the Commissioner, should be the man appointed Deputy Commissioner, but the Governor may be advised otherwise. That is why I seek right of appeal for all commissioned officers.

Mr. Travers—Why not have that without the Governor being advised by the Commissioner?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The honourable member need not beg the question. Somebody must make a recommendation in the first place, and I seek to provide a right of appeal.

Mr. Travers—Why not give right of appeal against the appointment and not worry about the recommendation?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I do not think the Committee would agree that we should question the Governnor's right to make the appointment. The recommendation for appointment should be published in the *Police Gazette* so that officers who believe they have a right to the appointment may appeal to the Police Appeal Board. When the matter had been settled it could go to the Governor to make the appointment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:—

Ayes (13).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Fletcher, Jennings, Macgillivray, McAlees, O'Halloran (teller), Quirke, Riches, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, McIntosh, Millhouse, Pearson, Playford (teller), Shannon, Travers, and White.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Lawn, and Stephens. Noes—Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Michael and Pattinson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

New clause 5—"Appointment of officers."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move to insert the following new clause:—

5. Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "Governor" in the first line of subsection (1) thereof the words "on the recommendation of the Commissioner."

In view of the remarks of the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) I hope that he will support the clause because apparently he believes in the right of appeal. The object of the clause is to set in train the necessary machinery so that commissioned officers may have the right of appeal. These officers are appointed by the Governor and are therefore precluded from a right of appeal to the Police Appeal Board. We should not give the right of appeal to an officer who is aggrieved by an appointment by His Excellency; we should start further down the line and see that any proper screening is done before the recommendation is made.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This provision is similar to that on which members have just voted. It means that the Governor must accept the advice of the Police Commissioner on all appointments and takes away from the Governor any discretion. In doing so it undermines the whole constitutional authority of this Parliament and Cabinet. At present members of Cabinet must answer questions in Parliament on all administrative matters, and the Chief Secretary is responsible for all matters concerning the Police Department. The amendment would circumvent Cabinet and the Minister and take away from Parliament its right to question him. It places the Commissioner in a superior position to the Governor, because it states that the Governor may, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, do certain things; in other words, the Governor would have to accept the Commissioner's recommendations on all appointments. The constitutional chain of authority is as follows:—Parliament controls Cabinet; Cabinet recommends to the Governor; the Governor approves on behalf of Her Majesty. Under the amendment, however, there would be no authority for Executive Council.

Mr. Riches—Has the Executive Council ever heard an appeal?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There are certain rights of appeal in the Public Service, but no right of appeal lies from any recommendation of the Governor, nor has it ever been. The right of appeal is merely against the recommendation.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is all my amendment provides.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. It provides that the Governor must act on the Commissioner's recommendation, and I hope the Committee will not accept it.

Mr. TRAVERS—This amendment is subject to the same vice as the former one. The Leader has really defeated his own object by the wording of the new clause, and although I agree with his object, I consider it cannot be achieved in the way he seeks. If section 52, instead of stating "on the recommendation of the Commissioner" were to state "on the recommendation of the Police Appeal Board," I would agree with the amendment, because it seems to me that we should not try to set up a dictatorship in the hands of the Commissioner or a stultifying right of appeal on the other hand. We ought to give the commissioned officer the right to appeal and when the matter has been thrashed out the ultimate result can go to the Governor so that an appointment can be made. I cannot support the inclusion of the words "on the recommendation of the Commissioner."

Mr. SHANNON—It amazes me to hear Opposition members put forward amendments to undermine the authority of Parliament. I hate to think what they would say if they occupied the Treasury benches and we suggested such things. The acceptance of the new clause would circumvent the rights and privileges of members of Parliament, because they would be denied the right to criticize. Are we to be responsible for carrying out the duties of elected members of Parliament or are we to load the responsibility on to the civil servants? I do not think Mr. O'Halloran realizes the extent to which he would undermine principles in this matter. I am opposed to his method of bringing about what might be a desirable change in the set up. I am all for more harmonious relations in the Police Force, but the acceptance of the new clause would create a situation that would not be tolerated by Parliament. Under it the Commissioner of Police would be able to tell the Governor what to do.

The Committee divided on the new clause—

Ayes (11).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Jennings, McAlees, O'Halloran (teller), Riches, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, Macgillivray, McIntosh, Millhouse, Pearson, Playford (teller), Quirke, Shannon, Travers and White.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Lawn and Stephens. Noes—Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Michael and Pattinson.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a small Bill that deals with only one topic, and I think all members will support it. It enables the Government to make regulations respecting advertisements of motion pictures, and in particular for prescribing information to be included in such advertisements. At present the Act does not enable the Government to deal with advertisements of public entertainment. The Bill has been introduced because the Government has received complaints that some advertisements of motion pictures give no indication whether the film to be shown is suitable for general exhibition or for adults only. The complainants allege that parents, through not knowing the Commonwealth Censor's classification of the films to be shown, have taken their children to the pictures on occasions when the programme was quite unsuitable for young people.

A substantial majority of the exhibitors do indicate in their advertisements the censor's classification of the films, but the practice is not universal. The Government therefore seeks power by this Bill to compel exhibitors and others to disclose information in their advertisements as to the nature of the film. It is desirable that the specific rules to be laid down on this topic should be prescribed by regulations, rather than by the Act itself, in order that alterations may easily be made having regard to any system of classification which may from time to time be in force, or any practical difficulties which may occur in administering the rules. The Government will be given power to make regulations to compel motion picture exhibitors to say whether or not their films are suitable for adults only or for general exhibition.

Mr. Riches—If a film is suitable for adults only does the Bill provide that children may not go?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. It deals only with the provision that parents shall be notified of the type of film to be shown. Many parents allege that some exhibitors do not give this information. Of course, the regulations to be made may be disallowed by Parliament if they are not in the best interests of the community.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—There is nothing contentious about the Bill and I support it. Not all motion pictures are suitable for children; indeed, some are not suitable for adults. It is essential that film advertisements show whether a film is suitable for general exhibition or for adults only. The Commonwealth Censorship Board grades films, and these gradings should be made known by exhibitors, but there are some who do not play the game. Matinee programmes are provided ostensibly for children, but I am sure that one recent matinee was not suitable for them. I do not criticize exhibitors as a whole, but there are a few who have not been stating in advertisements whether their films are suitable for general exhibition.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:—

Title, line 7—Leave out "relevant to the foregoing amendments" and insert "respecting the sale of meat within the said area."

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—I move that the amendment be agreed to. I should have moved it in this Chamber in order to make the title conform to the Bill as it left here.

Mr. JENNINGS—On behalf of the Opposition I indicate that we agree with the amendment. A completely innocuous Bill is made no more innocuous by the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:—

No. 1. Page 4, lines 21 and 22 (clause 5)—Leave out "shall not approve of" and insert "may withhold approval to."

No. 2. Page 8, line 18 (clause 10)—Leave out "for approval."

No. 3 Pages 8 and 9 (clause 10)—Leave out new section 29.

No. 4. Page 9 (clause 10)—Leave out new subsection (5) of new section 30.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move that the amendments be agreed to. As introduced in the House of Assembly, Clause 6 (now clause 7), provided that the committee was to withhold approval to a plan of subdivision if it did not comply with certain requirements. The Bill was amended by substituting "may" for "shall," and thus giving the committee a discretion in the matter. Paragraph (*d*) of clause 5 provides that any plan of subdivision which has been approved before the passing of the Bill but not deposited within two months after the passing of the Bill is to be again submitted for approval to the committee which is to withhold approval if the plan does not comply with clause 7. Obviously, the committee should have the same discretion under clause 5 as is now provided in clause 7 and amendment No. 1 provides accordingly.

New section 27 provides that when the committee has prepared its plan for Adelaide the plan is to be submitted to Parliament for approval. As introduced the Bill provided machinery whereby the approval of Parliament could be obtained to the plan when it was to be known as the developmental plan for the metropolitan area of Adelaide and to have the force of law. These provisions were struck out and the effect of the Bill is now that the plan is to be laid before Parliament and, if the plan meets with the approval of Parliament, it will require further legislation to approve of the plan and to give it legal force. Thus the words "for approval" are now redundant and amendment No. 2 strikes them out.

New section 29 provides that every metropolitan council is to secure a copy of the developmental plan. As drafted, the term "developmental plan" was applied to the plan when approved by Parliament and the intention of new section 29 was to secure that the plan as so approved would be available for inspection by persons interested. With the amendments previously referred to, new section 29 becomes redundant particularly as new section 28 provides that every metropolitan council is to be supplied with a copy of the plan as laid before Parliament. New section 29 is therefore struck out by amendment No. 3.

New section 30 provides that a proclamation may be made on the application of the owner of any land, declaring that the land shall not be subdivided into allotments. New subsection (5) provides that any such proclamation is not to be made after the developmental plan has the force of law and is to continue in force after that time. As the provisions of the Bill relating to the developmental plan having the force of law have been struck out of the Bill this subsection now has no meaning. New subsection (3) gives power to revoke or vary any proclamation made under the new section 30. Amendment No. 4 therefore strikes out new subsection (5).

Amendments agreed to.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment—

Page 3 (clause 7)—At the end of the clause add the following subclause:—

(3) If the colour of any paint brand is altered as aforesaid and if in any stock mortgage or preferable lien on wool within the meaning of the Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act, 1924-1935, or in any bill of sale within the meaning of The Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1940, or in any other instrument whatsoever any reference is made to the paint brand which is so altered, the stock mortgage or preferable lien on wool, or bill of sale or instrument, as the case may be, shall be construed as if the reference therein to the paint brand were a reference to the paint brand as altered as aforesaid.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—Clause 7 provides that in certain cases the colour of a registered paint brand may be altered to another colour. It was felt that where sheep or other stock were described in a stock mortgage together with a certain type of brand, the stock mortgage might be held to be invalid if there were a change in the colour of the brand. I do not think, however, that that fear was well founded, but in order to put the position beyond doubt the Legislative Council carried this amendment, which now safeguards those mortgages.

Amendment agreed to.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendments:—

No. 1. Page 3, line 8 (clause 4)—Insert the following paragraphs—

(*a*1) by adding after the word "pounds" in the fourth line the words "or if the total surrender value of a policy or policies on the life of another person and owned by the deceased does not exceed five hundred pounds at the date of the death of such owner;"

(*a*2) by inserting after the word "policy" in the fifth line the words "or policies or may allow dealings with the policy or policies."

No. 2. Page 3, line 10 (clause 4)—Insert the following paragraph—

(*b*1) by inserting after the word "policy" in the thirteenth line the words "or policies."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—These suggested amendments deal with the power of an insurance company to pay money due under a life assurance policy on the death of the person entitled without production of a certificate from the Commissioner of Succession Duties certifying that succession duty has been paid or that he consents to the particular transaction. The present Act contains a provision enabling life assurance money to be paid over without production of the certificate of the Commissioner of Succession Duties in any case where the amount of the insurance policy does not exceed £200. It is proposed by the Bill to extend this amount to £500; but the Bill is limited to policies which have been taken out by the deceased person on his own life.

There is no power for the insurance company to pay over money under policies which were taken out by the deceased person on the life of another person. It is proposed in the amendments to extend the provisions of the Bill so that life assurance companies will, without production of a Succession Duties certificate, be permitted to pay to the personal representative of the deceased the surrender value of a life assurance policy taken out by him on the life of another person. The proposal is limited to cases where the amount payable as surrender value does not exceed £500 and where the total amount of the estate does not exceed £1,500 and where the beneficiaries are the widow, widower, ancestors or descendants of the deceased, *i.e.*, to cases in which no duty is payable.

The proposal is a reasonable extension of what is already in the Act. The Commissioner of Succession Duties is in favour of its acceptance. It is the duty of this Parliament, wherever possible, to prevent red tape from creeping into our administration. For these reasons I ask members to accept the amendments.

Mr. TRAVERS—The original Act deals with the case of a policy that one had taken out on one's own life, whereas the amendment deals with the case where one has taken out a policy on the life of somebody else. Of course, the two cases should be parallel, and the amendments achieve that.

Suggested amendments agreed to.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RACING DAYS AND TAXES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1588.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—The Bill provides for an additional metropolitan racing day. At one time the Licensed Victuallers Racing Club was almost debarred from racing in the metropolitan area. A report I have received from that club indicates that during the 31 years of its existence—which, incidentally, includes the period of the racing ban—it distributed £111,157 in stake money. In this connection this club has always received favourable comment from owners, trainers and racing club members. That club will be able to hold a race meeting at Cheltenham very shortly, but I do not know what its position will be in 12 months. Few trophies are offered by other clubs of a value exceeding those presented by this club. However, that club is not to have the benefit of racing on what has been the raceless Saturday.

At Morphettville grandstand patrons who desire to enter the derby enclosure do not receive a pass-out check which entitles them to return. At Victoria Park and Cheltenham, pass-out checks are issued. At Victoria Park both sexes enjoy that service but at Cheltenham only men do. If a man and his wife go from the stand into the derby, on their return the wife has to pay to re-enter. At Morphettville both must pay and I am suspicious that there is a nigger in the woodpile somewhere there. I wonder whether there is some arrangement between the club and the Grandstand Bookmakers Association. Not long ago there was a hue and cry concerning interstate betting transactions at Morphettville. Naturally patrons seek the best odds available on the horse they desire to support. Under the present set-up it is to their advantage to patronize derby stand bookmakers for interstate investments. Perhaps that explains the reason why pass-out checks are not issued at Morphettville.

According to the Auditor-General's report, winnings bets tax amounted to over £500,000. The amount to be paid to the racing, trotting and coursing clubs to enable them to provide greater stake money and continue operating is slightly over £556,000. One wonders whether clubs have reached such a sorry state of affairs that they must receive Government assistance in order to continue their operations. The Licensed Victuallers Racing Club, which is to be denied the privilege of racing in the metropolitan area, has never sought financial assistance from winnings bets tax. If it is essential to encourage people to attend race meetings, a review should be made of conditions operating at the courses. A patron should not be denied services in the grandstand that operate in the flat and derby enclosures. I can see no valid reason why the additional Saturday's racing should not be conducted at Victoria Park where patrons are able to pass freely to and from the grandstand. I support the second reading but may have more to say in Committee.

Mr. TRAVERS (Torrens)—The Bill transfers one racing day from the Murray Bridge to the metropolitan area and provides that day to the S.A.J.C. As a member of that club I do not want to say anything unjust about it, nor do I want to say anything unjust about the subsidiary clubs. While it is not opportune at this stage to introduce a proposal to set up some controlling body over racing, the time is getting ever nearer when that may have to be done to ensure that justice is done to all racing clubs and to all racing people. By law the S.A.J.C. is given no statutory control of racing. The only way it acquires control is through the power of the purse. Totalizator days are allotted to the S.A.J.C. and from the control of those days, and the power to dole them out, the club has obtained control of the financial situation, and incidentally control of racing. I do not want to reflect on the S.A.J.C. for it does its work efficiently, but in South Australia there are a number of racing clubs that have been set up to cater for the amusement, through the medium of racing, of sections of the community. All the racing public does not belong to the S.A.J.C., or to the individual clubs. In South Australia there are three clubs that can be called course owning clubs. First there is the S.A.J.C., which I believe owns the freehold of the Morphettville racecourse. Secondly, there is the Cheltenham racecourse, which I think is leased by the Port Adelaide Racing Club. Thirdly, there is the Adelaide Racing Club, which can be called the course owning club for Victoria Park, but that course belongs to all the ratepayers in the metropolitan area, for it is part of the parklands. They are not the only clubs in the metropolitan area. One may say of a course owner that he is at liberty to let the course to anyone, but when it comes to giving totalizator days to the various clubs there are other considerations. If the controlling bodies are not prepared to make available to *bona fide* racing clubs some of the racing days someone must intervene and do the allotting.

Let us look at what has been happening. There has been a steady process of squeezing out of the smaller clubs, and it is a deplorable process. A few years ago racing was not a profitable undertaking. I know that, because for several years I was a member of a committee of a racing club. Latterly, racing has become extremely profitable and the process of squeezing out the smaller clubs has gone on apace. When it was not so profitable the smaller clubs were encouraged to take leases by the day and conduct meetings, but when it became profitable the encouragement disappeared. In 1950 the S.A.J.C. used its own course on only nine days in the year. In 1955 the club used the course on 15 days. The other days had been made available to the smaller clubs, but not in 1955. In 1950 the Victoria Park club used the course on nine days, whereas in 1955 it used it on 15 days. The Cheltenham course was used by the Port Adelaide club on nine days in 1950 and 15 days in 1955. Four subsidiary racing clubs have operated successfully and satisfactorily for years. They are Tattersalls Club, the Licensed Victuallers Club, the Amateur Turf Club and the Hunt Club. Let us look at the squeezing out process in regard to them.

Up to 1941 the Tattersalls Club conducted seven meetings a year and the course was readily made available to it at a reasonable rental. From 1942 to 1951 the club had only four meetings a year, and from 1952 onwards the number was reduced to one. The Licensed Victuallers Club up to 1951 conducted two meetings a year. From 1951 onwards it conducted only one, and now it is threatened with extinction because no course-owning club will make a course available to it. Up to 1951 the Amateur Turf Club conducted two meetings a year. From 1951 onwards it has conducted only one, and it is now threatened with extinction. The Hunt Club up to 1951 had two meetings a year, but from 1951 onwards it has conducted only one meeting, and it also is

threatened with complete extinction. These four clubs were formed by substantial groups of the racing community for the purpose of providing racing for their members, but they are being squeezed out as racing becomes more profitable. The course-owning clubs are hastening in a definite manner the day when some body will have to be set up to control racing and prevent these other clubs from being squeezed out of existence. The course-owning clubs have the remedy in their own hands. If they will not make their courses available at reasonable rentals the totalizator days must be allotted by another body. I would hesitate long before asking for legislative action in these domestic matters, but if people insist on asking for such action they can have no one to blame but themselves. It is not a matter of the courses being made available at a nominal rental. I understand the Cheltenham course has been let to subsidiary clubs at £1,000 a day, plus the club's share of the 7½ per cent commission on totalizator investments, and plus the wages of the totalizator and gate staffs for the day, which is about £900.

Mr. Davis—Can you give the figures for the three other clubs?

Mr. TRAVERS—I understand that the rental for the Morphettville and Victoria Park courses has been about £800, plus the wages for the totalizator and gate staffs, plus the 2½ per cent of the 7½ per cent commission on totalizator investments. The public supporting racing ought to know these things. I content myself in not opposing the transference of the one day from the country to the city and having it given to the S.A.J.C. I have no doubt that the club will handle the matter capably, but if the course-owning clubs insist on someone giving it power to do what they should do without being forced they will only have themselves to blame when the inevitable happens.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I oppose the Bill because country people will be deprived of another day's racing. Some years ago a similar Bill was introduced granting the metropolitan area another two days racing at the expense of Murray Bridge and Strathalbyn. It was wrong for all these days to be allotted to the metropolitan area. I do not know whether the clubs mentioned were agreeable to the transfer or whether the days were taken from them. When Saturdays are not available for racing in the country meetings must be held on week days, but that is not in the best interests of the State for it often means absence from work. If a country club races on a Saturday it has to race on the same day as a metropolitan meeting, which means that it will not get the class of horse or jockey it is entitled to. The Port Pirie Racing Club has spent thousands of pounds in establishing a new course. It held mid-week meetings, but they were a failure, and it decided to hold a meeting on a Saturday, but there were few starters. For two races only four horses were nominated. That is not fair to any racing club that has spent much money on its course. If the Port Pirie Club could hold a Saturday meeting when there was no metropolitan meeting it would get good horses and riders.

When there is a meeting in the metropolitan area the only riders available for a country meeting are lads working in industry who do a little riding as a sideline, but that is not fair to owners of horses or to punters. The last time a racing Bill was before the House Parliament took two meetings from country clubs and allotted them to the metropolitan area. I hope the Government will consider the position so that the large country clubs may be able to hold good meetings.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I cannot understand the motive for the introduction of this Bill and why preference has been given to the South Australian Jockey Club by allotting an extra racing day for Morphettville. A few years ago when the Act was amended to provide for a race meeting to be held in the metropolitan area every Saturday during the year, except one, all clubs and those associated with racing were satisfied, for the allocation of racing dates, as pointed out by the member for Torrens (Mr. Travers), was reasonable having regard to the fact that there were three course-owning clubs and four others who were being reasonably treated by the former. I am at a loss to understand why the club that was given the Saturday after the New Year race meeting, the Murray Bridge Racing Club, has been deprived of that meeting. No inconvenience was suffered by the ordinary racegoer (and I consider myself one because I miss few meetings) from the fact that there was no race meeting in the metropolitan area on the Saturday immediately following the New Year meeting run by the South Australian Jockey Club at Morphettville. I think that this new meeting will not be a success because the second day's race meeting of the New Year programme at Morphettville is noted for the number of scratchings.

Over the Christmas period there are five race meetings, three at Cheltenham and two

at Morphettville. After that the horses are tired and most of the punters have lost all their money. Therefore, the S.A.J.C. is unable to fill its programme satisfactorily on the second day of its New Year meeting. If it has an extra meeting it will encounter further difficulty. It is notorious that the South Australian Jockey Club has for many years asserted inside South Australia a supreme jurisdiction over racing affairs and other clubs, which it insists are subordinate to it, and this declaration of final authority has been long acquiesced in by all Australian racing clubs. It has no legal status, as was pointed out by the member for Torrens, but because its rules and regulations are accepted by all the other clubs it has an authority to which it is not entitled. It is recognized by the leading clubs in all the other States, and if the other South Australian clubs did not recognize its authority they might be disqualified and not able to conduct any meetings because all horses, trainers and jockeys are registered by the leading club. If any club did not accept the S.A.J.C.'s authority it would be more or less ostracized, and that position would obtain in all States. Perhaps the various clubs and all those associated with racing could take the matter into their own hands by revolting, but whether they would be successful is another matter.

I suggest that it by no means follows that the S.A.J.C. is not amenable to any form of control, but political action could be taken. Parliament could set up a controlling authority with full jurisdiction over racing in South Australia. Like the member for Torrens, I feel that the time is not far distant when Parliament will have to consider this. The Act provides for a substantial pecuniary return to the State out of bets made on the totalizator or with bookmakers. In effect, the clubs are the agents of the State for the due collection of this revenue. Under section 15 a licence for a totalizator can be obtained only from the Commissioner of Police, subject to approval of the Chief Secretary. Therefore, if that Minister were satisfied that the S.A.J.C. was abusing its powers in allotting racing dates so as to enrich itself at the expense of other clubs that were helpless under its tyrannical powers he could refuse his approval for a totalizator licence for it until it made a just and equitable allotment of racing dates. By this means the S.A.J.C. should be coerced into obedience to the Minister's idea of fair play in the allotment of racing dates. It is unthinkable that the Government, interested as it is in obtaining revenue from racing, should allow the S.A.J.C.'s authority to be turned into a source of self enrichment to the injury and oppression of those clubs unable to help themselves.

The member for Torrens gave us some interesting figures about the number of racing days that used to be allocated to the various clubs and the position today. The Government should take action to see that the non course-owning clubs are treated fairly. It is true that those who own courses must incur considerable expense in maintaining them. I admit that the S.A.J.C. has done a good job in providing facilities for racing; in fact, it has done a better job than the other two course-owning clubs. The Port Adelaide Racing Club has spent very little on amenities for its patrons, and the Adelaide Racing Club, which leases the Victoria Park course, which belongs to the people, has provided even fewer amenities. The flat enclosure there is a positive disgrace. I understand that the Caulfield racecourse is municipally owned, and all who have visited it will agree that the amenities and general surroundings can only be admired. Few Australian racecourses can compare with Caulfield. I understand that under the laws of the Victorian Amateur Turf Club for the conduct of its meetings it must provide certain aesthetic amenities on the flat, which is open to the public on other than racing days. In my opinion similar action should be taken to see that the Adelaide Racing Club provides decent amenities on the flat. It is side-stepping its obligations to the racing public in not providing them.

Mr. Travers referred to the gradual squeezing out of the non course-owning clubs. It will be recalled that a couple of years ago I asked the Premier to take the matter up with the racing clubs to see that the interests of the non course-owning clubs were protected, because I envisaged that although their racing days had been curtailed to a degree it was obvious that the ultimate aim was their squeezing out from the metropolitan area. It is rather strange that they allowed the Adelaide Hunt Club and the Tattersall's Club a meeting. Many of those associated with the S.A.J.C. are in some way also associated with those two clubs, but with the Amateur Turf Club and the Licensed Victuallers Club the position is somewhat different. The L.V.A. was one of the original racing clubs in South Australia and some protection should be afforded it by the Government, which claims it is opposed to monopolies. It could show that

it will not allow the present state of affairs to continue and thus eliminate these clubs. Particularly the L.V.A. should be protected, because none of the non course-owning clubs provides better stakes. This indicates that its profits are being used for the benefit of the sport. I do not know why preference has been given to the S.A.J.C., particularly in the light of its actions toward the non-course-owning clubs. I suggest that the Government should take cognizance of the complaints made in the debate and take the matter up with a view to at least one meeting being given to the L.V.A. and the Amateur Turf Clubs to prevent their going out of existence and thus prevent a monopoly, which is the aim of the S.A.J.C.

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—I am given to understand that if the Bill is passed the Murray Bridge Racing Club will be deprived of its only Saturday meeting. This is to be regretted. The set-up at Murray Bridge is a very good one. The club has a well-appointed course and caters well for its patrons. The committee is trying to set an example of what a country racecourse should be, but to do this it must have funds. Obviously if its Saturday meeting is taken away its income will be affected. It is good to encourage people from the city to travel to the country areas to see what is going on. We preach decentralization and say that it is desirable, and yet here we have a Bill aiming a blow at the root of the very thing we advocate. We have to decentralize not only industry, but a sport which is very popular. It would please me and possibly many other country members if this part of the Bill were deleted.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—The Bill provides for a limitation of the racing dates for the South-East. At present the six clubs have eight Saturdays each, and the Bill provides that those which avail themselves of the eight days may draw on some of the dates not used by the other clubs. I thoroughly agree with that. The other part of the Bill relates to the allocation of the only Saturday of the Murray Bridge Racing Club to the metropolitan area. Mr. Fred Walsh is concerned about its being allocated to the S.A.J.C. I am more concerned that it is being allocated to the metropolitan area. The Murray Bridge club is most prosperous and progressive, and the taking away of its Saturday meeting will eat into its finances. A total of 48 Saturdays is allocated to the metropolitan area, but only one to Murray Bridge, which is not far from Adelaide and people could visit there for an outing. If the club wishes to maintain a full programme of racing dates it will be forced to race on a Wednesday. I will seriously consider this clause in Committee.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I do not oppose the whole measure, because I think it has some virtues, but like other speakers I am concerned that the country area is going to lose a Saturday meeting. Although I am a metropolitan representative, I have always felt that it is wrong to take anything away from the country. It would be better to give it more concessions. A few years ago a Bill was passed which provided for more Saturday meetings in the metropolitan area, and I supported it with reluctance. Apparently those in power are never satisfied and are ready to take away the only Saturday available to the Murray Bridge club. I am guided by the fact that a member of the Legislative Council, who is also a committeeman of that club, spoke against the provision. Members of the club have advocated that it would be wrong to take away a concession from a country club. It appears that the Saturday in question would be devoted to the S.A.J.C. The three metropolitan clubs—the Adelaide Racing Club, the S.A.J.C. and the Port Adelaide Racing Club—in one period of 12 months made a profit of £43,961 after allowing for depreciation and other incidentals. That would indicate that these metropolitan clubs do not require another meeting. Members who support the Bill have said that the Murray Bridge Racing Club could race on Saturdays, but what chance would that club have of making a success of its fixture if a meeting were held in the city on the same day? None at all. We have been told for years how wrong it is to attend weekday meetings, so if Murray Bridge held its meeting on a Wednesday that would result in absenteeism. I do not want to see a country club lose a Saturday, therefore I oppose the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Number of times totalizator may be used."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Treasurer see that an effort is made to give the extra Saturday to either the Amateur Turf Club or the Licensed Victuallers' Racing Club?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The South Australian Jockey Club was selected to have the additional day because it has incurred much expenditure in the control of racing. Today it spends a large

sum on control measures that are good for racing generally. The Government did what a deputation requested.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I move—

In subclause (2) to strike out "paragraph is" and insert "paragraphs are"; and after paragraph (a1) to add the following paragraph:—

(a2) on the racecourses which are situated within fifty miles of the Post Office at Barmera for more days in the aggregate in any one year than a number calculated at the rate of eight days for each such club.

These amendments bring the Upper Murray district into conformity with the South-East in regard to racing dates.

Amendments carried.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Will the Treasurer say what he thinks about the attitude of the course-owning clubs that have prevented the two non-course-owning clubs from holding fixtures?

Clause as amended passed.

New clause 4—"Payment of commission on bets and returns."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I ask the Committee to agree to clause 4, which has been suggested by the Legislative Council.

Clause inserted.

New clause 5—"Taxes on winning bets."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I ask the Committee to agree to this clause, which has been suggested by the Legislative Council.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

At the commencement of clause 5 to insert the following subclause:—

(1) section 44a of the principal Act is amended as follows:—

(*a*) Subsection (1) is amended by striking out the words "payment made to any person by a licensed bookmaker in respect of" in the second and third lines and inserting in lieu thereof the words "amount won from a licensed bookmaker by any person on";

(*b*) The proviso to subsection (1) is struck out:

(*c*) Subsection (2) is amended by striking out the words "payment in respect of" in the fourth line and inserting in lieu thereof the words "money won on";

(*d*) Subsection (3) is amended by inserting after the words "in respect of" in the second line the words "money won on" and by striking out the words "plus the amount betted" at the end of that subsection:

(*e*) Subsection (4) is amended by striking out the words "in respect of" in the second line and inserting in lieu thereof "won on":

This amendment is amply justified by experience since the introduction of the winning bets tax. I opposed the taxing of the punter's stake then and ever since. I have taken every possible opportunity to argue against it because it is the punter who keeps the racing game going and it is time we gave him a little more encouragement to carry on the good work. If we continue to penalize him he will ultimately wake up to the fact that he is there, not with a chance of winning, but for the purpose of providing revenue for the State.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I ask members not to accept the amendment. The money collected through the winning bets tax is to a substantial extent paid to the clubs and applied by them to provide increased stakes, as a result of which the position in South Australia is much better than that in other States. The Government of this State collects and makes available to the race clubs large sums of money every year. I think the amount involved is almost £700,000, and that enables the clubs to continue.

Mr. O'Halloran—But you get most of it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, the Government gets about two-thirds. We have no surplus revenue in this State; at the moment we are probably as hard up as we have ever been.

Mr. DAVIS—I support the amendment. This is the most unfair tax that has ever been imposed on the community, because one could have a winning day but still lose because of the imposition of the tax. Every time this matter has been discussed we have heard the same thing from the Premier. When the Bill that introduced the winning bets tax was introduced, he said that the tax was to provide for social services, but we found that the wealthy racing clubs got a large percentage of the amount collected. If a punter backs a horse each way at four to one and the horse runs into a place, although he has not backed a loser he loses money, and the only winner is the Government. When this tax was imposed in Victoria only the winnings were taxed, but the people took strong exception to it, and it was removed. Under the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition only the winnings would be taxed, not the stakes. I think it is a fair amendment, and I hope the Premier will accept it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:—

Ayes (11).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Jennings, O'Halloran, Quirke, Riches, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Geoffrey Clarke, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, Macgillivray, McIntosh, Millhouse, Pearson, Playford, Shannon, Travers, and White.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Lawn, Stephens, and McAlees. Noes—Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Michael, Pattinson, and Dunnage.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

New clause 5 inserted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main proposal contained in this Bill is that every person registered after 30th June, 1956, as a medical practitioner, will be required to serve as a resident medical officer for at least twelve months before he commences practice. The Bill has been prepared pursuant to a request which was made by the Faculty of Medicine of the Adelaide University, with the support of the University Council and the Medical Board of South Australia. The proposal is similar to a scheme in New South Wales which was provided for some time ago by legislation in that State and was brought into operation in November of last year. New Zealand and the United Kingdom also have legislation for the same purpose, although the form of its differs somewhat from both the New South Wales Act and this Bill. This Bill requires the medical practitioner to have hospital experience after he is registered, but before he commences private practice. New Zealand and the United Kingdom require hospital experience after graduation but before registration.

The Government is credibly informed that because the English medical authorities now require compulsory hospital experience, they no longer recognize South Australian qualifications as being sufficient to entitle a South Australian practitioner to registration in the United Kingdom. The proposal in this Bill has for a long while been generally regarded by medical authorities as being desirable; but it could not be introduced until there were sufficient positions for resident medical officers in hospitals to enable all medical graduates to obtain the required 12 months' experience. Clause 4 of the Bill contains the provisions necessary for the proposed scheme. There is a certain amount of flexibility in the clause. The compulsory experience which is required can be got in any public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act or any other institution which is proclaimed as an approved institution for the purposes of the Bill. The Medical Board is given power to grant exemptions from the obligation to serve in a hospital. Such a power is necessary because there will no doubt be applications in future, as there have been in the past, from experienced persons from other countries to be registered in South Australia and there will be no reason for requiring all of these people to serve as resident medical officers. There is also a power to suspend the operation of the provisions in cases of emergency or other circumstances if it is desirable in the public interests to do so.

Clause 3 deals with a different problem, namely, reciprocity between South Australia and other countries in the matter of registration. This question has in the past created some difficulties and may again do so. The introduction of this Bill affords an opportunity to put the law on a more satisfactory basis. The amendments proposed are in the provisions dealing with the registration in this State of persons who are registered or entitled to be registered in the United Kingdom. Under the principal Act as it now stands a person is entitled as of right to registration if he is registered in the United Kingdom or possesses qualifications entitling him to be registered in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom grants registration to persons holding qualifications granted in a number of other countries, as well as to persons holding qualifications granted by Universities and other institutions in the United Kingdom itself. This Bill does not affect the right to registration of a person who has qualifications obtained in a University or Medical School of the United Kingdom. It is, however, anomalous that South Australia should be obliged—as it is at present—to recognize qualifications obtained in other countries irrespective of whether those countries recognize South Australian degrees and registrations. By this Bill conditions of medical practice in this State are being made more stringent, and it would be inconsistent if the Medical Board were still obliged to recognize a qualification obtained in a country whose standards may be lower than our own, and which grants no reciprocal registration to our own graduates.

For these reasons it is proposed to amend the paragraph dealing with the registration of United Kingdom practitioners so that registration as of right will be granted only to United Kingdom practitioners who have obtained their qualifications in the United Kingdom. This does not mean, however, that a person registered in the United Kingdom by virtue of qualifications obtained elsewhere will in no circumstances be able to secure registration in South Australia. He will, however, have to apply under provisions of the Act different from those applicable to practitioners from the United Kingdom and will have to satisfy the Board that he has passed through a course of medical study of not less than five years' duration and which is recognized by the Board as not lower in standard than that required in this State. In addition, his qualification will not be recognized unless the country which granted it recognizes qualifications obtained in South Australia. The amendments made by clause 3 are therefore for the purpose of establishing these two principles, namely:—

(*a*) that in future a United Kingdom practioner will only be granted registration in this State as of right by virtue of qualifications obtained in the United Kingdom:

(*b*) that a person whether registered in the United Kingdom or not whose qualifications were obtained in a country outside Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom will not be entitled to registration unless that country grants reciprocal registration to South Australian practitioners, and the qualifications relied on are of a standard not lower than those of this State.

The Bill will not affect any existing registration. There are only two points involved in this legislation. Firstly, students, before they become qualified in this State, will be required to undertake one year's service in a public hospital.

Mr. Riches—At what salary?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Salaries are at present about £14 or £15 a week. The students will also live at the institution.

Mr. Davis—Will they be sent to public hospitals in country areas?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think so because it is desirable to have them near the medical school where they will be under supervision. The second matter relates to reciprocity with the United Kingdom. Persons who have been trained in the United Kingdom will be accepted here, but other persons who may go to the United Kingdom for registration will have to prove their *bona fides*.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I support the second reading, but I regret that the Government has introduced this measure expecting members to debate it when they have only just received a copy of the Bill.

Mr. Lawn—The Government has been legislating by exhaustion. It does it every year. We have been taking it. Why don't you move the adjournment of the House?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—We should have more opportunity of considering matters. According to my understanding of the Premier's remarks, the Bill provides that students will have to spend at least one year at a public hospital before entering into general practice and establishes the basis for reciprocity with the United Kingdom.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages without amendment.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—The Council's amendment strikes out paragraph (*b*) of subclause (2) which states:—

The name and address of the place of business of the applicant.

That had to be stated on the specimen copy of a label. This is a minor amendment which makes little difference to the administration of the Act. I move that it be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:—

No. 1. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—Leave out "section is" and insert "sections are."

No. 2. Page 2, line 16 (clause 4)—After "or" second occurring insert "lights or."

No. 3. Page 2, (clause 4)—At the end of the clause insert the following new section:—

5d. "Burning of stubble by direction of Chief Officer of Fire Brigades." It shall not be a contravention of section 4 or section 5 if a person burns any stubble on any land or lights or maintains a fire for the purpose of burning any stubble on any land if—

(*a*) the fire is lighted in accordance with the direction of the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades or the Deputy Chief of Fire Brigades within the meaning of the Fire Brigades Act 1936-1944; and

(*b*) any conditions specified by the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades or, as the case may be,, the Deputy Chief Officer of Fire Brigades when giving the directions aforesaid are fully complied with.

No. 4. Page 3—After clause 8 insert new clause 8a as follows:—

8a. "Amendment of principal Act, S.13. Fires in the open."

Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:—

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act any person who during the period between the 30th day of November and the first day of the following February lights, uses or maintains any fire in the open air for any purpose whatsoever, except those mentioned in sections 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty for a first offence of not more than fifty pounds and for every subsequent offence of not more than one hundred pounds.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 to 3.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—Clause 4 as originally passed by the Assembly provided that a council could relax the conditions of sections 4 and 5 in order to permit stubble to be burnt off on township allotments. Sections 5a and 5b of the Act contain other relaxations of the provisions of sections 4 and 5. The amendment enacts a further new section which will allow the Chief Officer of Fire Brigades and the deputy to authorize the burning of stubble on any land subject to any conditions as are imposed by the officer concerned. It may be expected that these officers will see to it that proper precautions are taken to prevent the spread of a fire when land is burnt off. By giving this power to those officers steps can be taken to see that land is burnt off before it becomes a fire menace. I move:—

That amendments Nos. 1, 2 and 3 be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—This amendment prohibits the lighting of a fire in the open between November 30 and February 1, except for the purpose of stubble or scrub, or for charcoal burning in compliance with the Act. The prohibition applies throughout the State and is, except as mentioned, an absolute prohibition. I do not recommend that the amendment be accepted. First, it is unlikely that such a prohibition would be appropriate over the whole State during the period set out in the amendment. Secondly, I think this provision if strictly enforced could lead to many injustices. Thirdly, I do not think that the provision could be satisfactorily enforced. I think that it is not in the interests of good legislation to place an enactment on the Statute book which is not capable of being enforced. I move—

That amendment No. 4 be disagreed to.

This total prohibition of fires in the open is very impracticable and is completely unrealistic because there are occasions where it is unavoidable during the specified period to light fires. For instance, many housewives have their coppers in their backyards and although on days of high fire risk it would be dangerous to light the coppers they are in service every week of the year. It would be completely at variance with this provision for the coppers to be lit and the washing done in the normal way. Earlier I referred to a decision made by one of our judges that any fire lit in a tank in the open was held to be a fire lit in the open, so not only coppers but incinerators would be barred. Are we to lend ourselves to a provision that would prohibit the lighting of any type of camp fire, say by a drover, in outback country where there is no vestige of grass to burn? I have proposals for including minor provisions in the legislation at a later date. I think we could create special areas where the risk of fire is great and where some of these prohibitions could be tried. Under section 13 of the Act councils have power to prohibit fires in the open in their areas. Let us have that instead of making the prohibition State-wide.

Mr. FLETCHER—I agree with the Minister's remarks about making the provision State-wide, but I point out that in the South-East on the right day and with the right fire our forests could disappear. This is something that we must seriously consider.

Mr. Pearson—The day has been a long time coming!

Mr. FLETCHER—Yes, but it will come, and we shall then lose all our forests in the South-East. We cannot too soon take all possible precautions in our forest areas, and we cannot be too severe on those who light fires in them at certain times of the year. Whether the district councils will enforce safety measures remains to be seen. South Australia has done a marvellous job in afforestation, and if our forests are ruined by fire we shall lose some of our most valuable assets, and the livelihood of many people engaged in the forestry industry will be jeopardized. The Minister should take steps now to legislate that in certain areas it shall be an offence to light a fire in the open that would endanger our forests.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The Bill only toyed with some of the more serious bush fire problems. I said during the second reading debate that I favoured the total prohibition of the lighting of fires in certain districts. Certain districts will have to be fully protected, though there might be anomalies if the same provisions applied throughout the State and I can see that such a provision would not be sympathetically received in this House. The Minister mentioned the dangers of lighting coppers in backyards, and I am sure coppers have been the cause of many fires. He also mentioned the possibility of fires being started by negligence on the part of drovers, but they are not as numerous as they were and very few would be found in districts with a serious bush fire hazard. The Minister foreshadowed legislation for the total prohibition of fires in certain districts, but it is too late to draft any such legislation for this session. It is obvious that more stringent measures will have to be introduced in future.

Mr. HEASLIP—I oppose the amendment, because in the northern areas we frequently drove cattle and with a total prohibition on the lighting of fires we would not even be allowed to light a cigarette or a fire to boil the billy. The main purpose of the Bill was to give more discretionary powers to councils, but this amendment will take away some of those powers.

Amendment No. 4 disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:—

Because the amendment is too unrealistic.

Later the Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 4 to which the Assembly had disagreed.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments to clause 4:—

No. 1. To delete "striking out the words 'the fourteenth day after such publication' in" and to insert "inserting at the end of."

No. 2. To delete "and inserting in lieu thereof."

No. 3. After "words" to insert "Provided that the Board may order that the determination shall be deemed to have come into force on."

No. 4. To delete "having regard to the length of time involved in the hearing."

No. 5. To delete the whole of the proviso.

Consideration in Committee.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—With some reluctance I ask the Committee to accept the amendments. I say "with some reluctance" because the amendments made in another place restore clause 4 to precisely the same terms as it was when I introduced the Bill. When it was before this House the Premier decided to tinker with clause 4 and suggested some amendments to improve my Bill. I readily accepted them, but he has left me stranded now, and as he is not prepared to fight for his amendments I am forced to asked the Committee to agree to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

PROROGATION SPEECHES.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That the House at its rising do adjourn to Tuesday, December 20.

Of course, that is more or less a fictitious date, and today will be the last occasion on which this Parliament will meet before the next election. I express to the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters my personal thanks for their assistance during the last three years in the conduct of the business of the State. We have not always agreed, but the Parliament of South Australia has earned a reputation for conducting its public business with less Party bias than any other State. I doubt whether there is any other Australian Parliament where fewer personalities are involved in the discussions and where the guillotine is not applied to debates. It reflects the greatest credit on honourable members generally, because if they were not prepared to play the game such a system could not exist. That this has not become a House where Party political wrangles are prominent reflects the greatest credit on members, and I therefore express my thanks for their conduct in the affairs of the country.

I believe this Parliament has done a valuable work for this State. Progressive legislation has been passed and the fact that the standard of our social services had risen materially and the development of the State is now recognized by outside authorities as being phenomenal is a credit to the work of members.

I express to Mr. O'Halloran my thanks for the co-operation I have received in the conduct of public business. He has not always agreed with me—of course he could not always be right!—but he has agreed to assist in the conduct of the affairs of the State. Although we do not agree on many political issues, I hope we agree in our concern for the welfare of this State and the measures that should be taken toward that end. I thank him for his

personal co-operation on many occasions, and in this I know I express the feeling of my Ministers.

I thank the members of my own Party and my colleagues in the Ministry for their assistance. We have been a very happy family indeed. This sitting ends the political career of three members who have endeared themselves to the House. They have decided for various reasons not to contest the election. The Hon. Sir George Jenkins' record in the Parliamentry history of the State has hardly been equalled. He has a wealth of experience and wisdom and a great humanity, and in every way has been a good servant of the State. Mr. Don Michael and Mr. Hugh McAlees have not been with us so long, but they have won the esteem and affection of every honourable member. I am sure I express the views of everyone when I wish these three honourable gentlemen well and hope they may enjoy many years of health and prosperity. Although they will cease to be members, we hope they will from time to time visit the House and that we will, of course, be here to receive them.

I should like to make a special reference to you, Mr. Speaker. Your conduct of the Chair has earned you a reputation which far transcends the State boundaries. You have occupied the distinguished position for a term which is almost unequalled in the Parliamentary history of the British Commonwealth. You would have to do much research before finding another Speaker who had equalled your own record. I congratulate you not only on the length of your service to the House, but also on the calibre of that service. You have always taken the view that it is not your job to rush through legislation, but rather see that every honourable member has the opportunity to express himself, and that the rights of the minority are fully protected. I am certain that you enjoy the confidence of every honourable member. I congratulate you on the services you have given and hope you will long be spared in your present distinguished position. Mr. Teusner has only recently been appointed Chairman of Committees, but has already shown that we have a remarkably fine Parliamentarian who has studied the practices of the House and is one in whom members have the utmost confidence. We have learned to take almost for granted the high qualities of the services of the Clerks of the House, the Parliamentary Draftsman, Librarians, the messengers and the staff of the House generally. I doubt whether any Parliament in Australia can boast of the quality of the services these gentlemen give to us. Our Parliamentary institution is maintained with dignity and efficiency, but it is not over staffed. I express to these gentlemen the very good wishes of honourable members and thank them all sincerely for their assistance.

I sometimes wonder what our speeches would really look like if we did not have the assistance of the Parliamentary Draftsman and the officers of the House, and particularly the members of the *Hansard* Staff. I have long since learned that there is no need to check their reports for accuracy. Indeed, I can say that not once in 10 years have I ever voluntarily checked any statement or report for accuracy, and I think that is also the practice of many honourable members with regard to their speeches. I congratulate all those officers and wish them the compliments of the coming Season and express on behalf of honourable members our thanks for what they have done.

We have soon to face an election. During the campaign period we will strenuously voice our opinions and policies, but I am certain that will not prevent the friendliness that has always existed between members from continuing. I know they will fight for their policies without bringing personalities into it. That is essential for the proper conduct of our Parliamentary system.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion with a good deal of pleasure because I can agree with all the Premier's remarks. It is not often that I find myself in that happy position, and it is not often that I find myself upstanding in Parliament at this hour of the morning. I express to you, Mr. Speaker, my personal thanks for the kindly and competent way in which you have presided over the deliberations of this Chamber during the past session, and to the Chairman of Committees I express by appreciation for his chairmanship. We regret the passing of his predecessor, but our sorrow is mitigated by the fact that we have an extremely competent successor. To the members of my own Party I express a very great debt of gratitude for their loyal support. They have accepted my advice and my orders, and some times I have wondered why, but they did so gratuitously without criticism in order to enhance the debating strength of the Opposition.

To the Premier and his Ministers I extend the grateful thanks of the Opposition for their co-operation in the sometimes difficult circumstances that arose during the session. I also thank the rank and file members on the

Government side for the cordial spirit in which they have joined in the debates and for the helpful suggestions I have received from them from time to time. Three members are retiring. Sir George Jenkins, the elder statesman, came into this Parliament when I first became a member in 1918. We were not good political friends for a long time, but we have always been personal friends, and when we have contested an election in opposition to each other we have been able to fight it on principles and not on personalities. Mr. Michael came into Parliament much more recently, but I learned to respect his knowledge, particularly in land matters. I am sorry to see that he is retiring from Parliament and to realize that his knowledge will not be available to us. My old friend, Mr. Hughie McAlees, is one of the old-timers in the Labor movement, both industrial and political. He has a record of sticking to principle of which any man would be proud. I regret that he, too, has decided to retire and I wish him and the other two gentlemen well in their retirement. May they be blessed with health to enjoy that period of rest after their arduous duties in the affairs of State.

I join with the Premier in his thanks to the clerks, the *Hansard* staff, the press and the catering staff for the excellent service they have rendered during the session. I cannot say, of course, that I hope all members will be here next session for I have an eye on the Treasury benches, which means that I hope that one or two gentlemen here tonight will not be here next year. It could happen, of course, that I shall not be here myself! In conclusion, if I have forgotten anyone, I hope he will accept my apology for my remissness. I wish all and sundry a happy and jolly Christmas.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls)—Before putting the motion I wish, on behalf of the officers of the House, the clerks at the table, the Parliamentary Draftsman, the *Hansard* staff, the librarians, the messengers, and everybody associated with the services of the House, to thank the Premier and Leader of the Opposition for their kindly remarks. From my experience of working with the staffs in my capacity as Speaker, I know that they are competent and willing to give the utmost service to all members. I join with the Premier and Mr. O'Halloran in thanking members for the co-operation they have given the Speaker. Without that co-operation all the existing good relations and the recognition of this office would be impossible. It helps the organization of the House to run as well as it does.

After the next elections it will be interesting to prepare for the function to be held in April, 1957, to celebrate the centenary of the House of Assembly and bi-cameral Parliamentary system in this State. I join with the Premier and Mr. O'Halloran in saying that it is sad that we are to lose three members by their decision not to stand at the next election. I refer to Sir George Jenkins, Don Michael and Hughie McAlees. We shall, however, be seeing them later at a function at which appropriate things can be said to them.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.40 a.m. on Friday, November 25, the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 20, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of "God Save the Queen."