HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, December 3, 1959.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) 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:—

Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act Amendment.
Dog Fence Act Amendment.
Police Pensions Act Amendment.
Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment.
Vermin Act Amendment.
Limitation of Actions Act Amendment.
Local Government Act Amendment.
Mental Health Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.

PETERBOROUGH SEWERAGE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding proposals for sewerage at Peterborough, particularly whether the plans have been completed, and can he say what priority this particular work has in the scheme of providing sewerage for country towns?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This matter was discussed a long time ago and, at the instigation of the Leader, the matter was put in hand. In August, 1950, my predecessor advised in reply to Mr. O'Halloran's question that a survey of Peterborough had been completed and designs were in hand to enable completion of the final plans for submission, firstly to the Peterborough Corporation and, if endorsed, to the Public Works Committee. Subsequently, the scheme was gazetted but it was not proceeded with because, according to the information in the docket, funds did not permit at that stage. Latterly, the Government appointed an advisory committee on country sewerage to investigate and make recommendations on priorities for sewerage for country towns that had applied for that service. As the committee's recommendations did not include a high priority for Peterborough the matter was taken no further, as it was obviously impossible to deal with it. There, I think, the matter rests. I regret that I am unable to assure the Leader on how soon the scheme can be re-opened and action taken. That will depend on the amount of Loan moneys available in the next few years for country sewerage generally in order to proceed with those towns that have been given a higher priority on the advisory committee's list.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that following on a survey made in 1950 by an advisory committee it was felt that there was no urgency, on account of the water position, about having a sewerage scheme installed at Peterborough. Since that time Murray River water has been taken to the town, which now has an adequate supply. In view of this, can the Minister of Works say whether the position will be re-examined by the advisory committee?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—When the advisory committee's report was presented I read much of the evidence submitted to the committee but I am unable to confirm or deny the suggestion that the matter was governed by the availability of a water supply. I will look at the matter and discuss it with the honourable member.

ABATTOIRS SLAUGHTERINGS.

Mr. HEASLIP—Producers generally agree that the work being done at the metropolitan abattoirs is very good as it has disposed of more than one million sheep in recent months. Although rain in Victoria and New South Wales has relieved the position, there is still much pressure on the abattoirs for the disposal of stock. Can the Minister say what the position will be next week?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—All restrictions on the abattoirs market, whether on country markets or private bookings, will be lifted next week. It may be of interest to members if I give the latest figures of killings. Since July 1 last, 1,475,452 sheep and lambs have been slaughtered at the abattoirs and, since August 31, 1,169,261.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—As the reply to my question involves Government policy, I direct it to the Premier. This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report concerning proposals to build a new sewage treatment works at Bolivar and states that it may be necessary to acquire certain property. Will the Premier state whether the Government has made or is likely to make any investigation by survey of the hills area, as certain parts of Eden Hills will need sewerage? Has the Government anything in view for selecting a site in that area that would be suitable for a treatment works and for sewering Eden Hills, Blackwood and other areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The site mentioned by the honourable member has been examined by the Engineer-in-Chief's staff over a long period of years, and is certainly the most economical of any sites in the metropolitan area for these works. I am not sure whether a subsidiary treatment plant somewhere else has been considered, but I will obtain a report and let the honourable member have it during the recess.

Mr. HALL—I was interested to read the newspaper report of the proposed establishment of new sewage treatment works for Adelaide and surrounding districts. As these works will be in my electorate I am interested in the ramifications, and I understand that it will be a large project when fully developed. I believe that between 20,000,000 and 30,000,000 gallons of water will come from the plant each day. This is a large quantity of water and I have in mind that only yesterday this House considered a Bill to conserve underground water supplies in my area. Has the Minister of Works any plans in mind for the eventual dispersement of the water, perhaps for irrigation? Can he comment on the scheme, and say something about the advisability of using the water for irrigation purposes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am neither anxious nor willing to comment further on the scheme. I think that probably already too much has been said, because the new scheme has not yet been approved or even referred to the Public Works Committee, nor has Cabinet made a decision on the advisability of the scheme. The press apparently obtained much information on the matter, and I am not sure from what source. The question of utilizing treated effluent for irrigation purposes has been considered, and I agree with the honourable member that we should not waste any water in this State, and that every available gallon should be used to its fullest extent, but one problem is that the effluent from a sewage treatment plant is fairly saline, due to factors which I will not discuss now. It is estimated that effluent from treatment works contains 80 grains of salt to the gallon, which restricts its use for irrigation purposes to that type of vegetation that is capable of taking water containing that degree of salinity. For the growing of lucerne it is all right. The Engineer-in-Chief agrees with me that as a secondary stage we should have regard to the use of the water for irrigation purposes, which matter will be kept in mind.

WINE INDUSTRY.

Mr. KING—Can the Premier say whether any progress has been made with investigations now being conducted into the wine industry in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government has received requests from producers and producers' organizations regarding an inquiry into the wine industry, and it has also received requests on the same matter, but in a slightly different way, from the wine-makers themselves. With the best of goodwill from both sides of the industry, an investigation is being made. The Director of Agriculture made a preliminary report upon the matter, but more recently—some time last week, actually—the Prices Commissioner was instructed to make a full scale inquiry into the wine industry, both from the point of view of the price to the growers and selling problems in the industry. I think all interested parties have expressed their approval of the arrangements and, so far as I know, they are co-operating to the fullest extent to make information available to the Prices Commissioner, and I do not doubt that in due course a very useful report will be available.

AERODROMES.

Mr. RALSTON—In the past the policy of the Commonwealth Civil Aviation Department has been to own and develop all aerodromes where a regular air service operates, but a change of policy now seems imminent. The department has indicated that in future all country aerodromes, whether or not a regular service operates, are to be maintained and developed by local government authorities in conjunction with the department on a fifty-fifty basis. Any income earned from the aerodrome will be retained by the council concerned to offset to some degree the council's fifty-fifty contribution. I understand this will affect the aerodromes at Whyalla, Port Lincoln, Cleve, Cowell, Ceduna, Renmark, Mt. Gambier, Leigh Creek and Port Pirie, and some others not in regular service. Has the Premier been advised of this proposed change of policy by the Civil Aviation Department, and if not, will he have the matter investigated and advise me of the attitude of the State Government towards this proposed alteration in policy?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The State Government has not been consulted in this matter, for up till now it has been a matter between the Commonwealth Civil Aviation authorities and local government authorities.

The question of State policy has not arisen, and as far as I can see cannot arise, as it is a matter between two other authorities. The honourable member was good enough to tell me previously that he was going to ask this question, and I inquired into the matter. The policy that the Commonwealth has introduced is, I think, designed to meet considerable criticism the Commonwealth has received, in as much as it has taken the cost of establishing some aerodromes while refusing to take any responsibility regarding other aerodromes which may exist or which the local authorities may consider necessary. What the Commonwealth proposes, as far as I can find out in the limited time available, is to make a flat ruling that will apply to aerodromes that the local authorities accept under the Commonwealth's proposals, under which the Commonwealth will subsidize the establishment and maintenance of the aerodrome to the extent of 50 per cent, with the local governing body paying the other 50 per cent. I have not checked the position precisely, but I think that would be the position that has arisen at Port Augusta, where for a long time there has been very strong pressure for Commonwealth assistance, but up to now the Commonwealth has never played any part in connection with it. While the Commonwealth is making suggestions to local government authorities, I am informed that a local governing authority is not compelled to enter into the arrangement. Whether that means that the Commonwealth, in those circumstances, will pull out I do not know, but there is no compulsion on the local governing body to enter into an arrangement.

PURCHASE OF LAND BY ALIENS.

Mr. COUMBE—Can the Minister of Lands say whether it is a fact, as reported in today's *Advertiser*, that the Commonwealth, through the Minister for Immigration (the Hon. Alex Downer), has requested the South Australian Government to amend the section of the Law of Property Act requiring that, before non-naturalized persons can acquire land, they must obtain the approval of the Minister of Lands? Will the Minister amplify this matter for the benefit of the House, and say whether he considers that any alteration to the present system is either desirable or contemplated?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I read a similar statement in last night's *News* and I therefore anticipated a question on this matter. I was amazed that such a report should have appeared in the press, because ever since 1945 when the Act was passed we have made land available to migrants in this country. The statement in the press that a particular South Australian housing regulation which represented discrimination against migrants was doing very little good and barred unnaturalized migrants from owning a home is not in accordance with fact, as since the passing of the Law of Property Act in 1945, which requires that the consent of the Minister of Lands shall be obtained before any land can be acquired by an alien, 37,522 applications to purchase homes or blocks of land for erecting houses or other purposes have been approved by me as Minister of Lands. I may say also that many thousands of those transfers included homes on the blocks, and I know that many thousand more homes have been built on the other blocks.

WATER SCHEME FOR PALMER AND MILLENDILLA.

Mr. BYWATERS—Some time ago I introduced a deputation from the residents adjacent to Palmer and Millendilla with a view to getting an extension of the water main to serve that area. At the time the Minister of Works was told that an approach would be made by you, Mr. Speaker, as the member representing the adjoining district, to extend the pipeline to Sedan. I know that subsequently you, Sir, introduced a deputation along those lines. As this matter has been negotiated on for some time and we have heard nothing further, can the Minister of Works say whether he has considered this proposal? What are the possibilities of extending the main from the Mannum pipeline to serve that extremely arid area, especially in view of the prevailing drought conditions?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have seen the docket about this proposal which arose from discussions between the honourable member, as member for Murray, and yourself, Mr. Speaker, as member for the districts in the northern part of the proposed area, and I have seen the figures produced by the department's officers concerning the cost and the possible rating required to give the necessary return on capital cost, which, as country members know, is, after all, a modest return on the capital of the undertaking. The figures do not appear very encouraging, notwithstanding every effort in designing and costing the scheme to keep the capital cost to an absolute minimum, and the rating required from landholders to be served has to be extremely high.

Mr. Bywaters—Will they be given an opportunity to discuss this further with you?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I shall be happy to discuss it further with ratepayers from the honourable member's district and from your district, Mr. Speaker, as the scheme is being considered as a whole and, with its present design and costing, could not be sectionalized. I have not had time to thoroughly examine it, but at first glance the prospects do not appear bright for supplying water to the area at a reasonable rating.

BLACKWOOD ESTATE BUS SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—In recent weeks I have asked the Minister of Works several questions about the proposed Blackwood Estate bus service, and on November 24 the Minister reported that a conference had been held between the operator interested in providing that service, a representative of the Metropolitan Tramways Trust and a representative of the Railways Department, and that, as a result, the operator was making a more detailed investigation of the project. My information now is that he has made further investigations and, despite what may have been told him at the conference, he is still anxious to run the service. However, he has not yet had a definite answer from the Tramways Trust on his application for a licence. Is the Minister of Works in a position to say whether or not the trust is prepared to grant that licence? If not, will he make representations to the trust for a speedy answer to the application?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will take the matter up with the General Manager. I have not been notified of any developments in the last few days, but if the matter has reached the position suggested by the honourable member I should think a definite reply can shortly be expected from the trust.

PORT MACDONNELL SLIPWAY.

Mr. CORCORAN—For some time the Harbors Board has been carrying out preliminary investigations at Port MacDonnell to enable it to decide the location for a slipway and the type to be provided. Does the Minister of Agriculture know of any further developments that have taken place concerning this proposal in response to representations made from time to time by fishermen of the area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Since I visited Port MacDonnell early this year I have been particularly keen about the project, because I can see the need for a slipway. Much work has been done on the project. There were three possible sites, two of which have now been ruled out as impracticable. The engineers have decided that there is only one suitable site and it is alongside the jetty. The drawback to that, however, is that little land is available for the storage of boats, and to that end most of the recent inquiries have been directed. Efforts are being made to secure the necessary area so that the project can be further considered. In order to expedite the negotiations I have asked the Minister of Works to take over the responsibility of obtaining the land, simply because he has engineers available to advise him on technical matters, and he is doing this work for me.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Because of the extremely dry season the water position at Kimba has become serious and I understand that fresh restrictions are to be imposed. Will the Minister of Works inform me whether this is correct and what plans, if any, he has to provide a better supply to Kimba in future as that town is entirely dependent on surface water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It is correct that because the available supplies of water at Kimba have reached an extremely low level it has been necessary today, in Executive Council, to restrict further the use of water in the township. In view of this, arrangements have been made for the department to provide essential needs of the township by means of a tanker which will cart water from the nearest available source to the township tanks. I have asked the Engineer-in-Chief if he will instruct the district engineer to ensure that essential supplies are carefully maintained, and I am sure that will be done. As regards the general question of supplying Kimba, this matter has been considered in the past and is constantly being reviewed. I am concerned about this because it is the department's desire to maintain reasonable supplies to the town, but there appears to be no simple solution to the problem other than by extending the local catchment. As the honourable member is aware, Kimba is located on high country to which it is impossible to reticulate from any source except by additional pumping and any pipelines which could feed the town are at least 60 miles away. The only possible supply that could be considered at present is from the Tod River system to the south, and that is not capable of doing any more than it is called upon to do at present. From time to time representations have been made for the projected pipeline from Lincoln Gap to Iron Knob to be extended to

Kimba, but this would involve 56 miles of pipeline passing through country of low productive value. It would be a major undertaking and completely uneconomical. I assure the honourable member that I and the department are concerned about the supply. Last year we authorized an extension of the catchment area but that has not been effective this year because there has been no rain of any consequence in the district which the catchment could get. I assure the honourable member that the department will do its best to maintain essential supplies during the present critical period.

BROMPTON AND BOWDEN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—A few years ago the Engineering and Water Supply Department renewed the mains in the West Hindmarsh area, where there is now a very satisfactory supply of water. A number of industries in the Brompton and Bowden area were grateful recently to receive notification that the department intended to relay the mains there so as to give them what they believe will be an adequate supply of water as a protection in the event of fire. Can the Minister of Works say when this work will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have obtained the following information from the Engineer-in-Chief. The position at the present time is that there are two mainlaying gangs working in this area—one in Chief Street, Brompton, and the other in Wright Street, Renown Park. The gang working in Chief Street is engaged on the laying of a total length of 6,700ft. of 6in. main and 13,610ft. of 4in. main at an estimated cost of £29,000, to replace old mains which were laid during the period 1874 to 1900 in the area bounded by East Street, the Port Adelaide railway line, Wood Avenue and Torrens Road. When the work in Wood and Paget Streets has been completed this gang will join the gang at present working in Chief Street on the completion of the laying of mains in that area, together with the laying of a further 7,155ft. of 6in. main and 1,960ft. of 4in. main at an estimated cost of £38,450 in the Brompton-Hindmarsh and Bowden areas. The two gangs will remain in this general area until this work is completed.

THEBARTON TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—My question relates to the desire of the Parents and Friends Association of the Thebarton technical school to construct a protective fence around the bicycle rack at the school. I raised this matter about a month ago. The usual application was made for a subsidy but it was refused by the department, and I asked the Minister of Education whether that was indicative of a change in the policy on the part of the department in respect to subsidies for amenities of that kind and whether he would inquire further into the matter. Has he anything to report?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—What I informed the honourable member at the time was correct. There has been no change of policy in relation to subsidies, but, owing to the shortage of public funds resulting from the disastrous drought conditions, senior officers of the various branches of the Education Department have been requested to personally scrutinize all items of expenditure so that we may see how we are going during the first half of the financial year. One of the items is the payment of subsidies, which involves the expenditure of a large sum of money; and, as a result, the various branches—primary, technical and high—have been examining applications for subsidies for various amenities, particularly those not closely associated with actual teaching. They have not refused the applications, including the one mentioned by the honourable member, but they have deferred them until we can examine the general position. As soon as Parliament prorogues I hope to do that amongst other things, and see how far we have committed ourselves to the payment of subsidies in the first half of the financial year. The application mentioned by the honourable member is for a relatively small amount, and, in my view, for a desirable purpose, and I have no doubt in my mind that it will be granted.

COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. JENKINS—My question relates to the storage of water for Strathalbyn and the water district of Encounter Bay. Because of the dry weather experienced during the winter, when the rainfall was many inches below normal, we can expect a drying up of streams and creeks that feed the water supplies, and the warmer weather coming will quickly deplete the storages. I understand the department has made arrangements for people with bores to supplement both these supplies when needed. Will the Minister of Works have a close watch kept on the lowering levels of the reservoirs in order that pumping can be done before the levels reach a point that would mean restrictions or a shortage of supplies?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am sure that the department is keeping a close watch on the supplies, because at present it is able to do little else than watch supplies all over the State. As to the department's seeing that the levels do not fall to a point where restrictions or shortages of supplies are likely, I am afraid it would be unwise for me to give such an assurance. In a year when the State has received less than one-third of its normal rainfall I am afraid that problems will inevitably arise from time to time in various places. I assure the honourable member that it is not the desire of the department to cause difficulties at any point, nor will there be any negligence on its part. I am sure the officers of the department will keep a close watch in order to avoid restrictions or shortages, but I think it would be improper for me to give an assurance that I may be obliged to retract under the exigencies later on.

PORT AUGUSTA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question as to what progress has been made on the lowering of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and carrying out other alterations necessary to bring into use land made available to the department for the Port Augusta high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yesterday I received a lengthy minute from the Director of Education embodying reports and recommendations from officers of the Education, Architect-in-Chief's, and Engineer-in-Chief's departments. I agree generally with most of the recommendations, which follow substantially the suggestions made last year when I, with the honourable member, members of the high school council, the headmaster and other interested parties inspected the site. However, a necessarily large expenditure will be incurred if the recommendations are approved and those funds will come, not from moneys voted to the Minister of Education, but from moneys voted to the Minister of Works for expenditure in the Architect-in-Chief's Department and probably the Engineer-in-Chief's Department. I therefore feel that I should consult my colleague about this matter, which I will do as soon as the opportunity occurs. In any event, I am advised that the recommended work cannot be undertaken until next winter, at any rate, because of the lowering of the pipeline.

TINTINARA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on Tuesday regarding the township water supply at Tintinara?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It has been suggested that the Engineering and Water Supply Department take over the present railway supply, but it is doubtful if the railway storage tank is high enough to give reasonable pressures in a supply for the township and, from an examination made by a departmental officer, it appears that even if the railway bore is used new pumping equipment will be necessary. The Engineer for Design has intimated that it will be some weeks yet before the department's investigation is complete and before a scheme and estimate will be ready.

RAILWAY CROSSING GATES.

Mr. RYAN—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Railways to my recent question on whether the Railways Department will install railway crossing gates at Cheltenham and Albert Park?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has been advised by the Railways Commissioner that the level crossings near Cheltenham and at May Terrace, Albert Park, are provided with standard warning signs, flashing light signals and gongs. It is not intended at present to install gates at either crossing.

WHEAT SHIPMENT.

Mr. HAMBOUR—In today's *News* appeared the following report:—

Wheat exported from Port Adelaide had been replaced by shipments from other States or other South Australian zones at the cost of the Australian Wheat Board. Chairman of the board, Sir John Teasdale, said this by telephone from Melbourne today. All wheat so exported has already been replaced by the board with no extra cost to the consumer. These exports are what we term "grocery" lines—chiefly parcels of 50 to 100 tons of wheat to Asian ports. The board has recovered that extra cost from the special price obtained from the sale. That has also met the cost of sending wheat back to the Port Adelaide zone to replace it.

As this statement is not altogether in keeping with statements made in this House, will the Premier state whether it is correct?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The statement is certainly not in accord with the information supplied to me by responsible officers who have investigated this matter. I have been told that substantial shipments of wheat have been made from Port Adelaide—

certainly not grocery lines, but consistently heavy shipments. I do not know if Sir John Teasdale, who sent the report from Melbourne, has been wrongly advised. I saw the article mentioned, but he did not state the period to which his statement applied. He could have said, "This applies to the last two weeks." In general terms, his statement does not coincide with information supplied to me that the Wheat Board has consistently shipped from Port Adelaide in the last year. I have not yet been able to get adequate information on replacements. However, a thorough investigation is being made and I assure members that this matter will be sifted and examined completely. My criticism yesterday was not in connection with the increase of 4d. a bushel in the home consumption price of wheat, which is the charge that has been made. I do not think the Leader's question related to that.

Mr. O'Halloran—There was no relation whatever.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It was not correct to state that there was an objection to the increase. The Wheat Board has an obligation to supply wheat to the Australian consumer at the home consumption price, not at some price that can be jockeyed by manipulation of wheat from one place to another. As far as I am concerned, that has to stop, as it is an imposition on the consumer who has willingly agreed to pay a home consumption price well in excess of world parity.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL REPAIRS.

Mr. HUGHES—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question relating to urgent repairs required at the Wallaroo Hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have obtained the following report from the Director of Public Buildings:—

Extensive investigations have been carried out by the Structural Engineer of the Public Buildings Department in conjunction with a geologist of the Mines Department regarding repairs to the Wallaroo hospital building. Following these investigations, Cabinet last month approved the expenditure of approximately £23,000 for repairs to the buildings. A specification is now being prepared and tenders will be called for the work as soon as possible.

Members will note that the report is from the Public Buildings Department, the new name of the Architect-in-Chief's Department as from today. The title "Architect-in-Chief" has now disappeared, and the correct title is "Director, Public Buildings Department."

SEWERAGE AT TEA TREE GULLY, MODBURY, AND HIGHBURY.

Mr. LAUCKE—Looking to the future sewerage requirements of the Tea Tree Gully, Modbury, and Highbury areas, which are developing very rapidly, can the Minister of Works say whether it is expected that these areas will be linked up with existing sewerage systems, or whether a separate plan is envisaged for these areas?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am not aware that the department has considered sewerage for the areas mentioned by the honourable member, but I doubt very much whether it has, for the simple reason that it is heavily committed to projects in long built-up areas, areas which are developing ahead of those mentioned by the honourable member, and also areas where sewerage has not been installed and which urgently need it. I therefore doubt whether the department has any concrete proposal, or that it has been able to consider this area. I feel, however, that it is probable that much of this area of land, together with intervening land between that area and the metropolitan area, has been bought by the Housing Trust and other people, and would possibly be served by a series of trunk sewers which would lead into the existing system or new schemes which are at present under consideration.

APPROACHES TO BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently regarding approaches to the bridge at Blanchetown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has been informed by the Commissioner of Highways that it is not the intention of his department to construct culverts through the approach embankments of the Blanchetown bridge. Thorough investigations show that with the length of bridge which will be constructed, the heading up caused by the embankments during a flood similar to that of 1956 would only be of the order of 1½in.

SEPARATE ENFORCEMENT OF WARRANTS.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Premier a report from the Commissioner of Police concerning the matters which I raised about the execution of warrants in default of payment of fines, and, if he has, will he table that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—In the limited time I have had available since

the honourable member asked the question, I have made some inquiries into this matter. I have a complete report from the Commissioner of Police concerning the particular case. This case, as far as I can see, is one in which there are no merits whatsoever. I think the real issue is not centred around the case itself, but around the procedure and whether it is the correct procedure in this matter—whether, in point of fact, a magistrate has the right to direct the police to execute a warrant or not. Any criticism of the police in this matter is entirely unjustified. The police are acting in accordance with instructions which they have had from the Crown Law Department, and which have been approved by the Attorney-General, so that to criticize the police in this matter in my opinion is completely wrong. If any person is not satisfied with the action of a servant who is complying with a proper instruction, obviously he should go to the person who has issued the instruction. I have followed the matter back a little further, and have found that the procedure followed by the police is long-established practice. It arose initially out of a case in 1903, when the Full Court gave a decision regarding the issue of warrants. For the honourable member's information, those proceedings are reported in the *Advertiser* of September 22, 1903. The proceedings concerned the case of *Von Romer* v. *Robinson*, and the relevant point in this matter is this:—

Mr. Webb contended that even if it was not necessary under section 89 of the Justices Procedure Act for an application to be made for a warrant of distress, in order to give the justice of the peace jurisdiction to order the imprisonment of the defendant at the trial, yet it was clear that after the trial the magistrate would have no right to order his imprisonment, except after some application of the informant. If the informant did not wish the defendant to be imprisoned for non-payment of the fine, the magistrate would have no right to issue a warrant for his arrest of his own initiative. In this case it was clear that Robinson made no application for Von Romer's arrest. He went to the magistrate to ask him to allow Von Romer to have time in which to pay the fine, and it was clear that on that application the magistrate had no power to make the order for imprisonment which he did make. The Chief Justice, after consulting with the other judges, intimated that the bench was unanimous in the decision that Mr. Webb's last point represented the law correctly.

I am not a lawyer, but as far as I can see the procedure objected to recently is the procedure that has been in operation for many years, and it is a procedure that arose out of a decision of the Full Court. It has certainly not been the responsibility of the police; it has been the responsibility of the Crown Law Office and the Attorney-General, and any criticism of the police is entirely unjustified.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I asked the Premier whether he had a report from the Commissioner of Police and whether he would table it. In reply, the Premier quoted some unreported case in 1903, which did not discuss the procedure that the magistrates have adopted in these cases anyway, and did not answer my question. I ask the Premier if he will table the report which he has from the Commissioner of Police.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member is entirely misinformed. I did not quote a report from the Commissioner of Police this afternoon; I quoted—and I gave the honourable member the reference—from the *Advertiser* which in 1903 gave a report of the court proceedings. I shall be happy to table that report for the honourable member's instruction.

Mr. DUNSTAN—My first question to the Premier this afternoon was: had the Premier a report from the Commissioner of Police, and if so, would he table it? I have asked that question again and he has again refused to answer it. Will he do so now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is not the usual procedure of the Government to table the reports it receives from its officers. I do not intend to table that report. The honourable member need not trouble to look up Standing Orders, because I have not quoted from the report and therefore it does not have to be tabled.

GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK—The Minister of Education will, I think, remember that some time ago I raised the question of the possible purchase of land for the Gawler high school. I informed the Minister at the time that the land considered most desirable by the people in Gawler and the department was Giles' property south of the Gawler racecourse. Mr. Giles informed me that he desired to subdivide this land if the department did not want it. Since then I have seen Mr. Giles again and he has repeated his statement to me. I know that, although it was no doubt more profitable to subdivide, Mr. Giles, strangely enough, preferred to sell the land to the Education Department. Can the Minister say whether any firm decision has been made on the purchase of this land, and if not, will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—On the spur of the moment I do not recall any decision having been made in the matter, and, in fact, I am practically certain that none has been made and that no doubt it is still in the hands of the Property Officer and the Deputy Director of Education. I will take up the matter next week to see what the position is, and endeavour to expedite it and let the honourable member, and more particularly Mr. Giles, know.

CONVERSION OF SALT WATER TO FRESH.

Mr. HARDING—On several occasions members have asked questions about the possibility of converting salt water into fresh water, and in his last statement on the matter the Premier said that the Minister of Works would examine the position. Has the Minister of Works anything to report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have taken much interest in this matter and have sought all the information available from overseas. The Premier has just informed me that he forwarded a further report to me this morning, which I have not yet had an opportunity of examining. I have attempted to investigate all known possibilities, including straight distillation in conjunction with power generation. I do not think I can add anything to the statement I made recently to the press, namely, that although the proposal appears attractive at first glance, when the total cost is considered —that is, the cost of distillation plus amortization of the plant involved—it is not yet practicable and does not compare favourably with our present costs of reticulating water, even as far as the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline extends. However, I am confident that ere long we shall get better results. Of course, the cost of distillation and providing water can be reduced if the plant is operated in conjunction with electrical generation, but only by increasing the price of electricity. One could manipulate the two costs to get a most satisfactory result for one supply, but not both, and that is the problem.

I have referred the question to the General Manager of the Electricity Trust because I thought it might have some possibilities in view of the further development at Port Augusta. It does seem wise to keep a close watch on developments in this field because adjacent to our gulfs we have rapidly developing industrial areas and what is a natural geographical barrier for transport and conveyance of water could be converted to advantage if this project could be satisfactorily implemented. I intend to continue my investigations and departmental officers are anxious to keep in close touch with developments and to make recommendations as soon as they feel such a scheme has become practicable.

STIRLING NORTH TO QUORN ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Works any information concerning my recent questions about the sealing of the Stirling North to Quorn Road and whether Madman's Bridge has been completed and opened to traffic?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has received advice from the Commissioner of Highways that 1¼ miles of the Stirling North to Quorn Road has been sealed with bitumen. The base work for the ultimate sealing of a further 2 miles is in hand. Madman's Bridge is completed and was opened for traffic several weeks ago.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. COUMBE—Is the Minister of Works in a position to make a statement on the possible position of water supplies in the metropolitan area in the coming summer and indicate whether, in the event of water restrictions, he will appeal to the general public to co-operate in conserving water, particularly as I know that the public will react favourably?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—At the end of last week, owing to several days of heavy consumption, the metropolitan water reserves were somewhat depleted. We experienced several days of high consumption—the highest consumption being about 130,000,000 gallons on one day—and the reserves were depleted rather more rapidly than we could sustain over any lengthy period. However, with the advent of a little rain and some cooler weather, the position improved and instead of losing water from the reserves we gained a little through pumping exceeding consumption. I have asked, and the press has been good enough to publish requests, for consumers to exercise care, and the public has attempted to co-operate. One of the problems, of course, is that the ground is so dry that, although people may feel they are watering with restraint, the water disappears so quickly that there does not appear to have been any satisfactory result from the watering. However, the matter is under constant observation and I hope that restrictions will not be necessary. If we get further prolonged hot weather the position may have to be reviewed.

ROAD TO OIL REFINERY.

Mr. JENKINS—I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to my question of December 1 regarding the provision of a road to the proposed oil refinery.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Roads advises that it is expected that a start on the construction of the access road from the South Main Road to the proposed refinery will be made in March next year. Until this has been completed, alternative access from Tapleys Hill to the refinery will not be commenced.

HILLCREST WATER PRESSURE.

Mr. JENNINGS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the poor water pressure in Hillcrest?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Since the summer of 1958-59, when occasional low pressures on very hot days were experienced in portions of the Housing Trust area of Hillcrest, a 10in. main has been laid in Fosters Road. Some days ago the Hillcrest supply was transferred to the system fed by this 10in. main into which water is pumped from the trunk main laid last year in Grand Junction Road. This had the effect of increasing the pressure in the Hillcrest area and although the pressure was not abnormally high, the district engineer reports that following the change he had quite a large number of complaints from consumers that the pressure was too high and was affecting some of their pipes and appliances. Also following the change a number of leaks occurred in the department's service pipes and, to allow repairs to be made, the area was temporarily returned to its former source of supply and pressure. When repairs to the services are completed, the area will again be transferred to the higher pressure. The district engineer also reports that following the complaints of high pressure, he sent an inspector to the district to advise some of the householders on what they could do in regard to their sinks and bath heaters.

EDEN HILLS RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the alteration to the rail time table for the Eden Hills service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, states that arrangements have been made by the Railways Commissioner for the 5.26 p.m. Adelaide-Bridgewater railcar (which under the new time table ran express to Blackwood) to stop at Mitcham and Eden Hills. This became effective as from and including November 30.

BUSH FIRE RESEARCH COMMITTEE.

Mr. RALSTON—Recently the Bush Fire Research Committee announced a project estimated to cost more than £11,000 to protect from fire the pine forests at Wandilo in the South-East. I am in accord with this as this type of protection could prove of immense value in the future. Can the Minister of Forests say whether this amendment will include the purchase of land or, if not, what will be the major cost of this project?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—This land is actually forest reserve and it is being developed by the Bush Fire Research Committee partly for experimental purposes and partly for demonstration. It will develop a strip of country about three miles long and at least one-quarter of a mile wide and will pasture some of the land. Of the 600 to 700 acres about 100 acres will be sown down to pasture. After that is done any further expense will probably be borne by the Woods and Forests Department.

MOUNT BURR COMMUNITY HALL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Recently the Minister of Agriculture informed me that tenders were being called for the construction of a community hall at Mount Burr. Can he indicate the present position?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Tenders closed about a week ago and several were received. They are being examined by the Housing Trust. When any further progress can be reported I will inform the honourable member.

SPECIAL CLASSES IN UPPER MURRAY.

Mr. KING—Is the Minister of Education prepared to make a statement following a report by Mr. Piddington on the desirability of establishing occupation centres and opportunity classes in the River Murray areas?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Last year, at the request of the honourable member, I attended and addressed a conference at Berri of representatives of school welfare clubs, school committees, parents and teachers. I was accompanied by the senior psychologist of the Education Department (Mr. L. S. Piddington) who delivered a lecture on the education of the handicapped child. At that meeting I promised that a survey would be

made to ascertain what facilities were required for the education of handicapped children in the Upper Murray district. Owing to the visit overseas of the senior psychologist last year the survey could not be made at that time. However, accompanied by two members of his staff (Mr. E. S. May and Mr. E. T. Price) he visited the Upper Murray districts this year. Mr. Piddington has submitted a comprehensive report on the survey to the Director of Education, who has made several short and long range recommendations to me. I propose to put some of them into effect as opportunity occurs. As soon as buildings and suitably trained teachers are available I intend to establish at Berri or other districts in the Upper Murray opportunity classes and occupation centres for children who for one reason or another are retarded in their education. I hope that at least one suitable teacher can be found for this service at Berri next year. I am much indebted to the honourable member for the great interest he has displayed and the assistance he has rendered to me in this matter.

ALBERT NAMATJIRA.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works investigated the request I made yesterday about some means being adopted to perpetuate the memory of the late Albert Namatjira?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I mentioned this matter to the Protector of Aborigines and he informed me that the late Albert Namatjira is resting in the Alice Springs town cemetery, and that his grave is unmarked and without a headstone. Mr. McCoy of the Welfare Branch of the Aborigines Department, stationed at Alice Springs, has stated that the Public Trustee at Darwin is the executor of Albert Namatjira's estate, and that plans are being prepared by interested bodies for a headstone and for a monument to be erected. This information was obtained somewhat hurriedly, so I will maintain an interest in the matter and ascertain the ultimate result.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

Mr. STOTT—Recently I asked the Premier a question concerning drought relief for farmers. Following on that the Premier had a conference with the Prime Minister on the matter. He also told me that he had received no submissions for drought relief and that if he did they would receive consideration. Since that time I have received requests from people in my district and in other parts of the State. Apparently the Premier's statement received some publicity in country papers. Some meetings have been held on the matter, and it is evident that some farmers will need assistance, and it may be financial, seed or fuel. In some cases it has been reported that there will be a loss of 40 per cent in sheep. If I consolidate all these matters in a submission, will the Premier refer the matter to Cabinet and make a statement indicating the Government's intention on this important subject?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—After I made the statement I received a limited number of letters on the matter. Some cases have been examined, but in some there would have been great difficulty in carrying on even if there had been no drought. There was much disparity between them and cases purely connected with drought relief. When the examination of the cases has been completed I will indicate Government policy on the matter. This year the Government has no finance available to consider additional commitments. In this State over a long period of years we have had an extremely good run of favourable seasons, and under those circumstances I am not sure that it is possible, unless the Commonwealth Government helps, for the State to assume the responsibility for the first dry season. I feel that weather risks will always be associated with agricultural production and they must be, to some extent, provided for by the people engaged in agricultural pursuits. I am having the matter investigated and as soon as I have something definite I will advise the honourable member and make a public statement.

HUNDRED OF SPENCE RESERVE.

Mr. HARDING—In 1948 several inspections were made of land in the Hundred of Spence for the purpose of establishing a flora and fauna reserve, and an application was made to the Stockowners Association to have an area set aside for the purpose. Has the Minister of Lands the latest information on the matter?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Some time ago the chairman and other members of the Stockowners Association waited on me to make available about 14,000 acres of land for a fauna and flora reserve. However, a portion of it was included in a developmental scheme, and some of it will be included in an area that will be open for application within a few days. When that matter has been decided I will ask the Land Board to inspect the balance of the area to see whether it is suitable for the purpose mentioned by the honourable member.

NORTHERN FREEWAY.

Mr. COUMBE—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to a question I asked on November 25 concerning the new northern freeway and the new road to serve the northern suburbs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises me that no land has yet been purchased for the proposed future freeway through the north-eastern suburbs. The route has been located through the outer suburbs so that future subdividers and home builders can be advised of the land requirements for the long range scheme. It is not proposed to purchase existing buildings at this stage, but to preserve vacant land for the proposed road reserve. No specific route has been located through the relatively built-up area within the electorate of Torrens where a number of alternative schemes are possible.

PARINGA PARK SCHOOL FIRE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently concerning a press report that fire hydrants near the Paringa Park School were found to be out of order when an attempt was made to use them in the recent Paringa Park School fire? Can he state whether they are now free?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—On the occasion that gave rise to the honourable member's question it appears that two of the hydrants to which the brigade attempted to connect its appliances were found faulty. One was faulty because the valve spindle had been broken when used previously. It is not known how it came to be broken; possibly it was broken by somebody, perhaps an employee of the corporation, using it for council purposes. When an attempt was made to connect the second hydrant it was found that the fireman was unable to engage the standpipe in the fire plug, so a further fire plug was used, this time successfully. A subsequent examination of the two standpipes used at this fire revealed that one of the brigade's fittings was ⅛in. oversize. This is the reason that it could not be fitted to the second fire plug. This matter has been brought to the notice of the Chief Officer who has taken steps to have all appliances checked to see that they are of correct size. In connection with the periodical inspection of fire plugs, the Engineer-in-Chief states that there are approximately 50,000 fire plugs in the metropolitan area alone. To check all of these only once a year would require the full time services of seven men, and the annual cost would be about £10,000. At present, all water men, as and when they are able, inspect fire plugs and other main fittings in the course of other duties and report any defects found. The Chief Officer of the Fire Brigade has undertaken to instruct his officers to assist in this work of inspection of fire plugs and to report any difficulties.

HIRE-PURCHASE LEGISLATION.

Mr. KING—I have just received the following telegram from the Barmera Chamber of Commerce:—

Has the House fully considered the effect of husband and wife joint names on hire-purchase agreements covering tractors, trucks, industrial equipment, etc.? Wife wanting fur coat could prevent husband buying necessary farm equipment.

Has the Premier received any information of other repercussions of this rather peculiar piece of legislation?

The SPEAKER—Order! I do not think that question is in order, as the Bill is before the House at present.

HOLBROOK ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—On several occasions, and once during this session following on a letter I received from the school committee of the Flinders Park school, I have asked the Minister of Works a question relating to the Holbrook Road Bridge over the River Torrens. This bridge is not of very good construction, it was badly designed in that it has raised approaches, it is built on a bend in the road, it has a narrow footpath and it would be difficult for two trucks to pass. The school committee received advice in either January or February this year that reconstruction would be started at an early date, but no attempt has yet been made to start. Will the Minister of Works consult the Minister of Roads with a view to getting a definite answer on this matter, and advise me by letter after the House has risen?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

TANTANOOLA SCHOOL ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN—When I asked the Minister of Works a question recently concerning the delay in installing an electricity supply to the school residence and school at Tantanoola, the Minister gave an explanation that justified the delay, and said that tenders were being called for the work. If this has not been done, will the Minister use his influence to expedite the matter and have the installation made at an early date?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am unable to give the information required, but I will make inquiries and advise him by letter.

MILK PRICE.

Mr. SHANNON—Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Milk Board has yet decided the price of milk?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The Milk Board has gazetted an interim price increase of 2d. a gallon for producers. The honourable member will recall that it was stated earlier that the producers came to the Milk Board with new evidence and that they mentioned the dry seasonal conditions in asking for some interim increase to take place before the Milk Board review of all their costs, which will take place in about February next. The board has now increased the price by 2d. a gallon, which is a farthing a pint, and this increase will go to producers.

Mr. BYWATERS—Can the Minister of Agriculture say how this amount will be passed on to the consumer? For instance, can he say whether the increase to the consumer of ¼d. a pint will necessitate buying two pints of milk in order to get the advantage of ½d.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I explained that the price of milk would go up by ¼d. a pint. The details of whether farthings can be split, I would think, could probably be left to the Milk Board.

CONCESSION FARES TO COUNTRY PENSIONERS.

Mr. RALSTON—The Government has granted concession fares to pensioners who use State-owned transport in the metropolitan area, which I believe extends from Gawler in the north to Bridgewater in the south. The only objection I have to that policy is that it denies country pensioners concession fares until they are within the metropolitan area, whereas in Victoria pensioners are treated equally, there is no zoning, and they travel at half the adult rate anywhere in the State where State-owned transport is available. Will the Premier consider extending concession fares to pensioners in the next financial year to enable them to travel anywhere in the State at concession fares, as in Victoria?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member looks at *Hansard* he will see that I have answered two questions on this matter in the last two days.

PORT AUGUSTA POLICE STATION.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding accommodation at the Port Augusta police station?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have been advised that tenders will be called in the *Government Gazette* next week for additional accommodation to provide a cell block, toilets, interviewing room, offices, etc., at the Port Augusta police station. I do not quite know why the *Government Gazette* was specified, as it is normal to call tenders in the press and the local press. I presume that procedure will be followed in this case.

SOUTH-EAST SERVICE SLEEPER ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. RALSTON—On November 4, in reply to a question, the Minister of Railways advised, through the Minister of Works, that the Railways Department was endeavouring to obtain the concurrence of Victoria in using sleepers from the joint stock pool to provide two sleepers each on the trains leaving Mount Gambier and Adelaide on Christmas Eve. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Minister of Railways and advise me by letter as soon as a decision has been reached?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The honourable member's request is normal. If information is outstanding at the end of the session information is conveyed by letter. I will endeavour to have that done.

NORTHERN ROADS.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works received a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question relating to the Port Augusta to Wilmington and Port Augusta to Whyalla Roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has received the following report from the Commissioner of Highways:—

Port Augusta to Wilmington road.—The District Council of Wilmington is installing a number of drainage pipes and the road has not been resealed over the pipes to date. The finalizing of the work has been held up temporarily, pending the completion of Yorkey's Crossing, whilst the supply of the necessary 1½in. crushed rock for the bituminous penetration surface is not yet to hand. Deliveries of the latter are expected to be made early in the New Year. In the meantime, attention will be given to the maintenance of the short sections.

Port Augusta to Whyalla road.—Two miles of this section of Eyre Highway between Port Augusta and El Alamein camp is being strengthened because of the increased traffic caused

by the establishment of the army camp. The work has been temporarily held up pending the supply of crushed rock from the contractor. This will be to hand early in the new year, after which the final bituminous seal will be applied.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT ACCIDENT LIABILITY.

Mr. RICHES—On behalf of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) I ask the Minister of Works if he has a reply to the honourable member's question regarding the Highways Department's accident liability?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that, as is normal practice, a police report of the accident was requested and the matter was then referred to the Crown Solicitor, who advised that the Highways Department should accept liability. Payment has been made to the Crown Solicitor for settlement.

MOUNT COMPASS SCHOOL.

Mr. JENKINS—I was informed this afternoon that the Mount Compass school committee is concerned with the heavy undergrowth near the school surroundings and the pine plantation on two sides of the school, and the inadequate supply of water there. During discussions with the Minister of Education on the proposed new area school for Mount Compass, it was suggested that a bore or well could be put down to supply that school. Will the Minister take up with the Department of Public Buildings the possibility of putting down a well now to supply water for the present school, which is on the same site as the proposed new area school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be very pleased to do so.

SOUTH-EAST BUSH FIRE.

Mr. RALSTON (on notice)—Why was an inquest or public inquiry not held into the origin and all circumstances surrounding the fire which ravaged the districts of Kongorong, Mount Schanck, and Caroline on January 17, 1959?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Coroner reported to the Attorney-General that following consideration of police investigations he deemed an inquest unnecessary because:—

(1) There appeared to be no suspicious circumstances.

(2) No request for an inquest was made under section 27 of the Bush Fires Act or section 72 of the Fire Brigades Act.

(3) The police had not obtained any information which would suggest that the fire had been deliberately started.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: UNDERGROUND WATERS.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HEASLIP—In its report of the debate on the Underground Waters Preservation Bill the *Advertiser*, in summarizing my remarks, stated:—

The Bill, which he felt was essential to the welfare of the community, also prevented people from diverting fresh water channels to the detriment of their neighbours.

What I did say, as reported in *Hansard*, was:—

Under riparian rights water can be used while it is on a property but, after taking all that is needed, the landowner must put the excess back into the channel where it leaves his property. It cannot be diverted to another area where it would not naturally have gone.

I make this explanation so that the general public, and especially landholders, will not get the impression that this Bill has anything to do with riparian rights or surface water.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL—In this morning's *Advertiser* I am reported as having said in the debate on the Underground Waters Preservation Bill:—

On two properties west of Virginia the level had fallen up to 100ft. although there had been no drain on underground supplies except for stock water.

What I said was:—

Until 1956 they were all artesian bores, but in that year they ceased to overflow, and the water had to be pumped by windmill. Since 1956 the water levels in the bores have fallen as much as 30ft.

A little later I mentioned another section of that area, which I prefaced by saying "three miles to the north-east," and I mentioned the figure of 100ft. Those two figures have been wrongly connected in the press report. In the area where water was only being taken for stock, the figure is 30ft., not 100.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS 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.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give effect to a number of recommendations of the Dental Board, some of which will remove obsolete matter from the principal Act and others which have appeared to the Government to be reasonable and necessary to enable the board effectively to carry out its functions. As honourable members know, the board, which comprises a member (at present the Dean) of the faculty of dentistry in the University of Adelaide, a legally qualified medical practitioner and three elected registered dentists, is charged with the registration of dentists and the general oversight of the practice of dentistry in this State. The substantial matter covered by the Bill is the creation of a disciplinary committee separate and apart from the board itself.

Clause 3, apart from containing a consequential amendment, enlarges the definition of "dentistry" in the principal Act by including the performance of radiography in connection with human teeth or jaws, the giving of anaesthetics for dental operations, and the doing of preparatory work and giving preparatory advice in connection with dentures. All of these things are normally regarded as part of the original work of dentists, and the effect of widening the definition is that they can be done only by qualified dentists or medical practitioners. Clause 4 will vary the constitution of the Dental Board by providing that what I shall call the "University member" shall be a member of the faculty of dentistry to be nominated, instead of the Dean of the faculty, who may not be always available. Clause 5 raises the annual registration fee from two guineas to four guineas. In this connection it is relevant to point out that the principal Act has not been amended since 1936.

Clause 6 will establish a disciplinary committee which will take over the board's present duty to hear charges against dentists in respect of unprofessional or infamous conduct. The committee will consist of five members, one of whom to be the chairman, will be a legal practitioner of at least five years' standing, all to be appointed by the Governor upon the board's recommendation. This provision will bring the provisions relating to the discipline of dentists into line with those applicable in the case of the legal profession. At the present time the board itself deals with this question and thus is, in effect, both complainant and judge. It is considered desirable that the disciplinary committee should be separate. Clause 7 makes consequential amendments. Clause 9 amends section 18 of the principal Act (which sets out qualifications for registration as a dentist) in three respects. Paragraph (*a*) substitutes the General Dental Council of the United Kingdom for the General Medical Council of the United Kingdom, since there is now a Dental Council in the United Kingdom in addition to a Council of Medical Education. When the principal Act was passed, dental affairs came within the scope of the latter.

Paragraph (*b*) strikes out two subparagraphs of section 18 which are no longer operative. They covered the registration of operative dental assistants, a matter to which I shall refer when I come to clause 12. Paragraph (*c*) of clause 9 will permit the temporary registration of persons who have obtained all the necessary qualifications in an Australian University but have not actually been admitted to their degrees. It is designed to bridge the gap between final examinations and the conferment of degrees. Clause 8 effects a consequential amendment. Clause 10 will enable the personal representatives of a deceased dentist to continue his practice for up to twelve months or any longer period approved by the Board in order to enable the sale of the practice. But the practice must of course be continued by the employment of one or more registered dentists to conduct it. This appears to be a reasonable and necessary provision.

Clause 11 will add to the reasons for deregistration, mental or physical defect or an order by the disciplinary committee; the

latter addition is, of course, consequential. Clause 12 repeals all of the sections of the principal Act dealing with the registration of operative dental assistants except sections 27 and 30 which provide for the register and licence fees. The reason for the removal of the sections concerned is that they were designed to cover persons who were employed as operative dental assistants at the time when the sections were enacted, and the time has long since passed within which any new persons could become registered as operative dental assistants. The sections concerned are therefore obsolete. Clause 13 will remove from section 40 the provision that a person shall not practice dentistry if employed as an articled pupil or apprentice. The provisions of the principal Act concerning articled pupils and apprentices are now obsolete, as it is not the practice for students to gain their practical experience in this way. Clause 13 also raises the penalty for practising by unqualified persons and clauses 14, 15 and 16 also raise penalties provided by the principal Act.

Clause 17 is consequential upon the clause creating the new disciplinary committee and will provide for proceedings before that committee. Clause 18 is likewise consequential, while clause 19 will amend section 46 so as to empower the Board to refer applications for registration to the committee for inquiry. This clause is therefore of a consequential character. Clause 20 removes section 47 from the principal Act in view of the new provisions for a disciplinary committee. Clause 21 amends section 48 of the principal Act by making certain consequential amendments, prohibiting a registered dentist from holding out an unregistered person as a partner or assistant and by restricting the number of registered dentists employed by dental companies to the number employed on October 1 of the present year. At present there are three dental companies entitled to practice dentistry, having been registered at the time of the passing of the 1931 Act. Clause 22 will require dental companies to file certain returns with the Dental Board, while subsection (2) is consequential upon the earlier provision in clause 21 concerning the number of registered dentists that can be employed by such companies.

Clauses 23, 24, 25 and 26 effect consequential amendments. Clause 27 inserts a new and necessary provision conferring upon the disciplinary committee the powers exercisable by the board while clause 28 makes consequential amendments. Clause 29 enacts a new section which makes provision for suspension of an order of the disciplinary committee where an appeal is intended or has been brought. Clause 30 makes consequential amendments, adds to the regulation-making power the power to regulate advertisements, and to prescribe a code of professional conduct. The clause also increases the amount of the penalty that may be imposed by regulation. Clause 31 adds to the qualifications for registration by virtue of overseas qualifications certain degrees of the Universities of Malaya, Malta and Pretoria.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I oppose the second reading. I do not deny that what the Minister has said is correct, and that the proposed amendments were recommended by the Dental Board, but I have received numerous complaints from members of the dental profession that they have not been consulted about the proposals and expressing unhappiness with the board. Prominent dentists, whose reputations are beyond question, have informed me that they propose taking steps to alter the complement of the board as a result of these proposed amendments. They believe the board is undemocratic. Its recommendations do not reflect the desire of the majority of the profession and, indeed, most dentists have no knowledge of these proposals.

Mr. Dunstan—They could not get the Bill until today.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Bill was not available until today and members of the profession have not been able to consider it. In order to ascertain whether the complaints I received were general, I telephoned a country dentist and asked him his opinion of this Bill, but he did not know what I was talking about as he had not heard of it.

Mr. Millhouse—Nor had the President of the Dental Association until last night.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Apparently members of the profession have been busy since then. I believe the Government has been misled by a minor section of the profession that is exercising its power contrary to the general desires of the profession as a whole. The Government would be reluctant to introduce legislation that was opposed by the majority of persons affected by it. Practising dentists allege that the board has acted from motives of self-interest and claim that these amendments are not in the interests of the profession generally or of the public.

Members of the profession have secured legal advice on the effects of clause 3 and they claim that if accepted in its present form it could result in the elimination of eight commercial

laboratories that manufacture dentures on prescriptions from registered practitioners. These laboratories engage young people as apprentices, but they will be unable to continue their operations if this proposal is accepted. The clause makes no provision for the introduction, even on an experimental basis, of trained ancillary personnel, as in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Canada. Members of the profession claim that a disciplinary committee, as proposed in clause 6, should be elected by dentists and not be appointed by the board. The dental profession has done nothing to merit disciplining by an outside body.

Clause 30 duplicates the professional ethics and codes of behaviour of the Dental Association that are adopted after normal constitutional discussion by all members. In the past, when I have had occasion to refer complaints to the association, I have always received courteous attention and satisfaction. It is strange that the Bill contains no provision for the admission of North American degrees in our register, particularly as the principal lecturers at the last four dental conferences have been Americans, who are regarded as outstanding authorities on dental practice. The board is to be congratulated on its ability at manoeuvring. It has manoeuvred this Bill in such a manner that it has been introduced in the dying hours of the session when discussion is limited, with a view to prejudicing the majority of the dental profession to the advantage of the minority. I hope that the Bill is forcibly rejected.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—Although I do not necessarily agree with everything Mr. Hutchens said when referring to the Dental Board, I have come to the same conclusion as he and am unable to support the Bill at this juncture. I cannot understand why this Bill, which deals with a profession and seems to be a matter peculiarly for members of that profession, has been introduced in the last week of the session without the members of the profession having had an opportunity to consider it. I believe that is completely wrong. Members of the dental profession who have spoken to me applied to the Government Printer as late as last Friday for copies of the Bill because they had not been apprised of its contents, but were informed that it would not be available for three weeks. I was only able to obtain a copy yesterday. Members of the profession have been trying for some months to ascertain the contents of the Bill but have been unsuccessful. A matter such as this should be freely and fully discussed by them, but it has not been discussed at a formal meeting of the members of the Australian Dental Association, which is the professional body of dentists in South Australia. It may well have been discussed by the five members of the Dental Board, but the rank and file of the profession have not seen the Bill until within the last 48 hours. The only means by which they can have an opportunity of studying it is for Parliament to let the Bill lapse.

Three dentists, who have independently approached me on this matter within the last few days, have complained that the Bill does not contain any positive approach to the problem of dental health and the prevention of dental disease. It is purely and simply a restrictive measure and does nothing to promote education on dental health. The maxim that prevention is better than cure is entirely ignored. However, I have not only been approached by dentists, but by a partner in one of the eight or nine dental laboratories that perform dental work—making false teeth and specializing to a great degree. If we examine the definition of dentistry we find that it refers to the mechanical construction or renewal or repair of artificial dentures or restorative dental appliances. In other words, the making and repairing of false teeth. However, we find that dentistry does not include the mechanical construction of artificial dentures or other devices by an artisan in the course of his employment by a registered dentist. In other words, a dentist can employ a dental technician to carry out work, but the provision does not provide for dental laboratories that have been established in the last few years. One of these laboratories is a partnership of two men, employing six dental technicians, specializing in the casting of chrome cobalt skeleton metal dentures, whatever that is. They alone do the work in South Australia. They will be excluded under this definition because they will not be registered under the Bill. Section 40 of the principal Act states:—

No person shall practise dentistry for fee or reward unless—(*a*) he is a legally-qualified medical practitioner; or (*b*) he is registered as a dentist under this Act.

These firms will be deprived of their livelihood.

Mr. Coumbe—No!

Mr. Hutchens—That is the view of a learned Q.C.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I have explained the position and quoted the various provisions. These laboratories are excluded.

Mr. Dunstan—They are independent contractors.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. They work for a number of dentists. They are in precisely the same relationship to a dentist as a chemist is to a medical practitioner. These laboratories make false teeth by prescription. They employ technicians. The firm I have mentioned employs technicians to do the work, but these technicians will undoubtedly be caught because they are employed to do work under contract. It may be desirable to cut them out, but in the dying hours of the session I do not think we should cavalierly do so without being able to give full consideration to the matter. That is what we will do if the clause is accepted in its present form.

Mr. Hambour—Do you suggest that we defer the Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, and it would do no harm. It is a desirable Bill, but members should have the opportunity to consider it further. There is no doubt that up to the moment they have not had that opportunity.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—How would you solve the difficulty? The only way would be to consult the elected representatives.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No. The body to consult is the professional association. I refer to the Australian Dental Association, which should not be confused with the Dental Board. The association, which comprises all dentists in the State, has not considered the matter formally, and the members have been denied the opportunity to know the contents of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—Denied by whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—By those who drew the Bill. In his second reading explanation the Minister of Agriculture said it was drawn by the Dental Board. I have made three independent checks with dentists and asked whether the association had considered the matters in the Bill, and all of them said that the association had not been consulted.

Mr. Hambour—Did they know that the Bill was being prepared?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes.

Mr. Laucke—It has been mentioned in the monthly newsletter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Was there information about the contents of the Bill?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The president of the association has been regularly consulted.

Mr. Laucke—They had access through the president to the matters contained in the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That is entirely different information from what I obtained hurriedly in the last three days.

Mr. King—They must have had ample opportunity to secure the information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They did, but they were knocked back.

Mr. Laucke—They were in agreement about the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The three I spoke to were against it. The Premier referred to the president of the association, but he changes from year to year.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—There was a president up to November.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Up to last night the president did not know the Bill had been introduced.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The new president was elected last week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—If he had been president for only a week he must surely have known of a vital matter like this.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—He was elected since the Bill was first introduced.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—He must have been a man active in the association.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—He could not have been very active.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—As a whole, the association says that it had no knowledge of the Bill. That is my information on the matter. The dentists are entitled to look at the Bill, which contains one grave flaw. Its whole tenor is restrictive and not positive. Can the Minister say why the Bill was introduced within a week of the end of the session, and why is there such a desperate rush to get it through?

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—This is a Bill essentially to bring up to date the legislation under which the dental profession operates. I was surprised and disturbed to hear Mr. Hutchens and Mr. Millhouse speak as they did. They are opposed to the second reading basically on the ground that the rank and file of the profession has not been consulted about the Bill. On good authority I refute their assertions in this matter. I am told that 99 per cent of the registered dentists support the

Bill. The Dental Board comprises five members, four of whom are past presidents of the association. The board consists of a member of the Faculty of Dentistry at the University (at present the Dean of the Faculty); a legally-qualified medical practitioner elected by the British Medical Association; and three elected registered dentists. The board is empowered to register dentists and to supervise the practice of dentistry in this State. When the rank and file of registered dentists have elected three members by poll they are empowered to do certain things in respect to the profession with the full authority and acquiescence of the dentists who elected them. The president of the board is a past president of the Dental Association, as is also the B.M.A. representative of his association. Each month a newsletter is sent to all members of the association. References have been made to the preparation of the Bill and members have had access to the board in reference to the contents of the Bill. At present a dentist who has passed the necessary examination at the University cannot practise for perhaps three months, pending receipt of his degree.

Mr. Dunstan—The honourable member knows that special commemoration days are held to confer degrees.

Mr. LAUCKE—My information in respect of this Bill is completely authentic and it was presented fairly to me. We will be doing an injustice to the profession if we reject something that has been the subject of review and discussion for about 18 months.

Mr. Millhouse—What is the desperate need to pass this Bill within a week of the end of the session? Active members of the association have not been able to ascertain its contents, and when they have tried to get the information it has been refused.

Mr. LAUCKE—This has been a heavy session and it has been impossible to bring down all legislation early. The Bill has been before another place and members in this place have been able to peruse the Bill presented there. The honourable member suggests that information has been withheld from members of the association, but when I referred the matter to gentlemen who should know I was told that there had been no withholding of any information sought by a member, and I accept that statement. For 18 months at monthly meetings of the association the preparatory work in connection with the Bill has been discussed, and the matter has been mentioned in the monthly newsletter. The Dean, and the ex-Dean, of the Faculty at the University were consulted in the framing of the Bill. The present Dean had a complete draft submitted to him and he agreed with all the provisions. The Bill contains a more complete definition of "dentistry." It has been adapted from New South Wales legislation. Mr. Millhouse pointed out that, under clause 3, 37 operatives would be deprived of a livelihood, but I am told that that is not correct, because the operatives can act under a prescription from a registered dentist.

Mr. Dunstan—That is not possible.

Mr. Millhouse—Why should the Bill be passed so hurriedly?

Mr. LAUCKE—I want the Bill considered tonight in fairness to the profession. There is an element of haste that I regret, but I do not like to see a provision seeking certain amendments that is deferred if it is possible to have it agreed to, as it has been in another place. The section dealing with disciplinary matters is a good thing, as it has been felt that the board should not act as both prosecutor and judge.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you think it is a good thing that the board itself can determine fees paid to the committee?

Mr. LAUCKE—I think a board elected by the committee should be so empowered. Another portion of this Bill, dealing with certain companies acting as dental companies, is important. The board has been concerned at the possibility that commercial enterprise will gain control of the three remaining dental companies. This Bill provides that after this legislation is passed no person can become registered as a shareholder or beneficiary unless such person is a registered dentist, which is fair. I regard this legislation as desirable. I accept it as a carefully considered and weighed document by the people most concerned, and I support the second reading.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I oppose the second reading. I entirely agree with the excellent address given by the member for Mitcham but point out the difficulties with which the House is faced in dealing with such legislation at this stage of the session. This Bill makes fairly considerable amendments to the Act. There is not only difficulty in the matter the member spoke of, but in radiography as well, where certain practitioners have radiographers or technicians in their employ. Artisans who may perform dentistry may carry out dental work under the Act, but there is no exemption for radiography. If a

dentist on North Terrace sends a person down to a radiographer employed on North Terrace it is an offence. Some dentists have their own small plant but some do not, and a certain number find that the small plants used by dentists for radiography are not large enough in special cases. The dentist then has either to go to a radiographer in a bigger plant, or a technician has to do it. This seems to be a strange provision and I cannot see the justification for cutting out people who are technicians. At the moment there are not sufficient dentists in South Australia and it is desirable to attract people into the profession. I think the Dental Board has been concerned to try to attract people into the profession and to provide adequate safeguards. There are good things in this Bill but I cannot see how we will get more dentistry done if we cut out technicians of this kind.

Mr. Coumbe—Can you suggest a remedy?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I suggest that the best remedy is for the matter to be discussed by the rank and file members of the profession. The member for Barossa said that he has been informed that this has the support of 99.9 per cent of the profession, but I do not know how anyone could come to that conclusion, as no vote has been taken by the association. I know that in the legal profession, when some proposal comes up for a major change, the committee has to take over certain functions of the board. Members of the profession are not too happy about the way this board is to function. The legal profession has been considering a major change of having barristers and solicitors, as in other States. The details have been discussed, not only in general meetings, but they have been circulated each time members of the profession ask that this be done. Everyone can express his view and know what is being proposed and discussed, but that has not been done in this case. We are being asked to make a major change without sufficient time for all the people who are being affected to make their voices heard. In those circumstances I do not think Parliament is being given a chance to do this job. One of the major things about legislation is that the people have an opportunity to come along and discuss with members details of legislation put before us. Who can say that there has been time for members of the dental profession and others affected to do that in this case? I do not think that the House would agree to this Bill at this stage, and I hope it will not agree to the second reading. I suggest to the Premier that this legislation should be postponed so that we can take it into proper account and give it proper consideration in the next session.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—It has been refreshing to have two learned worthy professional men speak about another profession. It does not happen often, but there is such a thing as professional etiquette; generally speaking, the cobbler keeps to his last. I would regret if the profession became a little less cautious and dropped its guard. We have had a real harangue from the member for Mitcham, and the member for Norwood said that he had heard a fine oration from the member from Mitcham. They were scratching each other's backs, and both were attempting to deny another worthy profession the right to things it had been doing for a long time. Their advice makes me more cautious as lawyers live on argument and disagreement. The member for Mitcham almost cried about people who would be denied a livelihood. These artisans, who carry out the instructions of the qualified dentist, are not dentists any more than the ordinary clerk is a lawyer. They may be dentists some day. I am prepared to accept Mr. Laucke's statement, and I disagree with the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) because I feel that it is a case of one professional man attacking another professional man.

Mr. Millhouse—Do you say that any harm would be done if this matter were left over until next session?

Mr. SHANNON—No more than if we were dealing with a Bill relating to the legal profession. Any Bill that comes in late always receives criticism, and in this case that criticism has no relationship to the merits of the Bill. I have not heard the merits of this Bill, apart from the definition of dentists which the member for Mitcham attacked. We have had several of these professional measures before this Chamber. On one occasion we licensed people to practise the healing art on animals, and we denied anyone not qualified by a degree in veterinary science the right to practise.

Mr. Quirke—We are issuing licences every day.

Mr. Hambour—The member for Onkaparinga is a know-all.

Mr. SHANNON—I know enough to seek advice that is worth listening to. This is not the first time we have denied people the right to practise in certain professions. I

do not want an artisan to practise as a dentist, because I do not think that is in the interests of professional standards. It is unfortunate that we have not one dentist here to speak on this measure, although one or two members have apparently had something to do with the dental profession. It is obvious that the Bill is being attacked mainly because of the lateness of the session. I do not know why members expect all Bills to be brought in early.

Mr. Millhouse—Why couldn't this one have been brought in early?

Mr. SHANNON—It may have been because the Dental Board wished to discuss certain aspects of the measure with prominent members of the profession. We can choose between what has been said by the member for Mitcham and the member for Barossa. I do not believe the member for Mitcham would attempt to ask every legal man practising in South Australia what he thought about a Bill dealing with the legal profession.

Mr. Millhouse—Such a Bill would be discussed by the Council of the Law Society.

Mr. SHANNON—The acknowledged leaders in the dental profession comprise the Dental Board. I have the greatest difficulty in crediting that the member for Mitcham is sincere in this matter. I think the Bill was put forward in the interests of the dental profession, and not to damage it in any way. No-one will make me believe that the Government would agree to bringing down a Bill that it was not convinced expressed the desires of the profession for that legislation, and that is what the member for Mitcham is asking me to believe. Artisans are not going to be denied the right to act as artisans if they still wish to, and the work they are doing today can still be performed if carried out under the direct supervision of a dentist.

I would prefer the professional man of my choice to supervise the making of dentures rather than sending out a prescription to someone else, which smacks of commercializing the profession. The member for Mitcham referred to the chemist as having the same relationship to the medical man as a dental mechanic has to the dental profession, and I think that is an amazing statement. Firstly, the dentist is an academically qualified person, with a university degree. Similarly, a doctor has to pass a university degree, and I remind the member for Mitcham that even a chemist cannot practise until he has secured his degree in pharmacy. I think that might make some little change in the member for Mitcham's analogy.

Mr. Millhouse—That is irrelevant.

Mr. SHANNON—I think it is very relevant. The member for Mitcham is dealing with two professional people in one instance and in the other instance with a professional person and an ordinary artisan. What qualification does a dental mechanic have to possess? I suggest his practical experience can best be gained under the guidance and oversight of a qualified dentist, and that is what the dental profession suggests. If honourable members do not think that is right, why does the legal profession have people who are seeking to become lawyers articled to firms of legal practitioners to gain some experience in the law? Obviously, that is a proper practice, for it works very well and there have been no complaints about it. The articled clerk in the legal world seeks to become a qualified lawyer; that is his aim. In the other field there is an entirely different set-up, for only an odd few dental mechanics ever go to the time, trouble, and expense necessary to take a dental course. It is entirely wrong to suggest that we are going to deny them the opportunity of making a livelihood, because there must be sufficient dental work to ensure their employment. There is no real value in the argument that we are excluding a section of the profession, because these people were never in it. They are an adjunct to the profession just as are dental nurses.

Mr. Millhouse referred to the disciplinary committee that is proposed to be established. Unprofessional conduct in any profession is undesirable and some body must ensure that a standard is maintained and must be able to punish any offenders. The medical profession has its disciplinary body. I can remember instances of doctors doing the wrong thing with free medicine—supplying anti-biotics *ad lib*—and some have been de-registered. Why should not the dental profession have a somewhat similar set-up to ensure that its members maintain a high standard of professional conduct? If a profession made its own rules, unless it had legislative backing it would have no legal power to enforce them. In the dairying industry there is a voluntary equalization scheme, but the lack of legislative backing has resulted in break-aways by people who are not doing the right thing by the industry and who are refusing to pay the levies. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; adjourned debate made an order of the day for "Tuesday next."

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SCHOOL OF MINES AND INDUSTRIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from December 2. Page 2048.)

New Part VII (embodying new clauses 45 to 48)—"Minimum deposits"—moved by Mr. Hambour.

(For wording, see page 2045.)

The CHAIRMAN—Unless members desire it otherwise, I will put the whole of Part VII as one amendment.

The Committee divided on new Part VII:

Ayes (22).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hall, Hambour (teller), Harding, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, Nankivell, O'Halloran, Quirke, Ralston, Riches, and Ryan, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (12).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Millhouse, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mr. Shannon.

Pair.—(Aye)—Mr. Tapping. (No)—Mr. Laucke.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

New Part VII thus inserted.

New clause 49—"Maximum rate of terms charges."

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move to insert the following new clause 49:—

(1) In this section "capital outlay" means the balance originally payable under the agreement less the terms charges.

(2) Any provision in any agreement or other document whereby the hirer under a hire-purchase agreement is required to pay a sum (whether or not it is described in the agreement as terms charges) in respect of terms charges exceeding a sum equal to the simple interest on the capital outlay at a rate of 5 per centum per annum calculated on the basis of payment of the capital outlay at the end of the period of the hire-purchase agreement shall be void: Provided that nothing in this section shall limit in any respect the powers of any court under section 24 of this Act.

(3) Without affecting the liability of any person to be convicted of an offence against this section, where any agreement or other document contains a provision that is void under the provisions of subsection (2) of this section the liability of the hirer under the hire-purchase agreement concerned shall be reduced by the amount included in the hire-purchase agreement or any other agreement or document for terms charges. Such amount may be set off by the hirer against any amount that would otherwise be due or which becomes due to the owner under the hire-purchase agreement and to the extent to which such reduction is not satisfied by such set-off recovered by the hirer from the owner by action as for a debt.

(4) Where any agreement or other document contains a provision that is void under the provisions of subsection (2) of this section the owner under the hire-purchase agreement concerned shall be guilty of an offence.

In the second reading debate I gave a full explanation of this amendment. For some time the Opposition has felt that for two reasons the rate of interest on hire-purchase agreements should be limited. Firstly, it should be limited to protect people who have to resort to this business and, secondly, to reduce the amount of profit from the business. Greed and avarice have been displayed by some hire-purchase organizations. Many reputable firms are associated with this business but some firms will stop at nothing to get custom, so we believe that a limitation in interest rates is necessary. I have been accused of trying to make the interest limit too rigid but I propose a simple interest rate of 5 per cent for the duration of the contract, which, in effect, over 12 monthly payments, will be 9¾ per cent. It is necessary to allow for additional risks, although now in the hire-purchase business there is little risk, especially now that we have included Part VII. In South Australia a hire-purchase business is run by the Trades and Labor Council and associated unions. It is a co-operative organization and provides for an interest rate of 5 per cent flat. There is no difference between 5 per cent flat and 5 per cent simple for the duration of the contract. The co-operative concern has been established for only a short time, but it is making substantial profits and

building up reserves. It shows conclusively that hire-purchase business can be conducted on the basis I propose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The amendment contains a number of defects and I ask the Committee to reject it. If it is adopted it will prejudice the possibility of getting an effective measure passed this session.

Mr. O'Halloran—That would not be a defect, only an excuse.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I think it would be better to have half a loaf than no bread at all. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to go the whole hog that is his business, but some of the matters being discussed in this Committee will not help us to get proper legislation. Many of the matters raised are controversial and could lead to the Council taking a difficult stand on the Bill. The proposal is not for an interest rate of 5 per cent, for in effect it will be a rate of 9¾ per cent on a yearly agreement where there are 12 monthly payments. For some time there have been fixed interest rates in connection with hire-purchase business in New South Wales where the Labor Government until recently had a majority in both the Upper and the Lower Houses. That Government has been in control for a long time and was ably led by Mr. Cahill, for whom I had a great respect. Mr. Cahill introduced these interest rates that have been in operation ever since; they are not a flat rate of 5 per cent, but go as high as 10 per cent.

Yesterday we had an example of an attempt to take away from the poorer people an opportunity to get credit. If this amendment is given effect to I would say it would take away completely the credit of the smaller people. Whilst companies may be interested to sell a motor vehicle costing, say, £800, it is no attraction to sell smaller commodities at this rate because of the risk and bookkeeping involved. In general politics, the Leader has taken the side of the underdog and I believe his desire to curtail interest rates is in accordance with his policy, but this will take away the opportunity of the poorer classes to get hire-purchase facilities for small essential commodities. Who will give a hire-purchase agreement for a commodity costing, say, £25 and allow one year for repayment at an interest rate of 5 per cent? The bookkeeping and the mass of work involved would make a completely intolerable position. A much lower rate of interest is charged on motor cars than on household goods because of the added expenditure involved in the mass of small documents and in administration in the latter. I totally oppose the amendment, which I believe would do a grave disservice to the poor people of the community.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have listened with interest to the Premier's notional statement about what will happen to the poor people of this community if there is a limitation of interest rates. He said this would not be difficult for larger items but would hit smaller items. The outstanding company dealing in smaller items is David Murray's. If money is paid back to this firm in a short period no terms charges are made. This firm is able to make a profit without terms charges of the kind other companies have been enforcing on large items. Hire-purchase companies get their returns in various ways; they get them from things apart from terms charges. Retail companies such as David Murray's are able to make their retail profit apart entirely from the terms charges. They have some administration costs but the bookkeeping and sending out of accounts is not much greater than that done by any other establishment. In most cases the hirer goes along to an insurance company that the owner nominates and there is a kick-back from the insurance company to the store. If the hire-purchase company is financing retailers or is simply operating to purchase goods on the retail market and finance the hirer it gets a substantial kick-back from the manufacturer. It is able in those circumstances to make returns quite apart from terms charges.

Let me give an instance of what is happening to workers at the moment. A man, who wrote to me, went along to a retail store and purchased a television set. He was told what the terms charges would be and advised that he must also pay £15 a year over the three years for maintenance charges. When he asked if that was all he had to pay he was told that it was but, when he obtained the agreement, he found that he would be paying £18 a year for maintenance. When he protested, he was told that the company had forgotten to say that it was charging interest on the maintenance charge. He then found that the maintenance agreement went only to the replacement of valves and one or two other parts and that if something went wrong with some other part or there was an accident he would have to pay for it or take out another insurance policy at a cost of another £6 to

£10 a year. It is no wonder hire-purchase companies can pay over 9 per cent on debentures and still make an extraordinarily large profit. No one can seriously believe the Premier's argument that hire-purchase will be cut down if these companies are limited in their interest charges. The Industrial Department of the Commonwealth Bank found that it could make the whole of its overhead from the kick-backs and that all the rest was profit. This provision will not inconvenience people like David Murray's because, on the vast majority of their small transactions, they are not getting as much now. The people it will affect are those selling large items at exorbitant rates of interest. Small people in this community will be protected, not discommoded. That is evidence enough that the average small person in the community is concerned. It was a unanimous vote by the Labor Party's conference that hire-purchase charges should be limited, because the small people of this country are becoming incensed at the way they are being unmercifully fleeced by some hire-purchase companies in this State. No small transactions are going to be adversely affected by this amendment, although it may mean some cutting down of the fringe transactions on large purchases where people are being charged exorbitant amounts for what they are purchasing.

Poor people in my district have been charged heavy interest rates for secondhand goods, often in circumstances when they have had something put over them by hire-purchase companies. I do not think any small person will be inconvenienced in any way by this amendment. The amendment will protect them, and the only people who will be inconvenienced are the people who are now making unconscionable profits from this business. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON—If the Opposition is opposed to hire-purchase, obviously this amendment is a step in the right direction, because this amendment could kill it. It is said that some people are bled in their ignorance, and that sometimes they arrange to purchase for the home an article that they cannot really afford. That may be true in some cases. We are free agents, and trying to protect fools from their folly is a pretty hopeless task for any Parliament. The competition in hire-purchase ensures some check on exorbitant charges.

Mr. King—That has been proved.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, there is savage competition. When a hirer falls down on his payments on a secondhand article, the vendor often finds that his equity in the article has vanished entirely. Everyone knows that secondhand motor cars, for instance, can be a snare and a delusion. Because of the greater risk, a secondhand article should bear a little higher interest rate than new articles, and that is recognized in most businesses. A five per cent flat rate would, for all practical purposes, settle hire-purchase. This Bill gives a large measure of protection. Hire-purchase provides a lucrative field of employment, there being about 70 per cent of our manufactured goods sold through these channels, including some in other States, and I think we should be careful not to upset the present position. In a year such as we are facing at present, the unemployment which would result with the collapse of hire-purchase would be a calamity.

Mr. QUIRKE—Although I have all the sympathy in the world with the idea behind the amendment, I cannot support it. What is envisaged in the amendment is the desirable end, and it must come over a period of years. The economic structure in the State today is such that millions of pounds are invested by people who on application legitimately invested money at eight and nine per cent in these hire-purchase funds. I have said in the past that these rates are too high and entirely unnecessary, because the Commonwealth Bank has shown what can be done. It is the invested funds that would be endangered by this amendment. Any collapse taking place through hire-purchase companies being forced to abide by this amendment and not being able to recover the amount of money plus the costs that would accrue through the lower charge would endanger the investors who are being paid up to nine per cent on their money.

Mr. Clark—You mean you would give them a warning?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, so that this expensive invested money could be repaid at the expiration of the various terms. It is because of these implications that I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. LAUCKE—I oppose the amendment, because if five per cent flat were to be the maximum which could be charged by a hire-purchase organization it would mean that the return to the company of, say, 9.8 per cent would be just 1.8 per cent higher than the price of the money to the hire-purchase company in the first place. This would tend to

dry up the flow of investment to hire-purchase companies, for they just could not pay the present interest rates on money which they use in their businesses, and that must have a detrimental effect on the hire-purchase method of finance. The two sources from which borrowed capital comes are the banks and the individual loans to the hire-purchase companies. The total advances of all the banks of Australia to free enterprise business amount to £840,000,000, and only £10,000,000 is advanced by way of overdraft to hire-purchase companies. That means that £12 of every £1,000 loaned by the banks is the amount that goes to hire-purchase companies to finance their operations, which leaves a huge amount of money to be found by investment from insurance companies, but more particularly from individuals who are attracted to this investment by the interest rate offered.

An amount of £366,800,000 is owing to hire-purchase organizations, which indicates the extent to which the public money is tied up. It indicates also the very important part hire-purchase is playing in financing various industry and activity throughout the whole gamut of living. Anything that tends to dry up the flow of capital to this system of finance would be detrimental to our whole economy. If we had fixed rates, and better returns on investment were available in other States, our position would be adversely affected. Hire-purchase is a necessary part of modern trade and manufacture and as this amendment constitutes a real danger to the system I must oppose it.

Mr. LAWN—I support the amendment. Mr. Laucke said that if this amendment were carried hire-purchase companies could not pay their present interest rates. They pay about 8½ per cent, but I do not represent the people who secure those returns: I represent poor people. If there are any usurers in my district they certainly would not vote for me at election time. When the Government has to go to the loan market for money it has to compete with hire-purchase firms, yet this Government defends the right of hire-purchase companies to have unrestricted opportunities of borrowing money at whatever interest rates they care to pay and to impose whatever interest rates they care to charge. A worker hasn't that right. He cannot go to his employer and say, "I want a pound a week rise or else," because that constitutes a strike and he is liable to be punished. The Scriptures condemn usury. The Jews, who were anti-Christian, practised usury, but Christians condemn it. I have always believed that Mr. Laucke is a Christian, and if he is he should not defend usury.

Mr. King—What about the hire-purchase company operated by the trade unions?

Mr. LAWN—It charges 5 per cent and makes a handsome profit. It is useless for members opposite to say that hire-purchase companies could not operate with a fixed interest rate of 5 per cent. Mr. Laucke said that this amendment would be detrimental to the whole of our economy, but in New South Wales interest rates are prescribed, and have been for years, and it has not been detrimental to hire-purchase operations there. Mr. Hall, earlier today, interjected that this provision would have to be Australia-wide. When we attempted to provide for a fixed interest rate about three years ago the Premier said that it could not be done by one State alone, otherwise hire-purchase companies would not invest in that State. The situation in New South Wales clearly indicates that that is not so. New South Wales prescribes varying interest rates from 7 per cent upwards, and that provision has not proved detrimental.

Mr. Shannon said that this Bill provided a large measure of protection for the poor man. He admits that he is the director of an insurance company and is engaged in big business. He wants to use his influence in this House to obtain a large measure of protection for financial interests, not for the poor man. A few years ago I went to a hire-purchase company to borrow money to purchase a motor car. The loan was for a three-year period and the company made me take out insurance with its own company and I was charged interest on my insurance payments for the three years. There were 36 payments and I was obliged to pay 19 per cent simple interest.

Mr. Dunstan—Under this Bill a person cannot be compelled to insure with any stipulated company.

Mr. LAWN—I know that a hirer will be able to choose his insurance company, but that was not the practice in the past. We must control interest charges, just as we seek to control hire-purchase. I would have little had I not been able to use hire-purchase, and the fact that the trade union movement is operating a hire-purchase scheme proves conclusively that the Opposition does not oppose hire-purchase in principle but opposes poor people being fleeced by financial interests. By opposing fixed interest rates members opposite give unrestricted freedom to companies to

charge what they like and also to borrow from the investing public to the detriment of Government loans. The amendment will not kill hire-purchase because a similar provision operates satisfactorily elsewhere.

The Committee divided on new clause 49—

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, O'Halloran (teller), Ralston, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Mr. Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tapping and Riches. Noes—Messrs. Laucke and Coumbe.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

First, second, third and fourth schedules and title passed.

Clause 1—"Short title, commencement, repeal and division into Parts"—reconsidered.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I move:—

In sub-clause (4) after "Part VI.—Miscellaneous" to insert the words "Part VII.—Minimum deposits."

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

In Committee.

(Continued from December 1. Page 1972.)

Clause 13—"By-laws."

Mrs. STEELE—When progress was reported previously I was discussing the desirability of having a uniform standard in connection with child-minding centres. Can the Minister in charge of the Bill say whether a model by-law could be promulgated to deal with this matter of child-minding centres, because the consensus of opinion is that a uniform standard is desirable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works)—This is a Bill dealing with local government matters, and gives councils and corporations the jurisdiction of evolving and licensing child-minding centres. If we changed this proposal to control by another agency it would take the matter out of the purview of local government legislation. If we want the control to operate through this legislation we must adhere to the Bill. I do not think a model by-law could cover a uniform standard in connection with the licensing and types of premises as suggested by the honourable member. If the Bill is passed as framed and there is difficulty in its implementation, Parliament could look at the matter again, but at this stage I think it would be better to adhere to the Bill as framed.

Mr. SHANNON—There is some merit in the honourable member's proposal, because it would give local government bodies power to license, regulate and supervise child-minding centres run at a profit. Such an institution should be conducted properly. I point out to Mrs. Steele that what might be appropriate in Adelaide might not be appropriate in one of the larger towns, say, on Eyre Peninsula, where a small institution properly conducted under the supervision of the local council need not have the same type of equipment as would be expected at an institution handling a larger number of children.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It would be impossible to apply a uniform standard.

Mr. SHANNON—If we set the standard too high we would not get a service. Obviously only those who could be trusted would be licensed. If we make a standard we must make one appropriate to Port Pirie, Mount Gambier or Whyalla and other large centres with numbers of people.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It is a matter, not of standards, but of uniform standards.

Mr. SHANNON—There must be some variation. Surely the local government authority is best able to decide which building is most suitable. Although it is desirable to have a high standard, if we make it too high we may deny some people this service. These centres should not be money-making establishments but should provide a service to the people, and the clause will enable councils to see that the thing is done properly. The centres in some country towns may be the best obtainable, and this clause will give councils the right to accept them. I favour the clause as it stands.

Mr. KING—This clause is in addition to section 667, which gives councils the right to make by-laws for a number of purposes. It has been suggested that a model by-law would enable councils to set out a standard. A council is entitled to adopt a model by-law or to alter it. It appears that the Government, if it found necessary, could set out a minimum set of standards. A council has power to adopt the portion of a by-law it feels is desirable, and to discard undesirable parts. I favour

removing some anomalies that have crept into this matter because people give the minimum standards.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Burnside said that some control was necessary. In hospitals so many cubic feet must be provided to each patient and that should apply to these centres. There may be 20 children in a small room and, although it may be clean, it will not be in the best interests of the children concerned. I think it should be illegal for anyone anywhere in the State to have child-minding centres that do not measure up to a certain standard.

Mrs. STEELE—I am grateful to the members for Chaffey and Light for their support. Every State is meeting this problem, as many of these centres are below the desired standard. Local government authorities would appreciate some direction, and that is why I suggested a model by-law. The Australian Pre-School Association, the Federal organization set up by the Kindergarten Unions in the various States, has drawn up a set of standards for grounds, equipment, personnel and programmes. One of the most important things is that the rooms should be big enough for the number enrolled. No standard is now set for the space to be allotted. People who conduct these centres should be qualified because, after all, parents pay a fee and have the right to expect that their children will be looked after, that the conditions will be hygienic, and that the children will have rest periods, particularly as these centres cater for children from one to five years. There should be a trained nurse or someone trained in mothercraft to care for young children. Sometimes children are left from 7.45 a.m. until 6 p.m., which necessitates proper equipment, for which the association lays down a standard. We should set out some of the standards in a model by-law, which would be appreciated by local government authorities. People operating these centres in my municipality would appreciate some direction on standards. I know that the Kindergarten Union would be glad to supply the Minister with details of what it considers to be minimum requirements.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot see any objection to assisting local government bodies in the way the honourable member suggests, provided that we first give them power to legislate. We are really talking about something subsequent to this clause, so we should pass the clause and then we could perhaps draft a model by-law for councils to adopt if they desire to do so. Its adoption would not be obligatory on councils, which could amend it if they desire. It would only enable them to lay down standards that would apply to any premises they desired to license. I suggest that the Committee accept the clause on the understanding that an attempt will be made to prepare a model by-law which the councils will be able to use if they wish.

Mrs. STEELE—I thank the Minister for his assurance that this matter will be looked into. The organizations that have been pressing for some time in this matter have expressed some disappointment that this was not the subject of a special Bill, although I know arguments have been put forward against that. I believe a model by-law would be the next best thing, and if that eventuates we may have a period in which we can observe whether these child-minding centres throughout the State improve. If they do not, perhaps consideration could be given later to bringing in a separate Bill to deal with the situation, for I feel that is the ideal solution.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Powers respecting part of west park land."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) has given notice of an amendment, but unfortunately he is not able to be here this evening and I therefore ask leave to move the amendment for him.

Leave granted.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I move—

In proposed new section 855a, to delete subsections (1) to (4) inclusive.

If I am successful in this amendment I will move the other portions of the member for Whyalla's amendment, which relate to machinery clauses to be inserted in the event of the present amendment being carried. I move this amendment on behalf of the Opposition, which does not believe in the further alienation or leasing of park lands which would deprive the public of free access at all times. The Opposition feels that too much of the people's playground is being fenced in. The clause provides that the City Council shall have power to lease for a term of up to 25 years an area extending up to 65 acres. The member for Torrens referred to a proposed oval and said that 9¼ acres would be required, but there is no mention of that in the Bill.

Mr. Coumbe—I think I said that that is a long-range plan, to be implemented after this plan has been completed.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I see. We shall be giving the council the right to lease 65 acres, to be followed by a further 9¼ acres, and then we shall have a plan for a further area, until eventually what are known as the people's park lands will cease to exist. I do not object to the City Council's proposals to develop this area, but I think the proposal can be accomplished without a long-term lease. Within certain limits, the City Council is representative of the people of the city of Adelaide, who derive great benefit from the existence of the park lands which help to bring trade and commerce to the metropolitan area. It seems to me that sport is becoming more and more commercialized. When we give a body the right to lease park lands and to erect fences and certain structures, we give it the right to make a profit out of the people who come and view that sport. I am on the side of the younger and poorer people. I believe we want more players in this country and fewer viewers, and the way to get players is to give the young folk the opportunity to play in and around our city. Such opportunities exist in the park lands, but the more we enclose those park lands the more we restrict those opportunities.

I can visualize the time when the council will erect those amenities that are essential. I believe the National Fitness Council or some other body interested in physical exercises should be granted assistance in this regard. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) knows the area in question very well, and I think he made out an excellent case in opposition to this clause.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I agree with members opposite in their desire to preserve for the community, as far as possible, the free use and enjoyment of the open spaces surrounding Adelaide. Probably the difference between us is on how that can best be achieved. It is one thing to retain the wide open spaces—the green belt, as it is sometimes called—for the use of all the people. As a school boy, nearly 40 years ago, I played on the park lands around Adelaide in church clubs and other teams and I know the conditions that existed then and still exist today. There is nothing more pathetic than the spectacle that we see in our park lands of youngsters, full of enthusiasm, dragging out a piece of coconut matting to put on a broken up cricket pitch and bowling from a hole at the end of the wicket. It takes the most enthusiastic and imaginative cricketer to play cricket under those conditions.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the Committee should retain the proposals contained in the clause. Past events amply justify the attitude the Government has adopted in this matter. For many years the park lands have remained undeveloped and the circumstances that existed 30 years ago and more have continued and, despite opportunities for development and utilization by sporting bodies, the major developmental work has been undertaken by the City Council. The present efforts and the proposed intentions of the council should be commended, because it proposes to take practical steps to do something worth while for the benefit of the public in developing the areas around the city.

The member for West Torrens set out his views and those of his Party concerning the utilization of our park lands, but he made one error upon which this matter really rests. He said that the park lands were not the exclusive property of the people who resided in and around the metropolitan area, but that they were part of the heritage handed down by the founder of the city of Adelaide for the benefit of the youth and not so young. That applies not only to those living close by, but to people from suburban and country areas. I have in mind activities such as the Country Carnival Committee, which brings to Adelaide annually 30 or 40 teams of cricketers who play a series of matches. Those cricketers have found it extremely difficult to obtain the number of ovals necessary for the requirements of that carnival, and it has been necessary in recent years to arbitrarily curtail the number of teams that participate.

Mr. Fred Walsh—They play on grounds behind the Adelaide Oval.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I agree. When I was a member of a carnival team I played on almost every oval in the metropolitan area, including the Adelaide Oval and Adelaide Oval No. 2, but notwithstanding the co-operation of every oval authority in Adelaide—and I pay a tribute to them—there are not enough ovals. Grounds should be available to such organizations, but the member for West Torrens said that, although such grounds are, and should be, available to all and sundry, the responsibility for developing them without the opportunity to obtain adequate compensation or reward should be undertaken by the city ratepayers. It is somewhat incongruous to expect a small section of the community to provide for the needs of the whole without having the ability to extract a reasonable rental and return for the outlay of rates involved. In

this legislation the City Council has the right to lease to approved sporting bodies for a specified term certain portions of a prescribed area of the parklands so that they can be developed to the standard necessary for sporting activities.

Mr. Bywaters spoke somewhat nostalgically about the park lands being filled with the colourful uniforms of basketball players on Saturday afternoons, but if the present facilities meet the needs of the community why all the fuss and furore we have heard in recent years about the development of further ovals? The park lands should be adequately improved not only with more ovals on which to play, but with the provision of proper facilities. I can remember, as a boy, in the football season having to remove certain impedimenta left by grazing animals before we could play a game of football. We need something better than that.

How many sporting bodies would be prepared to erect even the minimum requirements without an assurance of securing some proper return? The minima of requirements are not just pitches and ovals on which to play, but dressing sheds, showers and places in which to store materials as well as provision for elderly folk to watch the activities of the younger generation in comparative comfort. I think much good will result from this clause. Other amendments have been foreshadowed and if honourable members desire to tighten up the conditions upon which leases may be granted, or to provide safeguards, the amendment proposed by the member for West Torrens would be acceptable. However, I ask the Committee to accept the clause to enable the proper and worth while development by the City Council of our park lands.

Mr. LAWN—I support the amendment. As a boy, for many years I played in the park lands, but I believe that the park lands are being alienated to such an extent that in time our youth will have no portion on which to play. I intend to quote from the Acts of Council, 1845-1849, when the Parliament of that day first vested control of the park lands in the Municipal Council of Adelaide. Section 79 of one Ordinance states:—

And be it enacted, that the reserves of Crown lands, known as the park lands, and all other reserves for public purposes in the city (with the exceptions specified in the schedule hereto annexed, marked J) shall be under the care, control, and management of the City Council, so far as is necessary for the purposes of this Ordinance: Provided nevertheless, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to vest in the said corporation, the property of the park lands, or of the public roads, bridges, streets, squares, open spaces, and thoroughfares within the municipal boundaries, which are hereby declared to be and remain vested in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and to be reserved for the public purposes to which the same have been respectively dedicated and set apart, as specified in the third section of an Act of the Imperial Parliament, passed in the session of the fifth and sixth year of Her Majesty's reign, cap. 36, intituled, "An Act for regulating the Sale of Waste Land belonging to the Crown in the Australian Colonies," subject always to the powers for the care and management thereof, hereby conferred on the said corporation: Provided also, that it shall not be lawful for the City Council to sell, alienate, or lease the said reserves or in any way or manner to use them, or suffer them to be used, contrary to the purposes for which they have been so set apart: Provided nevertheless, that nothing herein contained, shall be construed to prevent the City Council from deriving a fee on licences to depasture a limited number of cattle on the park lands.

There is no doubt that over 100 years ago when Parliament first vested control of the park lands in the council it inserted a proviso that under no circumstances should the council sell, lease, or alienate any of those park lands. I am indebted to Mr. J. S. Rees, who was a councillor in the Adelaide City Council from 1915 to 1938, for the book he compiled entitled *A Brief History of the Adelaide Park Lands.* Originally there were 2,300 acres of park lands, but when Mr. Rees wrote his book a few years ago only 1,600 acres were left. In the book Mr. Rees stated:—

The first impression is one of dismay that apparently approximately 700 acres have been applied to uses other than those dedicated by Colonel Light but the use to which the bulk of the alienated acres have been put, and which has already been dealt with, will probably have helped to allay the fears of citizens and create a better understanding of the actual facts today. Summed up, the position is—380 acres were retained more than 100 years ago for such purposes as required by the Government. One hundred and forty acres have been leased by the Adelaide City Council.

The leases relate to the Adelaide Oval, about 15 acres; South Australian Lawn Tennis Association, adjoining the oval, about 6 acres; University Oval, Teachers' Training College sports ground, and Railway Institute sports ground, each about 10 acres; Victoria Park Race Course, about 58 acres; Adelaide High School sports ground, approximately 26¼ acres; and the Koala Bear Farm and several bowling clubs, approximately 3 acres. I would have thought that the bowling greens took more than three acres. Colonel Light laid out the City of Adelaide and land was reserved for

the Government House reserve, the Barrack reserve between North Terrace and the river to the east of Government House, now occupied by the police barracks; guard house reserve, a small block abutting on North Terrace between Government House and the Barrack reserve; a hospital reserve; a cemetery reserve; a market place reserve; a botanic gardens reserve, and a stores reserve. Although 2,300 acres were invested in the City Council, Mr. Rees said that 700 acres had been taken from the people, and now the Bill provides for a further 65 acres to be taken. This is not the first occasion that we have had a Bill to amend the original Act, and bit by bit the park lands are being taken from the people. In 1877 there was a press controversy as to whether the Government should take over from the City Council some of the park lands. Mr. G. S. Kingston, the then member for Stanley and one time Speaker of this House, and also second in charge to Colonel Light when the survey was made, wrote to the *Advertiser* on November 12, 1877, about land being resumed for building purposes and for roads. He did not oppose some land being used for roads, but said:—

I deny the right of the Government to interfere with or make use of any portion of the park lands not specially reserved or set apart for Government purposes by Colonel Light and so described on his original plan of the city.

I believe that the park lands should be used by the people. Mr. Kingston made it clear in his letter to the press that there was no doubt in Colonel Light's mind that the park lands should be used by the people. The Adelaide Oval is fenced and is not available to the public except on special occasions and under certain conditions. Sometimes it is not possible to get in without a reserved ticket. At the racecourse an admission charge must be paid and it is not possible to get into the bowling greens without paying the necessary fees and being admitted to club membership. It will not be long before the young boys will say, "Our grandfathers used to play football, cricket and other sport in the park lands but bit by bit the control has been handed over to other interests and we, the grandchildren, will not be able to use the park lands as Colonel Light intended they should be used." I congratulate the council on its belated move to beautify the park lands. I have no objection to an oval being placed in the park lands for use by various sporting bodies, but it should be controlled by the council. It should not be fenced and not leased, especially for a term of 25 years. Under the circumstances I cannot support the clause in its present form, and endorse the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I hope sufficient members will decide to keep the park lands for the people and to carry out what was said in 1849.

Mr. COUMBE—I oppose the amendment on two grounds. I support progress and development in the park lands and their use by the general public. If we accept the amendment we will prevent the council from entering into long-term leases of 25 years, and take away the right of Parliament to say what should be the term of a lease. There is provision for long-term and short-term leases, but if the amendment is accepted there will be no long-term leases. The City Council could hardly be expected to spend, say, £20,000 and allow the land to be used from season to season. The amendment will cut out the provision which says that before any lease can be made the matter must be referred to Parliament. Many times I have heard Opposition members say that they want the right always for local government by-laws to come before Parliament for acceptance or rejection. They want the Legislature to be the supreme body. The amendment seeks to abolish that. I oppose the suggestion that this provision should be wiped out. All the amendment seeks is that the City Council shall set up a committee to run the scheme. This Parliament will not have the slightest say in how it shall be run. Clause 6 provides for a period not exceeding six months and the conditions of that clause would, under the amendment, be set by the council. The City Council has its own Parks and Gardens Committee, which leases these things, and I commend it.

Mr. Lawn—Are you saying that it does not lease the cricket pitches and the football grounds for six months?

Mr. COUMBE—I said that, in a major approach such as this, it would not. The honourable member said that this proposal would alienate the park lands, but I know of tennis clubs that have a lease from year to year and they have a closed membership. I cannot see any difference between that and the provision now before us. They have a membership fee from which they have to pay the City Council. One purpose of this amendment is to take away from this House the privilege and, I think, the necessity, of approving any lease. The Bill provides for a lease to be approved by this Parliament in the same

way as the original Adelaide Oval Act and Adelaide Race Course Act; the wording of this Bill is taken from those Acts. It has been said that if the Adelaide Oval were not there the area it occupies would be available to the people to use, but perhaps 20 or 30 people would use it, yet, when there is a test match or football grand final, 45,000 people are there in one day. How silly can you get! When the Davis Cup was here many people had to be turned away. These proposals will provide for a greater number of people to use the park lands than would use them under existing conditions. The people who want these facilities are mostly not ratepayers, and I do not see why ratepayers of the City of Adelaide should be expected to foot the Bill without some chance of recompense. Under this scheme the admission charges to the enclosures will be made legal and the capital expended will be recouped and used to establish new park lands. Mention was made of 9¼ acres. This was a reference to the area now being developed behind the Adelaide boys high school and the P.M.G.'s department, which is part of the 65 acres under this proposal.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The area behind the school is being developed by the Education Department.

Mr. COUMBE—No, it is south of the high school and behind the P.M.G. sheds. This area is now being developed, and will cost about £20,000. Pipes are being laid from the River Torrens, in the initial stages of a project that will cost £80,000. This is, perhaps, to establish facilities of Olympic standards for track work. Last year we had no facilities to attract the Empire games to this State, so we should support the City Council in this matter. It has been said that we should preserve the park lands in their natural state but, if that is the sign of progress, I am amazed! Most of us have played sport on the park lands and I would welcome any steps to improve them. This amendment stands in the way of progress of the park lands as it stifles development, it does not give any tenure in long term leases that would be expected by any major body, and it takes away from this Parliament the opportunity to accept or reject a lease. I trust that it will be rejected.

Mr. SHANNON—The chief executive officer of the Adelaide City Council (Mr. W. C. D. Veale) was sent overseas recently and came back full of enthusiasm for what he saw overseas. He encouraged the City Council to accept some forward thinking. We should be thankful that we have a man with the gifts and ability of Mr. Veale to plan on a long term scale so that we will ultimately have our park lands as they were intended to be. Nobody has criticized what is proposed in the south park lands or in the east park lands, or what has been done near the Zoo. We have had to wait for a long time for these things. The very principle is challenged in this amendment, and I do not want to be a part of it. We will not have to find the money for this. Adelaide could be a real garden city, as we want it to be, but, if we proscribe the city fathers, we will not get very far. I cannot see any harm in allowing a lease for the development of the park lands. I have been informed that Mr. Veale prepared a statement for future development, taking into account our park lands and squares, and we should encourage this. I hope the committee will not delete these provisions. I do not think they will be abused, and I am certain that the time will soon come when we will say it was a good thing to help these things.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Torrens clouded the issue and misrepresented members on this side of the House, whom he charged with insincerity. He said we were opposing the lease, but he should know that our cricket grounds, football grounds, and tennis courts are leased to various clubs for a season, for which they pay a fee. Provided they do nothing wrong that option is renewed the following year.

Mr. Coumbe—In many cases they put up their own clubhouses, too.

Mr. LAWN—If that cricket pitch or tennis court was not let to some particular club, what would happen on a Saturday? Various cricket teams would be fighting to get there to grab a pitch. On Saturday afternoons it is orderly because the various clubs are licensed, and the sport goes on, but sometimes on Saturday mornings the kiddies get out there and fight as to who gets the pitch. All the amendment seeks is to provide for a continuance of the present policy. I remind members that those sports grounds are not fenced off, and when they are not being used people can walk across them and play any sort of sport they like. I have complimented the council on its beautification plan, but I do not have to agree to this clause to give the council encouragement to continue with the beautification of the park lands. I have no objection to the Adelaide City Council beautifying this particular 65 acres and putting down proper sports

grounds and an oval, but I want the City Council to control it.

The Committee divided on Mr. O'Halloran's amendment—

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, O'Halloran (teller), Ralston, Ryan, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, and Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tapping, Riches, and Loveday. Noes—Messrs. Laucke, Coumbe, and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I move—

In subclause (4) after "executed" to strike out "either—(*a*) be approved by the Governor; or (*b*);" and after "Parliament and" to strike out "if so laid."

The subclause would then read:—

Every lease proposed to be granted pursuant to this section shall before being executed be laid before Parliament and shall not be executed if either House of Parliament by resolution disapproves of any term or condition thereof.

The Committee has expressed its views on the previous amendment, and I accept them. Members on this side of the House, along, no doubt, with other members, welcome the development that is contemplated in the beautification of the park lands. We are all in accord with it, but we are at variance according to how we might regard the question of the leases and permits to be granted. The Opposition is concerned that it is possible to lease out portion of the park lands to different bodies, and this provision, if it is allowed to remain in the Bill, can be accepted as a precedent for the future. It is contended that it is possible to lease the area in question, and if that is accepted by this Parliament it could easily be accepted as a precedent for any other portion of the park lands. It would then be in the Act, and it could subsequently be applied by a differently constituted council and a differently constituted Government. I still fear the possibility of the provision as it stands being extended to the Victoria Park racecourse. We must concern ourselves with the future. The City Council is the responsible body to determine these issues, but it is only the care, control, and administration of the park lands that is vested in the council, not the ownership. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) referred to Colonel Light and those associated with the surveying of the city, but I have discovered that none of Colonel Light's journals contain any reference to the park lands. A booklet on the subject issued by the Adelaide City Council states:—

There is in Colonel Light's Journal no reference to the park lands, which are so peculiar to this city. On a plan of the Adelaide plains, showing the Port and Town of Adelaide, drawn by him and dated February 7, 1837, he has written: "The dark green around the town I propose to the Resident Commissioner to be reserved as park grounds." Colonel Light's original plan of the City of Adelaide shows a line drawn around the city at some distance from its boundary roads, the land between the lines and the roads being intended for parks.

In 1838 the then Governor of South Australia (Lieutenant-Colonel Gawler) was authorized by the South Australian Colonization Commissioners to purchase the park lands without specifying any sum to be paid. About this time, it would seem, there was a project on foot by private individuals, to get possession of this land, and they, it is said, commenced a subscription to raise a fund to purchase them. Governor Gawler drew bills to the amount of £2,300 for the purpose. From available information, this sum, however, was never paid to the Land Fund (which was devoted to encouraging immigration), but was spent as ordinary revenue for general purposes, as there were pressing needs in that direction. In view of this, what practically amounted to a mock purchase of the park lands was arranged, the Colonial Secretary of the day lodging with the Colonial Treasurer a note promising to pay on demand the sum of £2,300 in purchase of the parks and 32 acres of park lands on the western side of the city, intended for a public cemetery. The money, however, was never paid. In 1848 the question was referred to the Lieutenant-Governor as to whether, in view of the promissory note, the sum mentioned should not be paid out of general revenue to the Land Fund. The Colonial Secretary, replying on behalf of His Excellency, stated that the Lieutenant-Governor had directed him to state that the debt in question might be held to be cancelled, as it was merely a mode of effecting a reserve for public uses of certain lands which, by the existing law, might be reserved without any obligation upon the Government to purchase them. "They are and have been accordingly so reserved," concluded the letter, "and will so continue to be reserved, and therefore the transaction may be considered at an end." The power by which these lands were reserved was the Act passed by the British Parliament under which the Colonization Commissioners of South Australia worked. That clearly establishes how the park lands were obtained. Mr. Coumbe said that nothing much had been done by clubs and associations which used the park lands in developing them and that, in the main, it had been left to the council, but I point out that the Western

Districts Amateur Athletic Club, which has used the area we are now discussing for many years, has established a playing area, a Sheffield running track, and a circular track in addition to making provision for other field games. It has constructed a concrete-block clubhouse, although it is not yet completed inside. I believe that other clubs, to a lesser extent—and I do not refer to the Adelaide Harriers Club because I am not competent to discuss that—have made similar improvements.

Mr. Shannon suggested that it would not be fair to expect the ratepayers of the City of Adelaide to bear the cost of developing and maintaining the park lands as they are not the only people who use them. Although the ratepayers subscribe directly to the council's rates, the council receives considerable revenue as a result of people utilizing the departmental stores and other business institutions in the city. One can easily imagine the expenditure in the city by persons, other than ratepayers, who visited it for the recent pageant. The council has many means of increasing its revenue, and I do not intend to discuss at length parking meters, which are closely related to one-armed bandits.

Adelaide is less fortunate than most big cities in respect of park lands. London, with its big population, has an extensive area of park lands and gardens, and Epping Forest, which is on the fringe of London, must be retained in perpetuity in its present condition. Mr. Shannon referred to Mr. Veale's overseas visit that has apparently inspired the council's policy to develop and beautify our park lands. From examining the proposal for the south park lands I have concluded that he must have visited West Berlin which, in 1947, was virtually rubble but which, by 1954, had revealed amazing recovery, rubble-covered areas being covered with soil and planted with shrubs.

When Adelaide had the opportunity to secure the Empire Games, the Adelaide City Council was not prepared to go far enough in providing facilities, but Perth, without interfering with the park lands, made sufficient provision. Had it been necessary to set aside part of our park lands for a second oval, I believe Parliament would have granted permission to secure the Games and if a second oval had been established it would no doubt be leased now to some authority. In Sydney, Moore Park and Centennial Park have been developed to provide facilities for sporting activities, but the only charge applying there is upon the clubs using the grounds. Adelaide needs more recreation reserves. It is unfortunate that in the development of our suburbs the various councils have not been required to set aside areas for public reserves and recreational purposes. Section 450 of the principal Act states:—

All park lands and public squares within the limits of any area shall, for all the purposes of this Act, be under the care, control, and management of the council of the area.

That bears out my earlier statement about the councils having control. Section 457 (4) states:—

No such lease shall be granted until, at a meeting of the ratepayers, a resolution has been passed in favour of a lease being granted of the lands in question under the powers conferred by this section, and, if a poll is demanded, until the poll has resulted in favour of the resolution.

That would apply to any council except the City Council. If it is good enough for them to be controlled by that means, surely it is appropriate to accept the provisions I seek to insert in this Bill. After all, the principle was accepted the other night when the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment to the Hospitals Act Amendment Bill to provide that although the Director-General of Hospitals could make recommendations about fees Parliament would scrutinize and finally reject or accept the proposals. That, in effect, is all that I seek in my amendment. The council can make recommendations in respect of any lease and they will be referred to Parliament, which will then determine the matter, in the same way as it determines by-laws per medium of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Parliament will have the final say whether there is to be any further alienation of the park lands.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the amendments improve the clause and I am happy to accept them. The wording of the clause was taken from the Act under which the Adelaide Oval is leased, but the Government thinks that the control of such a lease should be vested in Parliament. There is no objection to the amendments, and if they are carried it will be necessary for drafting amendments to be made to the clause.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I move—

In subclause (4) before "Parliament" first occurring to insert "both Houses of" and after "resolution" to insert "within 14 sitting days of such House after such lease has been laid before it."

The Government believes that the reference to 14 sittings days is necessary. This is the

usual time allowed for the disallowance of by-laws, and as framed the clause contains no definite period.

Amendments carried: clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Aessembly's amendments.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 1887.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—While this Bill was considered in another place no criticism of it was offered. It deals with drainage and sanitation generally of premises in towns and townships in local government areas. Section 123 of the Local Government Act is restricted to houses, but this Bill deals with all buildings. There is no possibility of an injustice being done in connection with broad acres, because the Bill restricts the provision to buildings on land of five acres or less.

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

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

Page 1.—After clause 2, insert new clauses as follow:—

No. 1—2a. Amendment of principal Act, section 6 (2)—Exemptions from Act—section 6 (2) of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by striking out the words "of the whole" after the figures "1953" in line 3 of paragraph (*b*) and by inserting after the word "premises" in line 4 the words "or any part thereof;"

(*b*) by adding after paragraph (*d*) the following new paragraph:—

"(*d*1) with respect to any lease in writing of any dwellinghouse the term of which is for six months or more and which is entered into after the passing of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment Act, 1959;"

No. 2—2b. Amendment of principal Act, section 54 (2)—Provisions for recovery of possession of shared accommodation to be leased in the future—section 54 (2) of the principal Act is amended by striking out paragraph IV thereof.

No. 3—2c. Amendment of principal Act, section 55c—Recovery of possession of premises in certain cases—Section 55c of the principal Act is amended by adding the following subsection thereto:—

"(7) A notice to quit pursuant to this section may be given by or on behalf of a body corporate being the lessor of any dwellinghouse on the ground that possession of the said dwellinghouse is required for the purpose of facilitating the sale of the dwellinghouse and the provisions of this section shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to any such notice to quit given by a body corporate.

No. 4—Page 2, line 1, clause 3—After the figure "3" insert the figure (1).

No. 5—Page 2, line 5, clause 3—After "lessee" insert new subclause (2) as follows:—

(2) Section 55d of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (3) thereof and substituting the following new subsection:—

"(3) Where two or more attached dwellinghouses are the property of the same lessor, the period of three months referred to in paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1) of this section shall commence to run from the time when the last of the lessees concerned delivers up possession."

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The first amendment relates to clause 3. This clause amends section 6 of the principal Act in two respects. That section provides for exemption from the operation of the Act. In particular, subsection (2) of section 6 exempts from the Act five classes of leases, namely, leases of dwelling houses completed after 1953, leases of premises not let for residential purposes between 1939 and 1953, written leases for three years made after 1953, written leases for two years made after 1954, and written leases of shops for one year or more made after 1954. The first amendment relates to leases of premises not let for residential purposes between 1939 and 1953. At present the exemption applies only where the lease covers the whole of the premises, and the amendment is designed to make it possible for the exemption to apply to a lease of part of premises. The second amendment to section 6 (2) will exempt from the Act any written lease of a dwelling house for six months or more made after 1959. At present such leases are exempt from rent control but not from the restrictions on recovery of possession. The amendment extends the exemption to cover the right of recovery of possession. The Government does not oppose this amendment; it has had it examined by the authorities and, although it is a slight

departure from the Act, there are some things that the Government feels are in its favour.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I move the following amendment—

To omit paragraph (*b*).

I do not mind paragraph (*a*). The Premier has dealt with that amendment, which allows exemption from the Act of leases entered into after 1953 in respect of part of any premises that were not let between 1939 and 1953. I do not know that that is a great departure. There have been some people who have not been discommoded who thought their premises were not affected, but they have been caught by the technicalities of this clause. However, I do not think there is any objection to this. The other part of the proposal is that there is to be an exemption from rent control where a lease is entered into for six months and, under the present provisions, at the end of that time the landlord can give notice to quit, get his tenant out, and demand another lease. This means that instead of having what we have had in this Act, if a man were to be released both from landlord and recovery control he would have to be given some tenure. That will be cut out, as the period is now six months, and it is far too little. There is no effective security of tenure. What sort of security has he for six months? Where a landlord gets vacant possession these premises are effectively released from control, and there is no security for the person going into them. That is not a slight departure from the principles of the legislation, but a major departure from what the Committee has agreed. I hope the Committee will not agree to the alterations proposed in paragraph (*b*) of the first amendment.

The Committee divided on Mr. Dunstan's amendment to omit paragraph (*b*)—

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, O'Halloran, Quirke, Ralston, Ryan, Stott, Frank Walsh and Fred Walsh.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller) and Mr. Shannon.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tapping, Riches and Loveday. Noes—Messrs. Laucke and Coumbe and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Mr. Dunstan's amendment thus carried; amendment No. 1, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Clause 4 removes from section 54 (2) of the principal Act a certain paragraph. Section 54 (2) provides that a notice to quit cannot be given in respect of shared accommodation in a dwellinghouse except subject to five provisions, one of which is that the rent for the premises has been fixed. The amendment removes this provision. As the Act now stands two persons might be sharing accommodation under agreement, informal or otherwise, and the owner might find it necessary to ask the tenant to leave but could not give a notice to quit because the rent had not been fixed. The amendment makes it possible for him to do so.

Amendment No. 2 agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Section 55c of the principal Act empowers the lessor of a dwellinghouse to give notice to quit, among other things, to facilitate a sale. It has been held that a body corporate cannot take the benefit of this provision. The amendment will make it possible for companies to give notice to quit for the purpose of sale in the same way as natural persons.

Amendment No. 3 agreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Clause 6 amends section 55d of the principal Act which provides, among other things, that after notice to quit and delivery up of possession by a lessee, if the lessor fails to sell the property within three months, he must offer the premises to the same lessee and, if the lessee does not within 14 days accept the offer, the lessor can let the house to someone else but on the same conditions as those previously obtaining. However, where the same owner of two or more attached dwellinghouses desires vacant possession in order to effect a sale of both premises, he gives simultaneous notice to all tenants who do not necessarily leave at the same time. The period of three months therefore begins at different times so that the owner cannot sell the premises as a whole. To sell one house at a time places him at a serious disadvantage, since price would be affected, even if he could sell at all. The amendment provides that the three months runs from the date on which the last tenant vacates. I move that the amendment of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Amendment No. 4 agreed to.

Amendment No. 5 agreed to.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment of its amendment No. 1.

MOTOR VEHICLES BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:—

No. 1. Page 7, line 4 (clause 13)—After "fire-breaks" insert "or for the destruction of dangerous or noxious weeds or the destruction of vermin."

No. 2. Page 7, line 6 (clause 13)—After "fire-break" insert "or of destroying dangerous or noxious weeds or vermin."

No. 3. Page 21, line 15 (clause 46)—Before "trailer" insert "tractor or."

No. 4. Page 21, after line 19 (clause 46)—After subclause (3) insert new subclause (3a) as follows:—

"(3a) A tractor shall carry one number plate, which shall be on the front thereof."

No. 5. Page 41, line 31 (clause 100)—After the word "shall" insert "without affecting its rights or liabilities, if any, as an owner."

No. 6. Page 42, line 35 (clause 102)—After the figure "12" insert "or section 13."

No. 7. Page 43, line 4 (clause 102)—Leave out "section" and insert "sections" and after the figure "12" insert "or 13."

No. 8. Page 43, line 18 (clause 102)—Leave out "section" and insert "sections" and after the figure "12" insert "or 13."

No. 9. Page 49, line 24 (clause 115)—Before the word "possible" insert the word "reasonably."

No. 10. Page 51, after clause 117, insert new clause 117a as follows:—

117a. (1) Where an insured person has caused bodily injury by negligence in the use of a motor vehicle to the spouse of such insured person such spouse shall notwithstanding anything contained in section 101 of the Law of Property Act, 1936, or any rule of the common law relating to the unity of the spouses during marriage be entitled to obtain by action against the insurer such judgment for damages for such bodily injury as such spouse could have obtained against the insured person if he or she were not married to such insured person.

(2) Nothing in this section shall derogate from or limit any right which any such spouse would have had at common law or pursuant to section 101 of the Law of Property Act, 1936, if this section had not been enacted.

(3) Nothing in this section shall affect or limit the provisions of section 25 (*d*) of the Wrongs Act, 1936-1958.

(4) An insurer sued under this section shall be deemed to be a tort feasor for the purposes of Part III of the Wrongs Act, 1936-1959.

(5) Such action shall not be brought against the insurer unless the spouse has as soon as reasonably possible after the injury was caused or within such time as would prevent the possibility of prejudice to the insurer given to the insurer full particulars of the act omission or circumstances alleged to have caused the injury and to have given rise to the cause of action and the date and place on and at which such act omission or circumstances occurred.

No. 11. Page 55, line 5 (clause 125)—After the word "him" add the words "by any police officer."

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Altogether, 11 amendments have been made by the Legislative Council, but many of them are consequential and do not, in point of fact, make a very big departure in principle from the original provisions. Amendment No. 1 exempts from registration a tractor, bulldozer, and other specified plant constructed or adapted for the purpose of destroying dangerous or noxious weeds and vermin, where such tractor, bulldozer, etc., is used or driven on a road for such purpose.

Amendment No. 1 agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This amendment is consequential to amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 2 agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 3 *and* 4.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are to clause 46. These amendments have the effect of requiring a tractor to have one number plate on the front thereof. Prior to this amendment a tractor would have been required to have two number plates, one in front and the other on the rear of the vehicle. Amendment No. 4 is consequential upon amendment No. 3.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 agreed to.

Amendment No. 5.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This amendment is designed to preserve the rights and liabilities of the Crown and the M.T.T. as an owner in addition to its rights and liabilities as an insurer.

Amendment No. 5 agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, *and* 8.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—These amendments refer to clause 102. Clause 102 (1) requires every motor vehicle driven on a road to have a third party insurance policy in force in relation to that vehicle, but excludes from the application of that section tractors driven in pursuance of clause 12 (1) until a

proclamation is made declaring that the section shall apply to those tractors. This amendment seeks to extend that exclusion to tractors driven in pursuance of clause 13 as well. The amendment only means that these tractors are excluded until a proper amount is fixed for their registration.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8 agreed to.

Amendment No. 9.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This is a small amendment which does not take the clause much further. There may be a shade of difference between this amendment and the original proposal, but whatever it is it does not make any appreciable difference, to my mind, and I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment No. 9 agreed to.

Amendment No. 10.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Clause 117a is a new clause, and it is a clause that makes some fundamental departures from the present law.

Mr. Stott—I'll say it does.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is an amendment that has been requested on a number of occasions, but the Government did not include it in the Bill as originally introduced, not because it does not have sympathy with the amendment but because it is such a fundamental alteration that it probably should not be included in a Road Traffic Act at all but in the Wrongs Act, for if we are going to give the husband and wife the right to proceed against each other for damages in motor accidents it would be equally reasonable to give them the right to proceed against each other for damages of all other matters that may arise. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment which, although it has some difficulties in it, is one that has been requested quite frequently, and if it had not been included in this particular legislation I think Cabinet would possibly have included it next year in an amendment to the Wrongs Act. In fact, I am not quite sure that Cabinet next year will not submit to Parliament an amendment to the Wrongs Act and ask to exclude this matter from the Motor Vehicles Act.

Mr. O'Halloran—In the meantime, the persons sought to be covered will be covered by this Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes. Next year the Government may introduce an amendment which will include this matter in the Wrongs Act, in which case it will not then be necessary to have it in this Act. In the meantime, I ask the Committee to accept the amendment. The effect of this new clause is to give the spouse of an injured person who has caused injury to that spouse by negligence in the use of a motor vehicle the right to recover from the insurer by action. The clause further provides that an action shall not be brought against the insurer unless the spouse has, as soon as reasonably possible after an injury was caused or within such time as would prevent possibility of prejudice to the insurer, given to the insurer details of the nature of the claim. The reference to provisions of the Wrongs Act relates to recovery of contribution betwen co-tort feasors. One of the problems in the matter is that it is the type of thing that would lay itself open to a certain amount of collusion between the parties in the event of an accident. For instance, the husband, if he were the driver of a vehicle, could admit negligence for the purpose of getting some redress from the insurance company for his wife. The Legislative Council's amendment provides that notice must be given very promptly so that the insurance company can investigate the case to see that it is a *bona fide* one. I move that the amendment of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Mrs. STEELE—Not unnaturally, I am very pleased to see the inclusion of this amendment, because I feel that it does remove a glaring anomaly that has been evident for a very long time. As the Treasurer said, representations have been made over a considerable period to have this matter included in the Act, and this amendment from the Legislative Council does that. The Treasurer referred to collusion, but there is no more reason why there should be collusion in this case than there should be between father and son, mother and daughter, or between any two parties. I hope the Government will accept the amendment.

Mr. STOTT—I am rather surprised that in this Bill the Government would accept an amendment that interferes with a fundamental principle of law—that a wife should not give evidence against her husband.

Mr. Millhouse—That went out 60 years ago.

Mr. STOTT—Members of the legal profession may be smart enough to get a few quid out of these things, but this Bill is not the place for such an alteration of our law.

Amendment No. 10 agreed to.

Amendment No. 11.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This amendment is intended to clarify a possible drafting omission.

Amendment No. 11 agreed to.

[*Sitting suspended from* 10.36 *to* 11.30 *p.m.*]

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:—

Clause 6—Page 2, line 9—Strike out all words in this clause after "amended" and insert in lieu thereof the following passage:—

(i) by inserting after the word "shall" in line two the words "where the weight carried in excess of the weight allowed by this Act does not exceed twenty hundredweight"; and

(ii) by adding at the end of this section the following subsection (the previous part of section 91 being read as subsection (1)).

(2) Where the weight carried in excess of the weight allowed by this Act exceeds twenty hundredweight, the penalty in respect of the first twenty hundredweight shall be as provided in subsection (1) of this section, and not less than two pounds nor more than five pounds for each hundredweight exceeding twenty.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—What the Legislative Council has done is to bring this provision back in line with the original Act, section 91 of which states:—

If any person is guilty of an offence against section 86, 87, 88, or 89 he shall be liable to a penalty calculated at the rate of not less than five shillings and not more than two pounds for each hundredweight or part of a hundredweight carried in excess of the weight allowed by this Act.

The Legislative Council has taken it further than that and has increased the penalties, by providing that where the weight carried in excess of the weight allowed by the Act exceeds 20 hundredweight the penalty in respect of the first 20 hundredweight shall be as provided in subsection (1) and not less than £2 nor more than £5 for each hundredweight exceeding twenty. The Council has pointed out in another part of the Act there is power for a magistrate to delicense any person if he thinks any offence under the Road Traffic Act is sufficiently serious, but the Council has removed the provision we inserted and added instead additional penalties for gross overloading. I move that the amendment of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The Legislative Council has provided some additional penalties but has wiped out the provision relating to proving these offences, especially against interstate transport owners. In other words, we provide a few additional penalties that we are not able to enforce against interstate transport owners. All our careful consideration and lengthy debate has been completely wiped out by the Legislative Council which, so far as I can see, has not understood what we were trying to do.

Mr. Millhouse—If the Legislative Council could not understand it perhaps no-one else would be able to.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The court would be able to understand it, as would most other people. After a very lengthy debate here we agreed to the clause with amendments. If the Treasurer accepts the Legislative Council's amendment, it is clear that he is accepting something that is useless. What is the use of putting in penalties if offences cannot be proved? Some people would be wrongly penalized if we did not put in safeguards, and now we are going to cut them out. If this House is to be overridden by the gentlemen in another place, we have no intestinal fortitude left. I hope the Committee will not accept the Legislative Council's amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The matter was debated in another place, where the Government supported the view expressed in this place. Apparently Mr. Dunstan could not convince some of the members of his own Party there on this matter.

Mr. Dunstan—Apparently neither did the Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I was able to convince my colleagues, but apparently the honourable member could not convince his.

Mr. Dunstan—Let us have a conference and convince everybody.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We will probably have one next year, but I do not

suggest one tonight. We have already lost one Bill this session because we were not prepared to meet the position in a reasonable way. It was not a one-Party vote in another place on this amendment.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Legislative Council's amendment is much in line with the one I moved here, so there must still be a drop of intelligence in another place. The ego of members there is colossal—

The CHAIRMAN—Order!

Mr. HAMBOUR—Before the provision left this place I said I would oppose clause 6, and in consequence, to be consistent, I must accept the Legislative Council's amendment. The only difference between it and my amendment is the discretion allowed the magistrate.

The Committee divided on the question "That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to":—

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, Coumbe, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (14).—Messrs. Clark, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McKee, O'Halloran, Quirke, Ralston, Ryan, Stott, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Legislative Council's amendment thus agreed to.

WINE INDUSTRY INQUIRY.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I move—

That the prayer contained in the petitions No. 1 to No. 7—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member is out of order. He must first move that notices of motion be now resumed.

Mr. BYWATERS moved—

That notices of motion be now resumed.

The House divided on the motion:—

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

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

STUART ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I move—

That the Standing Orders and practice of the House be so far suspended as to enable me to ask a question without notice.

I seek a suspension of Standing Orders in this way because I was unable to ask a question in the normal course of events today, as the subject matter of the question was brought in after questions were disposed of. If members grant me permission, the question I intend to ask is:—

In view of the Premier's undertaking on September 2 that the Government would provide an opportunity for debate on the recommendations of the Stuart Royal Commission, will the Government take action to have Parliament meet to debate the report of the Commission as soon as possible?

The position was that there was a motion before this House on September 2 in relation to the proceedings before the Royal Commission and the reconstitution of it, and the Premier in reply to that motion—which was a motion of no-confidence in the Government—said:—

I suggest that the Royal Commission be allowed to complete its work and bring in its recommendations. They would be public recommendations; and then if the Leader of the Opposition or any other person had any comment to make on them I should be happy to hear them before further action was taken.

Clearly that means that this House is to have an opportunity of expressing its mind upon the subject of the recommendations, but the report of the Royal Commission was tabled in this House this afternoon after question time, indeed, in the midst of the debate, by courtesy of members. It has, of course, been impossible for an opportunity to be given to members to study the report or to have an opportunity to debate the contents of that report and the recommendations which it makes, during the course of this session of Parliament, since it is proposed that Parliament will adjourn upon the completion of the business before it on this occasion. In those circumstances it is surely proper that the very first opportunity be given to members, and I think it is desirable that members should know what the view of the Government is on this question of whether members are to have an opportunity of examining this report and giving in this House the views that they represent on behalf of the people who elect them here, both as to that report and its recommendations.

I think it is most undesirable that it should be some time in the middle of next year before the report is debated, and in these circumstances I respectfully ask members, in the very

extraordinary circumstances with which we are faced, in that this report has been laid on the table of the House in the dying hours of this session without any opportunity for examination or debate or for a question to be asked in the normal course of proceedings in relation to debate upon it, that that question should be asked, and the Government say that we may have some indication of what opportunity we are to have to exercise our rights as members in relation to it at the first opportunity.

Motion carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In view of the Premier's undertaking on September 2 that the Government would provide an opportunity for debate on the recommendations of the Stuart Royal Commission, will the Government take action to have Parliament meet to debate the report of the Commission as soon as possible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I did not state that I would provide a time for debate in the House. What I said was that I should be happy to hear any comment any honourable member desired to make on the matter. The answer to the first question is that the Government does not intend to call Parliament together to debate the Royal Commission's report. I have not had any more time to consider this report than the honourable member has. When I heard very late that the Commissioners were attempting to complete the report in time to present it to His Excellency this afternoon, I immediately consulted with my colleagues and arranged that copies be sent down to the House immediately, and the honourable member has seen the copies laid upon the table of the House. Up to that time I had no knowledge of the contents of the report and I have only briefly scanned them since, so I am not in a position yet to know its full implications.

Another good reason why this matter should not be debated at this stage is that I have been reliably informed that certain legal action is pending in connection with it, and in those circumstances I think every honourable member will realize that it would not be proper for Parliament to initiate a debate upon a topic of this description. Cabinet will consider the report at the earliest opportunity, and arrangements will be made for copies of the report to be available to members. I think the Chief Secretary moved in another place that the report be printed, but, if he has not done so, arrangements will be made for copies of the report to be prepared, and if any honourable member has any matter he wants to bring forward the House no doubt will meet—

Mr. Stott—Does the legal action involve public money?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It very easily could, but I am not going into that angle at present. I have been informed that there is a strong likelihood that certain legal action will be taken in connection with this matter. Under those circumstances, the answer to the honourable member's question is that the Government does not intend to call the House together to initiate a debate.

Mr. Lawn—Is the report available to the press? Was it brought in late this afternoon so that the *News* could not get it and the *Advertiser* would get it first?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not consulted my colleagues, but next year the procedure of the House may be altered somewhat by having two sessions of Parliament instead of one, and the implications of that procedure are now being examined. It is not intended to call Parliament together to consider this matter at present. When Cabinet has examined the report it will take any necessary proper action regarding it.

PROROGATION SPEECHES.

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until January 5.

I want at the outset to say, Mr. Speaker, that the House has the utmost confidence in your integrity and the rulings you give. I believe you have conducted the proceedings in a manner which is a credit to the Parliamentary system. We have learned over a period of years to appreciate your guidance and your impartiality, and on behalf of members of this side of the House I convey to you our goodwill and hope that you will have a very happy Christmas and a very profitable New Year.

I also express our goodwill to my colleague, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Dunnage). His is a very heavy task, for I believe this House spends much more time on Committee work than is usual in many Parliaments. I have listened, for instance, to the debates in Canberra, and quite frequently Bills are taken as a whole in Committee with no detailed consideration given to the clauses such as here, and there is certainly no prolonged debate as we have had upon the contentious clauses of the Road Traffic Bill this year.

I also thank the Clerks of the House for their assistance, which is greatly appreciated. Every member has come from some other field of activity, frequently with no previous experience of Parliamentary practice, and the ready assistance of the Clerks enables members to give effect to their ideas, and it is of great value to the smooth working of this institution. I convey our goodwill and appreciation to our new Parliamentary Draftsmen, who came to us as strangers, but who are now part of our Parliamentary family. We have learned to respect their knowledge and ability, and I convey to Dr. Wynes and his colleague my good wishes and hope that they are as happy in their association with this Parliament as Parliament is in its association with them.

I convey to my opponents opposite my goodwill, and thank them for their assistance throughout the session and for their goodwill on many other occasions. Whilst we are Parliamentary opponents, and have strongly opposite views on occasions, we appreciate each other's viewpoint, more so in this Parliament than in many other Parliaments of the Commonwealth. I realize how heavy has been the work of the Leader of the Opposition and to Mr. and Mrs. O'Halloran I express my goodwill and the hope that he will have many years of successful and active life in the political sphere of South Australia. I express my good wishes to all members opposite.

In this Parliament we have most efficient staffs, including the library, messenger and catering staffs, which all go out of their way to ensure that members have everything that can be provided for them, and I place on record our appreciation of their services, often rendered at extremely late hours and under difficult circumstances, but always cheerfully.

We have, of course, another authority always watching over us. I refer to the gentlemen of *Hansard*. The Leader of *Hansard* (Mr. Rex Underwood) is leaving us, but he leaves with the reputation of a most efficient and cultured gentleman and one who has undertaken all his work in the supervision of *Hansard* entirely to the satisfaction of all members. To him and his colleagues I extend our gratitude at this particular time. The Leader of the Opposition will forgive me if I thank my own colleagues in the Cabinet and the members of my own Party for their assistance and loyal support. I believe this Parliament is happier than any other in Australia. Before we meet again as a Parliament the Christmas and New Year season will be upon us, and I extend to all members the compliments of the season and hope that their health will remain good and that they will progress in their activities.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion and join with the Premier in expressing my admiration of the way you, Sir, have presided over the Sittings of this House during the current session. I also wish to thank the Chairman of Committees for the painstaking way in which he has handled the various Bills, some of them rather difficult and containing many clauses that were subject to many amendments. He has rendered satisfaction so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak for all members on this side of the House in that regard.

I congratulate our new acquisitions to Parliament—the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant. We had grown to know Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. Cartledge, and had confided in them our problems about amendments and the interpretation of legal problems, but they have left us. In Dr. Wynes and his assistant we have two new-found friends who are prepared at all times to help in every possible way.

Our friends on *Hansard*, of course, have my enduring gratitude. I can appreciate the long-suffering way in which they have translated my halting remarks into intelligible English so that even the ordinary person who reads *Hansard*—and I hope there are some persons, both ordinary and extraordinary, who read it—can understand them. I have received from the Clerks all the assistance that it is possible to receive, and thank them most sincerely. We have the catering staff, the messengers and all those associated with Parliament whose duty it is to serve the Parliament in various ways. It is a wonderful staff, of whom we might well be proud, and on behalf of the Opposition I thank them for their services during the current session.

I am grateful to the Premier for his personal remarks about myself and Mrs. O'Halloran, and I reciprocate so far as he and Lady Playford are concerned. We have been dour opponents and have contended on the field of political principles, but we have kept our contentions to political principles. I wish Sir Thomas and Lady Playford all they would wish for themselves. I was happy indeed to hear his wish for my continued success. I have been Leader of the Opposition for 10 years and at four State elections in that period I have striven for greater success.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I did not say "greater success."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—No, but continued success. I have had varying success at those four elections and I wonder whether I might not have greater success in the not far distant future. I agree with the Premier that South Australia has a democratic Parliament, where we are allowed to express our views freely. I do not say that we have democratic elections. As South Australians we have privileges which unfortunately have not been given to people in many parts of the world. I want to keep what we have, to treasure it, and to improve on it if possible, and in the future I shall strive to do just that. I cannot find sufficient words of praise for my colleagues on the Opposition benches to reward them for their loyal and consistent service, and for the way in which they have supported me. I join with the Premier in wishing all members a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with other members in making these valedictory remarks. Since you have been in the Chair we have witnessed in this Parliament rather extraordinary happenings, and you have had to use all your wisdom, and to apply much commonsense. in your decisions on a number of occasions, especially when most controversial matters have been before the Chair. You have carried out your duties with much credit to yourself and to this Parliament. I am sure that all members are proud to be associated with this Parliament, of which you, Sir, are the head. I congratulate you on your excellent service and on the impartial way in which you have dealt with matters this session. I know that you will continue to act in that way in the future. I wish you every success and happiness.

The Chairman of Committees, too, has at times had a difficult task to perform. In Committee debates some members take every opportunity to dot their I's and cross their T's as we go through the various clauses, but the Chairman has always been able to get the Bills through, and he has done a good job. The Clerks of the House have co-operated splendidly with members. I add my commendation of the work of the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant. Dr. Wynes came to this Parliament to take the place of a most outstanding man in Sir Edgar Bean, who was renowned throughout Australia. To try to emulate his work was a difficult, and sometimes embarrassing, task for Dr. Wynes. Undoubtedly he was nervous when he first came to this Parliament this session, but he carried out his duties with much credit to himself, and I feel certain that in future he will be a great assistance to members, especially when he understands more thoroughly the democratic privileges we enjoy.

The *Hansard* staff has done its work well. In debates all sorts of views are put forward by members, and the *Hansard* staff records them very well indeed. We have had two new messengers in the Chamber this session. It is not an easy task for a messenger to have to look up records, Acts of Parliament, and copies of *Hansard* for members when he is new, but the two new messengers deserve special mention for the way in which they have assisted us. The catering staff has done a magnificent job. It excelled itself when it provided those outstanding banquets at Parliament House, and splendid references were made to their work by overseas visitors when we had the pleasure and privilege of entertaining them on several occasions. The excellent work and splendid co-operation of the catering staff will be mentioned in the records of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and because of that it will become world-renowned.

I thank the Ministers for their co-operation with members. We do not always see eye to eye with what they do, but they have co-operated with us very well indeed. One outstanding feature of this session has been the way in which the new members have come through with flying colours. No doubt they were nervous at the beginning of the session, but they learned to express their views fearlessly and courageously. As I have said, we have witnessed this session some extraordinary happenings, but it is good for such things to happen in a democratic institution that is really the voice of the people. We have seen that expressed in this Parliament more than in any other Parliament in the Commonwealth. I wish all members a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and to those members who are absent through sickness I wish a speedy recovery to good health, and every happiness at Christmas time.

The SPEAKER—I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Ridley for their kind references to both the Chairman of Committees and me. If the conduct of proceedings in this House has given satisfaction to members I can only say that it has been due in the main to the wholehearted co-operation the Chair has received from all members. I want to say how much I appreciate that co-operation, and to also express the appreciation of the Chairman of Committees. To both of us members have extended every consideration. I think all members realize to

the full that over the years this Parliament has set a very high example, and in no small measure it has been due to the efforts of previous Speakers, who set a high standard in matters of decorum and dignity in the conduct of business. I am sure all members are cognizant of the need for this to be maintained in the future. I join with the Premier and other members in their commendatory remarks of the work of the Clerks at the Table. I personally am proud to know that we have such efficient officers and nobody realizes their value more than the Ministers and the Speaker. The outstanding work they have done in the interests of our Parliamentary institution has been to the benefit of members generally. I also associate myself with the remarks about the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant. We paid a tribute 12 months ago to Sir Edgar Bean, who then retired. I agree with the remarks about Dr. Wynes and Mr. Ludowici, who have demonstrated in the last 12 months that they are capable and efficient officers.

Reference has also been made to the *Hansard* staff, and I should like to place on record our appreciation of the efficient service rendered to Parliament by the former Director of the Government Reporting Staff and Leader of *Hansard,* Mr. Rex Underwood, who, as members know, retired this week. For many years he has been associated with this House. He joined the South Australian Public Service in 1920 after having served for some time with the Commonwealth Railways and the law firm in which the late Sir Josiah Symon, K.C., was a partner. After a short period in the Public Stores Department, he was appointed to the *Hansard* staff in 1923, became Assistant Leader in 1933 and, on the retirement of Mr. Berry Smith in 1950, became Leader. I think members will join with me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Underwood many happy years of retirement and health and prosperity in the future.

Next year Mr. Harry Tisher, our Head Messenger, will retire. No doubt tribute will be paid to him at the end of next year, but, as he will retire in six or seven months, I take this opportunity to express on behalf of those who have been associated with him our appreciation of the sterling services he has rendered and the many courtesies he has extended to us during the 22 years in which he has been associated with this House as Messenger and, in the last eighteen years, as Head Messenger. May I also express my appreciation to all the other messengers for their services and to the catering staff, which is so ably led by Miss Jean Bottomley. All officers to whom I have referred have in no small measure contributed, by their assiduous attention to and conscientious discharge of their duties, towards the smooth functioning of our Parliamentary institution.

May I finally express the hope that those members unable to be here tonight because of ill-health—I refer particularly to Mr. Tapping—will be restored speedily to health. I take this opportunity of wishing all members of this Chamber a blessed Christmas and a properous and happy new year.

Motion carried.

PROROGATION.

At 12.34 a.m. on Friday, December 4, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 5, 1960, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of the National Anthem.