HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 31, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

TOWN PLANNING REPORT.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Since the presentation of the Town Planning Committee's report, many people have become concerned about their future and the future of their houses because it appears that many of the projected freeways will go through areas now occupied by dwellings. Some people who own these houses are still repaying loans from various institutions (I have in mind the War Service Homes Division and banks, which do not regard second mortgages favourably). In order to prevent panic and the selling of these houses by people wishing to avoid an economic loss, will the Premier assure house owners that, where a property is acquired for the purpose of putting into effect the town planning report, the person who sells for that purpose will not be prejudiced in securing another loan, if necessary, to replace the house he has sold?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In answer to a previous question, I stated that no attempt would be made this session to deal with the Town Planning Committee's report because it is by its nature a far-reaching document. In any case, I think the recommendations will have to be examined closely, some being in broad rather than specific terms. In the first place, if a property was acquired under the plan, it could be acquired only if Parliament first approved the plan. Secondly, if it involved an acquisition, the payment for the property would be at least its full face value—possibly higher than its normal value—so I could not imagine anyone being out of pocket because of any proposals of the plan. However, the point raised by the honourable member will be examined to see whether it is necessary to take any action if and when the plan is approved by Parliament.

LOCK AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Last year an area school was promised for the Lock district, and children from two schools in nearby towns were encouraged to attend the Lock school. I understand the school was given higher primary status. At present 190 children attend the school—the enrolment having increased by 87 in the last four years. A house is available for purchase for use by a second married teacher. Ten scholars who are attending schools in the city at present would attend at Lock if it became an area school. Can the Minister of Education say what is being done about establishing the promised area school at Lock?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As the honourable member is well aware, Lock is situated in a somewhat isolated area on Eyre Peninsula where secondary education until recently has not been available. A request was made by the school committee in 1961 for the establishment of an area school. Although this could not be approved, it was decided to provide the necessary accommodation and staff to enable grade 8 and grade 9 classes to be commenced this year in English, history, geography, mathematics I, mathematics II and elementary science. The Murdinga and Tooligie Siding schools were closed and transport provided to bring the children in to Lock. The request for an area school has been renewed this year when there have been 154 primary and 21 secondary students on the roll, making a total of 175 scholars.

It is considered that these numbers do not justify the establishment of an area school at present. However, it is hoped that they will be increased in 1963 and the school committee has been advised to use all endeavours to build up the numbers and to submit a further case then. The department has been encouraging and will continue to encourage the growth and development of this school in the hope that sufficient numbers will be built up and maintained to enable an area school to be established in the not distant future.

INSTANT MILK.

Mr. BYWATERS: Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about instant milk and its processing in New South Wales. Since then this process has been widely publicized. Last week I questioned whether this process could be an advantage or disadvantage to the dairying industry. I thought it could be an advantage in supplying people in outback areas unable to get fresh milk now, and in supplying near Asian markets. Has the Minister any knowledge of this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received a report from the Chief Dairy Adviser as follows:

The "instantizing" process was developed in United States of America in the early 1950's, and has the special advantage of making milk powders more readily and completely dispersable in water. Flavour of reconstituted

''instant'' milk powder is better than that of ordinary milk powder. The ''instantizing'' process involves drying, partial re-hydration of the powder with steam and a final drying. The increased solubility is due to a change in structure of the lactose crystals in the milk powder. The process was first applied to skim milk, and served to increase consumption of skim milk in the ''instant'' powder form. The higher butterfat content of full cream milk powder was an obstacle to dispersability and application of the ''instantizing'' process.

More recent research developments, such as production of soluble powdered butterfat and cheese, have provided the vital clues to successful application of the ''instantizing'' process to normal milk, making possible the production of ''instant'' full cream milk powder. The process could enhance sales of milk in remote areas as well as Asian countries. By increasing the dispersability of powdered milk as well as improving flavour, it is likely that overall sales of milk could increase with benefit to the dairying industry as a whole and in this State.

AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago regarding a Mines Department survey of pollution of the atmosphere over Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Director of Mines that is not at all conclusive. It states that the present position on this investigation is that preliminary inspections have been carried out at Port Pirie to determine suitable locations for installing the necessary measuring equipment, which is being ordered. However, it must be emphasized that the investigation will need to be carried out over a considerable period to ensure consistent results. No reliable short-term answer can be expected.

SCHOOL OF ART.

Mr. COUMBE: Good progress is being made in the construction of the fine three-storey building for the new South Australian School of Art in Stanley Street, North Adelaide, in my district. Can the Minister of Education say what arrangements are being made to transfer the School of Art from its unsuitable location in the old Exhibition Building, which I understand is to be demolished to make way for university expansion? Can he also say when it is expected by his department that this school will be open for enrolment and operation?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I very much regret that I cannot give any definite date. Together with the officers of the department, I had hoped that the school would be completed and ready for opening at the beginning of the next school year, but there were some changes in the plans and designs of the school and it was considered in the best interests of all concerned that it should be of a different construction from that originally planned. As a result, I understand the school will not be ready until after the first term next year. However, I hope that it will be opened at the beginning of the second term. In the meantime, the students and the staff at the School of Art are carrying on under considerable difficulties, because it was an absolute necessity for the university to start on its building for the faculties of law, arts and economics, and the School of Art had to be transferred over to the premises previously occupied by the Motor Vehicles Department. I hope that all at the school will carry on with as good grace as they can, and that the students and staff will have this very fine school by the middle of next year.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Tea Tree Gully Primary School Committee has expressed its concern to me at the anomalous classification of the school, bearing in mind the number of children attending it. The school has again been classified as a class 4 school for 1963, despite the large increases in numbers enrolled since the school was first classified as class 4. To illustrate the increase in numbers enrolled at the school, I quote figures of the enrolments and average attendances as at various dates. In February, 1961, the total enrolment was 228 and the average attendance was 220; in December, 1961, the enrolment was 322 and the average attendance 294; in February, 1962, the enrolment was 379 and the average attendance 365; in July, 1962, the enrolment was 470 and the average attendance 407; and in October, 1962, the total enrolment was 507 and the average attendance 457. The average attendance for the four months from July to October, 1962, was 423, and the estimated enrolment for February, 1963, is 600. From the Education Department's official list of schools for 1962, Tea Tree Gully is shown to have had an average attendance of 253.8, but this does not really reflect the true position of a school in a rapidly expanding area. There is only one other class 4 primary school having a greater average attendance—Pooraka with 276.1. Nine class 3 schools have a lower average attendance than Tea Tree Gully on 1961 figures. Three class 2 schools have a lower average attendance than the Tea Tree Gully average for the four months from July to October, 1962. Bearing in mind the

increased administrative duties for the headmaster in an area such as this as a result of the many transfers, the enrolment of migrant children and related clerical duties associated with a school of these numbers, the splitting of classes due to increased enrolments which makes a break in the continuity of teaching, the lack of a "floating" teacher, and the already over-crowded classrooms, an added burden and restriction is placed on the teaching staff when other members of the staff are absent—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is beginning to debate the question.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am explaining the situation, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Education say what conditions must apply before the classification of a school can be raised, and whether the regulations will be amended so that the needs of old-established schools with exploding school-age populations can be fully met?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Following the very strong and vigorous representations made to me in person and by correspondence on this matter, I have just a few moments ago received a report dated today from the Director of Education, and I cannot do better in the first instance than read that report. The Director states:

The classification of the school. As I pointed out in my recent report on a similar question in regard to the Peterborough Primary School, the classification of a primary school does not affect the number of teachers on the staff at the school. The number of teachers appointed to a school depends on the actual enrolments from time to time. At the present time the enrolments of the Tea Tree Gully school are about 507 children and there is a staff of a head teacher and 11 assistants. In view of the special circumstances attaching to this school, care has been taken to ensure that these 11 assistants are specially well qualified. The Superintendent reports that the teaching competence of some of the teachers would be regarded as excellent and of the others as being very good. The classification of a primary school, as of other schools, is mainly a device for classifying the head of that school. In his report of October 30, 1962, herewith, the Superintendent draws attention to the fact that all our schools, including the Tea Tree Gully school, are classified in accordance with the regulations. It is also significant that in view of the size of the school we have, in fact, relieved the head teacher of the responsibility for taking a class so that he will be free to concentrate on the administration and running of the school.

Accommodation. At the present time this school has 11 classrooms for 507 children. The average per classroom is therefore 46. I regarded this as being unduly high and took steps to ask the Department of Public Buildings to erect three additional rooms. I was confident that these three additional rooms would provide adequately for the present enrolments as well as the enrolments at the beginning of next year. These are estimated at about 600 children. Fourteen classrooms for 600 would give an average of 43 children per room. Unfortunately the contractor for the essential earth works was delayed and it is only now that the Finsbury Works Division is able to proceed with the erection of these three timber rooms. There is no doubt, however, that they will be available before the beginning of term 1 next year. It is also relevant that the new school at Modbury is likely to be available by the beginning of next year.

That is the specific report dealing with the classification of and the accommodation at this school. Answering the honourable member on the more general question, I have received representations from individual members of Parliament, including the honourable member, from parent bodies, and also from the Teachers' Institute, asking me to review the reclassification of schools generally. We have in recent years been very generous in the classification of all our schools—infant, primary, area, high and technical high—and I have been criticized as it has been said that we have really gone too far, raised the status of too many schools, and that we have too many colonels and not enough privates. Whether or not that is fair criticism I do not know, but it is one that I hear from time to time.

Mr. Clark: It is the reverse of what used to obtain.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That is so. I have stated only this week that as soon as possible after the House prorogues I intend to have discussions with those interested parties and their representatives to review the question of reclassification (of primary schools in particular), without making any promise that a reclassification will be made soon. I intend to give the matter my personal and sympathetic consideration.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTIONS.

Mr. TAPPING: The following appeared in the October report of the Australian Road Safety Council, under the heading "Thousands of Defective Vehicles are a Menace to Road Safety":

Thousands of times each year Australian drivers who have been casual about the maintenance of their cars suddenly meet death or injury. At the critical moment inefficient equipment causes a road accident. Worn tyres fail to grip, brakes don't respond, lights, springs, steering breakdown . . . In New South Wales, where compulsory inspection is

on an annual basis—and more frequent for buses and taxis—a renewal of registration is denied unless a certificate of roadworthiness is produced.

Will the Premier consider the merits of the New South Wales regulations with a view to annual inspections of vehicles being made compulsory in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has repeatedly examined legislation on this matter, but an annual inspection achieves nothing as regards the safety of the vehicle concerned, because every honourable member who has a knowledge of motoring knows that brakes may be in good order today, yet defective a few days later. From the point of view of providing for the safety of a vehicle, the Government does not believe that such an inspection achieves very much. It may be necessary for vehicles once a year to be examined and straightened up a little, but we already have laws dealing with defective vehicles and I do not believe that the New South Wales legislation takes it much further. However, at the appropriate time I will let the honourable member have a report on the position.

PASTORAL BOARD REPORT.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question regarding a recent visit to the Far North by members of the Pastoral Board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a report from the board on this matter and I shall be pleased to make a copy of it available to the honourable member. It deals with the general question of what forms of assistance could be given. Probably the most important recommendation deals with taxation. The report points out that a property that may normally have an output of 1,000 beasts a year may be, owing to dry conditions, compelled to sell, say, 5,000, and as a consequence the returns from that property rise not by a relatively small sum but by a very great sum, and taxation has to be paid on that sum. The report suggested that where a property has to be "de-stocked" to meet dry conditions some allowance should be made in the income tax laws to enable re-stocking when the dry conditions cease. Rather than give a summary of the report which I received only yesterday and which I have had the opportunity to read only once, I will forward to the honourable member a copy so that he may make its contents available to his constituents, and if he has any comments to offer after he has read the report, I shall be pleased to hear them.

HOUSING TRUST ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently, the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Minister of Lands, said the Government had decided not to amend the Housing Trust Act to enable the trust to offer business sites in the Whyalla West extension. At present about 70 Housing Trust houses await occupation there: they are almost completed. The nearest shopping centre would be at least two miles away. There is no prospect of shops being built nearby for a long time. This is particularly bad from the point of view of European immigrants who come to these areas, and it is regarded as one of the prime reasons for the turn-over of migrant labour there. Will the Minister take up this matter preferably with a view to sending an officer to interview the Chairman of the Whyalla City Commission, to inspect the area, and to see what is involved and what can be done when the next business sites are offered by auction so that the smaller business people will have an opportunity to secure an individual site?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I consider that I recognize the problem fairly well, and I realize that every additional building the trust is asked to erect detracts from its house-building effort in some way. I do not think there is any prospect of getting a shop in an area where there are 70 unoccupied houses. I do not know who would want to run a shop in such circumstances. This matter has been considered closely and I cannot see any point in sending an officer to look around an area that he already knows fairly well. However, I shall be happy to have a discussion with the honourable member to ascertain whether he is in possession of some facts of which the Lands Department is not aware. If, as a result of the discussion, I find that the department is not aware of something the honourable member knows I shall certainly be agreeable to further action being taken, but I am not prepared to say that I will send an officer there unless further evidence is brought to light.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the Premier say whether standing charges made by the Electricity Trust for country single wire earth return installations are in every case by agreement between the land owner and the trust and therefore personal, or whether they can be attached to the land?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Acting General Manager of the Electricity Trust states that these charges apply over a

period of 10 years and are made by way of agreement between the land owner and the trust. They are not a charge on the land.

WOODWORK CLASSES.

Mr. RICHES: Yesterday, in reply to the member for Gawler, the Minister of Education said he would have discussions with the South Australian Institute of Teachers and that possibly he would be hearing from the institute about the discontinuance of woodwork teaching in primary schools. Has any decision been reached and has he altered the opinion he expressed yesterday?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I had a lengthy discussion with the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the immediate past president and president of the men's branch and the president of the women's branch. This discussion lasted about two hours, but we could not get around to several topics in which they were interested. They were intensely and vitally interested in the problem of Communism or alleged Communism in our schools and in the proposed matriculation alterations. The discussion finished at about 5.45, when we adjourned our discussion to a further date. What I said in reply to the member for Gawler was correct: I intend as soon as possible after the House prorogues to have a lengthy discussion with the institute on this matter and on other matters affecting our mutual interest. This will probably be within the next week or fortnight at the latest.

BOTTLED GAS.

Mr. HARDING: In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading of "Bottled Gas Costs Cut Announced", appeared the following report:

A reduction in costs for bottled gas users has been announced by the South Australian Gas Co. The reduction is in the rental charge for bottled gas cylinders, amounting to 25 per cent for a pair of 100 lb. cylinders and 20 per cent for 60 lb. cylinders. This is the third price reduction announced this year by the company in country gas rate structures. It was expected there would be a further appreciable reduction in bottled gas prices when the oil refinery at Hallett Cove began production and it was no longer necessary to transport bottled gas from the Melbourne refinery.

Bottled gas is becoming popular in the country and even in the suburbs of Adelaide. Will the Premier say whether in other States bottled gas is competitive with electricity for the production of power, heat and light? Will he also say what effect it will have, when it becomes cheaper and is in greater demand in South Australia, on the development of the Electricity Trust and the usage of electricity in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have to get a report on this involved question. I presume that from a heating point of view ordinary gas in the metropolitan area is probably slightly cheaper than electricity used in a stove, but certain other aspects come into this matter—the cost of installation and so on—and there has been no great problem either about gas unduly competing with electricity or electricity competing with gas. There has been room for both.

MORNINGTON CROSSING.

Mr. FRED WALSH: My question arises from two accidents that have occurred in the last few days on Anzac Highway near St. John School, Mornington. About five years ago I asked the Highways Department to install a zebra crossing or make adequate provision for the protection of children near this school, but unfortunately nothing was done beyond placing two yellow lines across the roadway. For some time Mr. Supple has been acting voluntarily as monitor, but recently he has not been well and has been unable to carry out those duties; consequently two children have been knocked down. Unfortunately, Anzac Highway is generally regarded by many motorists as a speedway, and as a result there have been tragic consequences. I believe the department through the Road Traffic Board should consider having adequate safety provisions by way of either a zebra crossing or traffic lights, whichever it considers adequate. Because of the nature of the crossing and particularly as the opening of the Plympton High School about two years ago has increased the number of schoolchildren crossing there, will the Premier request the Road Traffic Board to consider urgently providing adequate safety measures for children crossing Anzac Highway at Mornington?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have this matter examined. I am not sure, however, who actually controls the Anzac Highway. I know the Government made large grants towards its establishment and pays a sum for lighting. However, the highway is considered to be under the control of councils. If that is the case, of course, the local council would be the authority that would normally install the traffic control safety devices for the school. However, I will have the matter investigated by the Road Traffic Board to

see which is the authority, in the first place, and whether it can be moved to make the adequate and necessary arrangements, in the second place.

CITY MILK QUOTA.

Mr. JENKINS: Last weekend my attention was drawn to the fact that several farmers are converting their farms to dairying and getting city milk licences. The existing dairymen are perturbed to think that they may have their quota of city milk interfered with and are anxious to find out whether that would be the case. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what the position is?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I would have to get the details of where the farms are. No increase in the city milk area is contemplated by the Metropolitan Milk Board; but it is competent for anyone to apply for a licence within the present area. I suggest that the honourable member let me have the details of the farms and I can tell him whether the board is doing what it is obliged to do under its Act or whether anything new is contemplated. To my knowledge, no increase is contemplated at the moment.

ELIZABETH FIRE STATION.

Mr. CLARK: I am pleased to know that a new fire station is being erected at Elizabeth. There is no doubt that this is urgently needed because of the increasing number of houses and industrial works in that area. Can the Premier either tell me now or ascertain from the Fire Brigades Board whether this station is to be staffed by full-time officers under the control of the board or whether it will be staffed by volunteer firemen?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will get the information for the honourable member. I do not know the detailed plan. This is under a board that is not directly controlled by the Government.

PORT PIRIE TO PORT BROUGHTON ROAD.

Mr. McKEE: This question is further to a question I asked the Minister on August 2 last, when he said that he would take up with his colleague the Minister of Roads the proposed sealing of the Port Pirie to Port Broughton Road. In answer to a further question on September 4, the Minister replied that the road was "lightly trafficked" and it was "not included in forward planning for early reconstruction". I am afraid I cannot agree with the Minister on that score because there are—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. McKEE: I point out that this road is very important to the people of Port Pirie and surrounding districts, particularly having regard to the bulk handling installations at Port Pirie. I am sure that the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) if he were present would support me in this, because many of his constituents would use this road. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with his colleague for further consideration?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I should point out that at the time the question was asked my colleague the Minister (who is now absent from the State) had based his reply on factual information from his departmental officers about the traffic count on this road. If my memory is correct, I think the reply stated that, if it did not—

Mr. McKee: It is really too bad for people to use.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will not enter into a debate on that matter.

The SPEAKER: You had better not!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Thank you very much! I have used that road myself recently. If it becomes a question of arguing the merits or demerits of road construction on that basis, then I suggest that probably some roads on Eyre Peninsula have a prior claim.

HOSPITAL DISPENSARY.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yesterday I asked a question on notice about the overflowing of a waste pipe in the proposed dispensary in the new east wing of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I questioned the Premier about the instructions issued by the Administrator. The Premier did not say whether or not, in fact, any instructions had been issued by the Administrator; he simply said that this section of the east wing had not been taken over by the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was not under the jurisdiction of the Administrator. Most of the remainder of the building is under the jurisdiction of the Administrator, and the rest of the building is, to some extent, affected by the contamination of the basement. Also, of course, hospital employees are engaged in and about the building. On my information, the Administrator did issue an instruction to the hospital employees that this matter was to be kept strictly confidential. If that was the case, why was it done and what aspects of it were strictly confidential?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: After the honourable member said he would put his question on notice, I made such inquiries as I could to find out what the precise position was so that I would be able to tell the House about it. In answers to questions on notice, one does not write a book: one sets out the facts as they are. This area was not under the jurisdiction of the Administrator; it was locked up. The reason for the contamination was largely that it was an unoccupied room at that time, locked up and not yet handed over. If it had been an occupied room, as soon as a blockage occurred in the sewerage pipes it would have been remedied and the nuisance that there was would not have been created. As far as I can see, the building was not under the control of the Administrator and he could not give any "instructions" (the word that the honourable member has used); nor could I find any evidence that he had given anything more. I think he told one doctor (I believe a Dr. Anderson, but I am not sure), a doctor in the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, that it would not be advisable to mention this matter to Dr. Crompton because Dr. Crompton always took every opportunity he could of belittling the Adelaide hospital. Whether or not that was correct, it could not take the form of an instruction because the Administrator had no power to give an instruction. I understand that the doctor concerned immediately rushed off to Dr. Crompton so that the honourable member could put his questions on notice.

NORTH ADELAIDE RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier obtain a report for me from the relevant authority on means of overcoming the congested traffic position at the North Adelaide railway crossing? I ask this question of the Premier because at present he is Acting Minister of Railways, Acting Minister of Roads and Acting Minister of Local Government, and all portfolios are concerned with this question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure in what capacity I am to get the report. No doubt in one capacity I would reply that I had no control and that it was a matter for another authority. However, I will try to obtain a report.

PETERBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about alterations to the Peterborough High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The need for modernizing the home science and dressmaking rooms has been appreciated for some considerable time and plans have been prepared by the Public Buildings Department. The work has not been carried out yet because of more urgent minor works elsewhere. However, a further request has now been made to the Public Buildings Department to undertake this work as an urgent matter. I have been advised by the Director, Public Buildings Department, that, because of the volume of minor works referred to that department for attention, it has not been possible as yet to investigate the request for additional toilets. Arrangements will be made for a site inspection as soon as possible.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works supply any information about the water position at Kimba and can he say whether any water entered the catchment areas during the rains last week?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Without referring to actual figures I cannot indicate the present holdings at Kimba, but I do know that a small intake occurred during a thunderstorm last week or late the previous week. I will obtain the necessary information tonight or tomorrow morning and will inform the honourable member by telephone if no other means are available.

SEPTIC TANKS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Is the Premier aware that a number of speculative builders are constructing houses in unsewered areas and providing them with septic systems that do not work because they are installed in clay or rock and there is an overflow of effluent as soon as the unsuspecting purchaser moves into the property? There is practically no method of rectifying this situation in an area where there is no reasonable evaporation of the effluent. This practice is going on to an alarming extent and up to the present the builders are getting away with it. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health to see whether some action cannot be taken to prevent speculative builders from engaging in this practice? The builders sell premises with septic systems which are ineffective and which condemn the people living in them to having ineffective septic tanks until the remote future when it will be economic to sewer the areas.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that under the Health Act provision exists whereby it is necessary for all septic tanks to be inspected and approved before use. However, I will check that for the honourable member and inform him of the position. The question of effluent from septic tanks has always been with us. The problem occurs in areas where a septic tank may have been approved a long while ago and may have worked satisfactorily for a long time, but gradually the soil has become saturated and a breakdown has occurred. I know that that problem exists in some of the foothill areas of Burnside. It is a problem in some of the eastern capitals where large areas are not sewered. This applies particularly in Brisbane and Sydney. In reply to the question, I will see whether any action is necessary and, if it is, I will see that it is taken.

WAIKERIE DISTRICT COUNCIL.

Mr. CURREN: I have received a letter dated November 2, 1961, addressed to the former member for my district, regarding the Taylorville ward of the Waikerie District Council. This letter, signed by the Minister of Local Government, states:

Thank you for the further information contained in your letter of November 2. Cabinet has given careful consideration to the contentions therein. It notes that Waikerie did, in fact, give a very favourable differential rate for the Taylorville ward and under the circumstances considers that the *status quo* should be maintained for at least another 12 months, to see if the Waikerie District Council can justify its administration. However, I have written to the Waikerie council along these lines, pointing out that it was expected that the differential rate of the Taylorville ward would be maintained and that no capital encumbrance or commitment based on the security of rates should be placed on that ward while the position remained in doubt. This, I think, should satisfy your fears regarding swimming pools, etc.

An article in the *River News*, headed "District Council of Waikerie, Notice of Intention to Borrow", states:

The District Council of Waikerie hereby gives notice that it proposes to borrow the sum of £10,000 . . . on the security of differential special rates.

The concluding paragraph states:

The differential special rates on which the loan will be secured will apply from year to year until the loan is repaid and will be declared as follows:—Town, Waikerie, Ramco, River and Holder Irrigation wards, penny-halfpenny in the pound; Qualco, Holder, and Taylorville wards, one penny in the pound; New Well and Paisley wards, halfpenny in the pound.

That was signed by the District Clerk and dated October 22, 1962. In view of the apparent intention of the council to disregard the request of the Minister while the position is in a state of flux, will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Local Government, accede to the request contained in the previous petition for Taylorville ward to be transferred to the Morgan District Council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the honourable member realizes that this problem was submitted for investigation by a special magistrate. The special magistrate gave a decision, but the decision was not accepted by the Taylorville ward as being reasonable. I think that sets out the brief history of the position. The Government at that time did not desire that that decision, which did not appear to be accepted, should be necessarily regarded as final, but desired that the council should have an opportunity of showing its *bona fides* regarding the area in question, the problem having arisen over some question of differential rating. I will have the matter examined to see whether it is necessary to take any further action.

ABORIGINES' HOUSING.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my question of yesterday concerning the Aborigines Department's programme for housing in the immediate future, particularly at Port Augusta?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. In the short time available I have obtained information from the Acting Secretary of the Aborigines Department. The total programme for housing this year is 32 houses, and they are to be located at the following places: Port Lincoln, Gerard, Point McLeay, Point Pearce, Port Augusta, Meningie, Kimba, Copley, Iron Knob, Blinman, Marree and Berri. The acting head of the department states that he confidently expects that the programme will be completed as planned and that 32 houses will be erected.

OODNADATTA SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my question of yesterday regarding the sealing of the Oodnadatta school yard.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports:

Funds have been approved for the provision of a suitable paved area at the Oodnadatta Primary School yard. However, before

proceeding with the approved work, the possibility of providing cement paving in lieu of bitumen paving is being considered, because of the climatic condition and remote area of the school.

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN DUPLICATION.

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Works will recall having received at Port Pirie a deputation of landholders from the Port Pirie foothills on the day of the opening of the silo when representations were made to him regarding the placing underground of the duplicated Morgan-Whyalla main. The Minister told the deputation that its request might depend on the acceptance of tenders for the construction of the main and whether it was to be constructed of cement, and that there was every possibility of the request being acceded to. I think I saw a report that tenders had been accepted. Can the Minister say whether that is so and whether any decision has been reached on that matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As promised, I took up the matter with the Engineer-in-Chief immediately I was able to see him during the week after I saw the deputation, and I discussed the problem with him. The tenders have not been accepted but they are in the early stages of examination. I therefore asked the Engineer-in-Chief to discuss the matter again with me before a final decision was taken regarding the tenders. The matter is therefore at that stage. The tenders are still under examination, and attention is being given to the request made by the Chairman of the district council at the deputation. I will discuss the matter again with the Engineer-in-Chief before a decision is finally made regarding tenders.

AMPOL BAN.

Mr. HALL: There are reported moves today of the Communist-inspired Seamen's Union to institute a world-wide ban on the Ampol company's ships. The attitude of the Australian Council of Trade Unions at present seems to be rather undefined in this matter. As the Australian community as a whole, through the Commonwealth Government, has subsidized the company already to the extent of £1,000,000 in the construction of the new ship and thereby assisted South Australian employment at Whyalla, I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition what action the State Labor Party has taken to safeguard our own shipbuilding industry at Whyalla in the face of this subversive and un-Australian action contemplated against a wholly owned Australian company?

Mr. HUTCHENS (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The statement as reported by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) has not been studied by me, but I assure him that members of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia, and throughout Australia, are as keen as any other person to see that local industries are supported and assisted in the interests of the development of this country and will act accordingly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CHOWILLA DAM.

Mr. CURREN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CURREN: The Premier, in replying to my questions on certain aspects of the proposed Chowilla dam said:

> The Government is satisfied that there is no sound basis to support the objections raised in the honourable member's questions.

The inference from that sentence could be that I am opposed to the construction of this great national project, but I wish to dispel any doubts on that score. I have always fully supported the project and will continue to do so. I sought the information so that I would be able to answer the numerous queries I have received from constituents on these aspects of the proposed dam. The answers given to my questions will enable me to dispel any doubts that people may have regarding this vital project. The importance to the Upper Murray irrigation settlements of an adequate supply of good quality water cannot be stressed too strongly.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: CRAFT CLASSES.

The SPEAKER: This morning I received the following letter from the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches):

> I have to inform you that it is my intention to move a motion of urgency today in the House, namely, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock for the purpose of discussing the following matter, namely, the proposed discontinuance of craft classes in primary schools.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Four members having risen:

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I move:

> That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, the proposed discontinuance

of craft classes in primary schools. I thank members who support me. I assure the House at the outset that I am not proposing to embark upon any lengthy debate on this matter, nor is the subject matter being raised with any desire to make it a political issue. I have taken this step because this is the last day of sitting and there would be no other opportunity available to me to bring under the notice of the Minister in Parliament a question that I consider is important to the State. I consider it obligatory on me also to explain why this motion was not submitted earlier. The reason was that my attention was directed to this matter in the area I represent only this week and on making investigations I understood that a similar situation applied to many other primary schools and that therefore the matter was one of urgency extending far beyond the limits of my district.

The decision to ask the House to discuss this matter was reached only this morning, when it was too late for me to inform the Minister; I just had time to inform the Speaker. I apologize to the Minister for the fact that he may not have had prior advice of this motion. I repeat that it is submitted not in an attempt at censure but to give vent to the feelings of people who I consider should be heard on this important issue. Schools where woodwork and craft subjects have been taught for a long time are one by one discontinuing this teaching. The procedure being followed seems to be one of crowding out primary schoolchildren from woodwork centres in which they have been accustomed to receive this tuition, and this is almost a *fait accompli* before school committees are made aware of what is going on.

At Port Augusta, representations have been made on this matter over a considerable period. In the first place, a woodwork centre was established at the high school and an assurance given that primary schoolchildren would be able to attend for tuition. When pressure was brought to bear by the high school because of lack of space, a new woodwork centre was established at the Willsden Primary School. Nobody has yet heard officially that the Willsden Primary School woodwork centre is to be taken over by secondary classes and that primary schoolboys are to be denied tuition there, but we have had word on the grapevine that this is proposed and will almost certainly be the position when the school year opens next year. There has been no official word, but this has been rumoured to such a degree that the rumour seems to have substance. This is causing concern to parents, teachers and school committees.

I know it is the stated policy of the Director of Education, who seems to be in complete control of the curriculum of primary schools, that woodwork and home science should not be taught in primary schools, he being convinced that better work can be done if these subjects are taught only in secondary schools. We have known that that has been in the mind of the Director for two or three years, but it has not been accepted by school committees throughout the State, and representations have been made and resolutions carried from time to time urging the department to get away from the Director's decision. We thought that on all these matters the Minister had kept an open mind, and even at this stage I know of no quarrel with any decision he has made. However, in reply to a question yesterday he referred to the Director's policy and said categorically that he agreed with him. I do not think the decision reflects the opinion of the majority of members of this House or meets the wishes of most parents, schoolteachers or members of school committees. My whole purpose in submitting this motion is to ask the Minister to assure members that he will preserve an open mind and have the matter fully investigated before the department is finally committed to the complete abolition of the teaching of woodwork and home science in primary schools so that wherever possible their teaching may be continued.

It has been argued that children in grade 7 are not of the appropriate age to be taught these subjects, and that is the reason the Director has given for his decision. If that is the only reason why woodwork will no longer be taught in primary schools, I think the matter should be seriously considered. Every teacher to whom I have spoken has without exception agreed that woodwork is a most desirable subject to be taught in the upper grades of primary schools, and particularly in grade 7. I do not say that every teacher thinks this, but every teacher to whom I have spoken does.

This matter has been raised annually at the Port Augusta Primary School Committee meetings and I know I am speaking for the great majority of parents in saying that they desire their children to be taught woodwork in grade 7. They have expressed great concern about any move to deprive their children of this tuition. It is not suggested that the value of this tuition at this level can be

judged by the types of articles made by children, as one does not expect any child of this age to bring home a completed article of furniture. However, several advantages are claimed —that boys are taught to use their hands and apply themselves usefully and that an examination study of children who have taken these lessons has shown that boys who start woodwork in grade 7 have a terrific advantage when they go to high school, and most of them are able to complete a woodwork course in two years. Those who have a grounding in the handling of tools in grade 7 have an advantage. The teachers to whom I have spoken are convinced that it is the right level at which boys should be taught the use of their hands. They are also convinced that no satisfactory alternative to woodwork as a subject in primary schools has been suggested. I have seen, not this year but three years ago, grade 7 boys fooling around with plasticine because there were no other facilities available, and in the absence of woodwork there was no possibility of any manual work being taught to the boys. I believe the Director has stated that manual subjects could be eliminated and greater emphasis placed on the academic studies—English and so on—in the grade 7 year. There is a feeling that it is not wise to have boys and girls all the time engaged in purely academic subjects—that a balance is needed. I have been supported in that view by many teachers with whom I have conversed.

Particularly in the country (I cannot answer so much for the city) about 7 per cent of boys do not reach high school. About 11 per cent of all children who enter a secondary school leave in the first year; so it can be assumed that nearly 25 per cent of the children of the State if they were not given any tuition at the primary school level would get less than one year's tuition in any of these subjects. The Minister will agree that it has not been established that it is not possible to teach woodwork satisfactorily to grade 7 pupils, but it may well be that the department is embarrassed by the lack of teachers and accommodation. If that is so, let us be frank about it and say so. If that is so, let us continue to teach woodwork where craft centres and teachers are available and make sure that no woodwork class is closed down merely because of policy. If the decision reached is one of expediency and expense, we should make renewed overtures to the Commonwealth Government for assistance if our children are being denied the advantages of the type of education to which they have become accustomed over the years. We could a few years ago teach our lads woodwork in primary schools. Parents are asking why we cannot do it today. That is a fair question and it is right, when a large body of people feels so strongly on this matter, that its voice should be heard here.

I have been told that motions have been carried not only by parents' meetings at Port Augusta from time to time but also at combined schools' meetings. I believe the Public Schools Committees' Association regards this as a retrograde step and asks the Minister not to proceed with it. I have also been given to understand that the South Australian Institute of Teachers (I know the district committee of that institute in the northern areas has carried motions and they have been carried, too, at the State level expressing concern at this contemplated action, describing it as a retrograde step) is asking the Minister not to proceed with it. I bring this matter forward not as a censure but rather as an appeal to the Minister to hear the representations coming forward from so many sources, asking him to keep an open mind on this matter before he commits himself, as it would appear to us that he was prepared to do by his answer to questions yesterday. Of course, no vote will be taken on this motion. It has been raised in this manner because it is not a subject that could be raised satisfactorily by way of question, because justice could not be done to the matter by my attempting to explain it at question time; also because I felt (and I am fortified now with the support that has been given) that this matter was not only of local but also of general concern throughout the State.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) and was surprised to hear that the Education Department intended soon to discontinue home science and woodwork in the primary schools. The Minister knows my feelings on this matter, that country students particularly are at some disadvantage compared with city students in the matter of technical education. That is so particularly with the small country schools. The member for Stuart gave figures of children who did not proceed to secondary school level. I know that is the case in many of the small country schools, that they have not the facilities to engage in secondary education, or they do not do so for some reason or other. Often their only education is

primary and they are not academically inclined, so it would be an advantage for them to get some technical education in both these subjects. I have known of teachers (or teachers' wives, in the case of domestic arts) coming into the schools and giving the youngsters the advantage of their experience in these fields. It would be a backward step, particularly with these smaller schools, if both these subjects were discontinued.

In Murray Bridge the primary school has a woodwork centre. It is not very elegant and possibly the idea is to remove this because of the need for a more modern one at the high school. Here again many of those students who attend at grade 7 level could get an advantage from the modern woodwork centres. Often students have not the ability to proceed to higher academic fields and they leave school because of the lack of technical facilities. It is good if they can start to learn these subjects in grade 7 because if they proceed to high school for one year (until they reach the leaving age) they have the advantage of two years' instruction in both these important subjects.

Frequently the time allocated for the teaching of such subjects at the smaller schools is not being used to the best advantage, but if we revert to the stage when pupils use plasticine it will be a retrograde step. This is not a censure motion, but it affords members an opportunity to speak on this important subject. I hope that the department will have a second look at this matter.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I do not intend to speak at length, but I must express concern at what seems to be a likely change in the teaching of these subjects. I am not certain that an irrevocable decision has been reached, but a change would be regrettable. In the last few months many people—and not all from my district—have spoken to me about this. I was a teacher for 25 years and people speak to me about these subjects because they know I am interested in education matters. We must remember that many boys and girls do not have any secondary education. We must also remember that a greater number—indeed more than I like to see—do not have more than 12 months' secondary education. I well remember before the teaching of woodwork was introduced into schools having to learn something about this subject along with other teachers. I can also remember the expedients that teachers were forced into in the teaching of manual work, as it was then termed. Some teachers are naturally gifted with their hands. One member this afternoon suggested that work with plasticine was a waste of time, but I have seen excellent work done with this material by teachers who knew how to use it. However, most of us—including myself—dreaded each week the period when we had to teach manual work.

Mr. Quirke: Could you make a box now?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, but I was never much good with plasticine and I could never manage to do good work with other modelling materials. I do not have that knack, and most teachers are in that category. One big advantage of teaching woodwork and domestic arts is that boys and girls learn things that will be of use to them all their lives. I have heard woodwork criticized, but if boys learned only to use and love tools that would be of great assistance to them. After all, many adult males have difficulty in driving a nail into wood: in fact, sometimes that action is fraught with danger. The introduction of domestic arts and woodwork proved a boon to scholars and teachers. Some people may claim that mothers should be capable of teaching girls home science. There may be some truth in that, but mothers are not as well equipped as teachers trained in domestic arts or home science.

I taught grade 7 at Gawler for 10 or 12 years and I can remember when grade 6 boys and girls were taught home science and woodwork at the high school. I think grade 6 was too early, but those scholars went along to make up the numbers. The work that was done was valuable to the scholars and it taught them how to use their hands. I have heard my colleagues express the view that generally a boy who is good with his brain is not good with his hands and *vice versa*. I do not agree with that. My experience has been that scholars who are bright scholastically can use their hands as well. There are exceptions. I have seen boys who can do expert work with their hands but who are no good at anything else. If it has been finally decided to do away with woodwork and domestic arts at the primary school level, our schools will be the poorer. I do not know what will replace these subjects at the primary school level. If it is to be some other form of craft work, that could be valuable if it is taught by people who are keen on craft work and really understand it. If it is taught by those who find it just a burden, I am afraid that the boys will find it a burden, too. I realize that probably needlework courses could take the place to some extent of the domestic arts course.

I do hope that if the proposed policy is adopted it will not mean that no handwork at all is to be done in grade 7. I know there is a school of thought that the boys and girls would be better occupied in grade 7 doing nothing but academic subjects, but as one who quite frankly was always more interested in academic subjects than the other subjects mentioned I still cannot agree with that point of view. I think it was the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) who said that there was much disquiet concerning the proposed change. From what I have heard directly and from what I have read about it, I believe that this disquiet has been particularly evident in the country, not only amongst the parents of the boys and girls but also amongst school committees. I know that the School Committees' Association, teachers in general and the South Australian Institute of Teachers also are concerned. I was hoping that they would have had a chance yesterday afternoon to consult with the Minister about it, but I understand from what he said this afternoon that their time was taken up with weightier subjects and they did not manage to get this subject discussed.

I hope it will not be thought that I am speaking in a mood of carping criticism, or that I am speaking too much in the vein of one who put in much time as a teacher. I know that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) several times has by implication accused me of still being pedagogic, something I had hoped I never was; but apparently it still shows in me at times.

Mr. Millhouse: It was meant to be a compliment.

Mr. CLARK: I hope that the few words we have said this afternoon will give the Minister additional cause to think about this matter, because I know that he has devoted much thought to it. I fear that if the change is made it may well be regretted.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Some months ago I introduced to the Minister a deputation of parents, mainly of scholars of the Cowandilla Demonstration School. However, there were representatives of children from other schools who use the equipment at this school. I endorse the remarks of other members regarding the disquiet among parents, and even amongst the children, for that matter, at the possibility of the discontinuance by the department of the domestic arts and woodwork classes in primary schools. We understand—and these are figures compiled by persons in the Education Department—that 11 per cent of primary schoolchildren do not go on to secondary schools. Of the scholars who do, 14 per cent leave either during or at the termination of their first year. We can therefore see that between 11 per cent and 25 per cent of children will have very little tuition in the use of tools or any experience in domestic arts.

The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) spoke about his qualifications as a woodworking teacher. I claim that I am no mug myself at using tools, and the only education I ever had in the use of tools was at the Gilbert Street Woodworking Centre in 1919 and until May 1920, when I left school. I was then in grade 8 I do not wish to weary the House with saying what I have done with tools since then, but there is not much around my house that I am unable to do in the way of maintenance, repairs or making things. This type of experience will be lost to many of our children in future if the action of the Director of Education prevails. I emphasize that, because when we met the Minister he told us that the question was outside his jurisdiction and that it was one for the Director to determine.

Irrespective of whether domestic arts or woodwork should or should not be taught in a primary school, the fact remains, in my opinion anyway, that this decision should not rest with a departmental officer; it is a matter that should be entirely the responsibility of the Minister or the Government, so that the Minister or the Government would be answerable to Parliament. This is only one instance among many others of decisions being outside the control of the Minister. I support the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I also wish to add a protest. I have in my district the Norwood Woodwork Centre, which serves a number of schools in my district and in the district of the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele). I have attended that centre on many occasions; in fact, I go along to give out the prizes every year. I can imagine nothing that would upset both the boys and the parents more than the thought that such a woodwork centre might close down, and it does appear that it is the policy eventually to close woodwork centres that cater for primary schools. This centre caters entirely for primary schools, apart from a small amount of adult education.

I have seen the work the boys do. They get at a school of this kind not just some sort of facility in the use of their hands

but a sense of craftsmanhip in working with timber. It is something which I think is enormously important to their education, and is appreciated by the boys and their parents. A very keen parent's committee that works for the woodwork centre has obtained valuable equipment as well as a library for the boys. It is wonderful to see the keen interest the boys at this centre take in the craftwork done there. They become young craftsmen in the short time they are there. I think this is something that should be maintained and I hope the Minister will not proceed to close woodwork centres of this kind, because in my district I know that any such move will be met with a great deal of upset and most bitter disappointment.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): First, let me hasten to assure the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) that there was no need for him to apologize to me for not notifying me that he intended to move this motion. Certainly, there was no obligation on him to apologize for moving the motion. As a member of about 30 years' continuous experience in this House, he knows perfectly well that it is not only his right but his duty to rise on the floor of the House in matters affecting the interests of his constituents or the public at large. It is a matter of complete indifference whether it is at the beginning or the end of a session. I am in no hurry for this Parliament to prorogue and am prepared to discuss (either today, tomorrow or next week) any matters in the interests of my constituents or the public. I am in a leisurely mood, and there is no need to apologize.

At the outset I should like to clear up one or two matters. This decision was made not for any reasons of convenience but on purely educational grounds. In Division V, "Courses of Instruction", section 28 of the Education Act provides:

(1) The Director shall determine the courses of instruction for each branch of education in the public schools.

(2) For the purpose of assisting the Director to determine the course of instruction in primary schools, high schools, technical schools and other kinds of schools, there shall be appointed for each kind of schools an advisory curriculum board for that kind of schools.

(3) Each board shall consist of—

(*a*) the superintendent or superintendents of the kind of schools in question;

(*b*) two inspectors or other officers appointed by the Minister;

(*c*) two teachers appointed by the Minister, after nomination in the prescribed manner by teachers of the prescribed grades.

Some time ago the Director of Education, after consultation with his principal officers and after numerous and detailed discussions at staff conferences, decided that it would be in the best interests of the students at our schools on purely educational grounds that the teaching of craft work be gradually discontinued in the primary grades and that it would be far more beneficial for them if they did an extended course of craft work beginning in the first year of secondary school. After these detailed discussions, in due course he sent me a minute strongly recommending that that course be gradually adopted, and I concurred with his recommendation. On March 12 of this year the Director wrote to the General Secretary of the South Australian Institute of Teachers as follows:

Dear Mr. Kiek,

Experience has shown the department that more beneficial results will be obtained by teaching craft subjects at the secondary level only rather than commencing at the primary stage. In order to assist in making this change of policy more widely known, I would be grateful if you could arrange for the attached notice to be published in the Teachers' Journal. Your co-operation in this matter will be appreciated.

The notice that the Director attached stated:

The teaching of woodwork to boys and of domestic arts to girls in our primary schools (especially those in the metropolitan area) has received careful consideration by the Director of Education and by the superintendents and inspectors concerned. It is considered that under present-day conditions the teaching of these subjects is best undertaken at the secondary level. Courses in these subjects are designed to cover three years and it is considered to be better for these three years to be taken in the one school than at two different schools. Experience has also shown that the stage when boys and girls normally enter our secondary schools is more appropriate for the beginning of work on these subjects than at the beginning of the last year of primary school. As is widely known, woodwork for boys and domestic arts for girls used to be taught mainly in primary schools because relatively few boys and girls remained for any significant time in secondary schools. This position is now completely changed. Practically all boys and girls now enter our secondary schools and an increasingly large majority remain for at least three years. It is hoped that the deferment of instruction in craft subjects to the secondary stages will encourage more and more students to remain at secondary schools for a minimum of three years.

Mr. Riches: They must crowd a lot into three years at secondary schools.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not arguing that; I am only giving the reasons that prompted the Director, in consultation with all his able and experienced

superintendents, to arrive at that decision in conformity with his powers under the Act. Before doing this he put the matter to me in the form of a minute, to which I shall refer later. I am now explaining the reasons. Mr. C. W. Reed, the Honorary Secretary of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association, wrote to the Director of Education as follows:

Dear Mr. Mander-Jones,

Complaints have been received by this association from school committees in respect of the closure of woodwork and domestic art centres in certain primary schools, and I have been directed to inquire from you on what will be the future policy of your department in these matters.

The Director of Education wrote to Mr. Reed as follows:

Dear Mr. Reed,

Thank you for your letter of January 30, 1962, in which you refer to the closing of certain woodwork and domestic art centres in primary schools and inquire on future policy in connection with these centres.

As you know, there is an age of readiness for children to begin the study of each subject in the various courses. For example, it is generally agreed that the age of readiness for children to start to learn to read and to figure is between 4 and 6 years of age, that the formal study of science should begin at 12 or 13 years and that the study of economics and psychology should not begin before the age of 17 to 19 years.

Most educational authorities are now agreed that the optimum age of readiness for beginning the study of woodwork and domestic arts is in the first year of the secondary courses when the children are from 12½ to 13½ years of age.

It is true, of course, that in the past these subjects, and particularly woodwork for boys, have been started in grade 7 and occasionally in grade 6. In each case the course to the Intermediate is a three-year course and this has enabled these students to sit for the examination in each subject at the end of the second year. Experience in recent years shows that more effective results are obtained and more progress made in each subject if the three years in each of these craft courses coincides with the first three years of the secondary course.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung, the motion lapsed.

COMPANIES BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 34, line 7 (clause 21)—After "and" insert ", where an order is so registered,"

No. 2. Page 34, lines 8 and 9 (clause 21)—Leave out "every such order, and on such registration and not before, the alteration of the memorandum shall take effect" and insert "that order"

No. 3. Page 34, line 10 (clause 21)—After "Registrar" insert "referred to in subsection (3) of this section".

No. 4. Page 49, line 14 (clause 38)—After "registered" insert—

"; or

(iii) is a subsidiary of a banking corporation or of a pastoral company referred to in subparagraph (i) of this paragraph, the whole of the issued shares of which subsidiary are held beneficially by the banking corporation or the pastoral company, as the case may be, and the repayment of all existing and future deposits with and loans to which subsidiary are guaranteed by the banking corporation or pastoral company".

No. 5 Page 74, line 9 (clause 62)—After "convert" insert "or make provision for the conversion of".

No. 6. Page 74, line 10 (clause 62)—After "re-convert" insert "or make provision for the re-conversion of".

No. 7. Page 74, line 42 (clause 62)—After "capital" insert "or converted any of its shares into stock or re-converted stock into shares".

No. 8 Page 74, line 43 (clause 62)—After "increase" insert "or after the conversion or re-conversion, as the case may be".

No. 9. Page 74, line 44 (clause 62)—After "increase" insert ", conversion or re-conversion".

No. 10. Page 125, line 23 (clause 129)—After "thereof" insert "or the means by which the amount will be ascertained".

No. 11. Page 136, lines 31 and 32 (clause 141)—Leave out "(whether a member or not)" and insert "(who, if the articles so provide, shall be a member, but otherwise need not be a member)".

No. 12. Page 137, line 4 (clause 141)—Leave out "need not also be a member" and insert "shall be a member or need not be a member, as the case requires".

No. 13. Page 148 (clause 158)—After subclause (4) insert a new subclause as follows:

(4a) The Registrar may, on the application of an exempt proprietary company, or a prescribed proprietary company or a prescribed private company to which section 398 applies, by notice in writing given to such company, fix a day in lieu of the date of the annual general meeting of the company as the date—

(*a*) up to which the return to be made by that company under subsection (2) of this section must be made; and

(*b*) from which the time within which the return must be lodged under subsection (4) of this section is to be calculated,

and when a date has been so fixed, this section shall be construed, so far as it applies to that company, as if the date so fixed were substituted for the date of the annual general meeting referred

to in subsections (2) and (4) of this section.

No. 14. Page 235, line 31 (clause 284)—After "may" insert ", if the Court so orders,"

No. 15. Page 235, lines 33 to 39 (clause 284)—Leave out paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*).

No. 16. Page 237, line 20 (clause 286)—Leave out "the owner of" and insert "entitled to".

No. 17. Page 278, line 40 (clause 352)—Leave out ", unless otherwise ordered by the Court,".

No. 18. Page 278, line 42 (clause 352)—Leave out "pay the net" and insert ", in the case of a foreign company incorporated in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth shall, if the Court so orders and subject to such terms and conditions as the Court may impose, pay the whole or any part of the".

No. 19. Page 348, Ninth schedule, clause 2 (1) (i), subparagraph (iii)—After "interest" being the last word of subparagraph (iii) insert "but not being any loan to which section 125 does not apply by reason of the operation of paragraph (*f*) of subsection (1) of that section".

No. 20. Page 351, Tenth schedule, Part B, clause 1, paragraph (*a*)—After "corporation" being the last word of paragraph (*a*) of clause 1 insert "and the number, description and amount of marketable securities in the offeror corporation held by or on behalf of each such director or, in the case of a director where none are so held, contain a statement to that effect".

No. 21. Page 351, Tenth schedule, Part B, clause 1, paragraph (*c*)—After "offeror corporation" in the second line of paragraph (*c*) insert "and each of the directors thereof".

No. 22. Page 351, Tenth schedule, Part B, clause 1, paragraph (*d*)—After "capital" being the last word of subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (*d*) insert—

"; and

(iii) set out whether or not there has been any material change in the financial position of the offeror corporation since the date of the last balance sheet laid before the corporation in general meeting and, if so, particulars of such change."

Amendments Nos 1 *to* 3.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): These amendments make only drafting improvements to clause 21 without altering the original intention of the clause. I could explain it in more detail, if required.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Under this clause (clause 38) as originally agreed to by this House every corporation is required to issue a debenture where money is deposited with or lent to that corporation pursuant to an invitation to the public. The clause, however, exempts certain corporations from that requirement. The exempted corporations are banks and pastoral companies that are governed by the Commonwealth Banking Act and life insurance companies and wholly owned subsidiaries of life insurance companies if declared by the Governor by notice in the *Gazette* to be "prescribed corporations". This amendment extends the class of prescribed corporations to wholly owned subsidiaries of banks and such pastoral companies where the repayment of all existing and future deposits with and loans to those subsidiaries are guaranteed by the parent company and the subsidiaries themselves are also declared by the Governor to be prescribed corporations. This would enable certain banks and pastoral companies to receive deposits and loans from the public through wholly owned subsidiaries which are more flexible and less expensive to operate. I strongly urge the acceptance of this sound amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 5 *to* 9.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: These amendments to clause 62 would make it possible for a company to alter the conditions of its memorandum so as to make provision for the conversion of paid-up shares into stock and for the reconversion of that stock into paid-up shares. This practice would save companies the necessity and expense of calling and holding a general meeting if they desired to convert their paid-up shares into stock, and *vice versa*. The amendments to subclause (4) of the clause would ensure that notice was given to the Registrar whenever such conversions and reconversions took place, and thus ensure that the records in the Registrar's office relating to the company will be complete. I ask that the amendments be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 10.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This clause (clause 129) prevents any payment being made to a director of a company as compensation for loss of office, etc., unless particulars with respect to the payment, and the amounts thereof, have been disclosed to the members and approved by them in general meeting. As some retirement allowances which come within the clause are related to the level of fees which a director will receive at the time of retirement, the actual amount of the payment cannot always be ascertained at

the time when the company's approval for the payment is sought. This amendment therefore provides that, as an alternative to the actual amount, the means by which that amount is to be ascertained must be disclosed to the members and approved by them.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 11 *and* 12.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Under this clause (clause 141) as originally agreed to by this House, a member of a public company was permitted to appoint another person (whether a member or not) as his proxy to attend, vote and speak in his stead at a meeting of the company. These amendments provide that such a proxy must if the articles of the company so provide be a member but otherwise need not be a member. The amendments are designed to stop the admission of hired trouble-makers to a meeting of a company. Again, I think it is in the best interests of the community that we do not have these hired spruikers.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 13.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This clause requires every company with a share capital to lodge an annual return with the Registrar. Subclause (2) requires the return to be made up to the date of the annual general meeting of the company or a date not later than the fourteenth day after that date and subclause (4) requires the return to be lodged with the Registrar within one month or, in the case of a company which has a branch registrar outside the Commonwealth, within two months after the annual general meeting. The requirements of subclauses (2) and (4) present no difficulties to public companies and subsidiaries of public companies whose annual returns are usually prepared by their own officers. Besides, it is important in the public interest that their annual returns should be lodged within a short period of their annual general meetings. But it has been brought to the notice of the Government that in the case of proprietary and private companies which are not obliged to file their accounts with the Registrar and whose annual and other returns and other documents are prepared for them by outside accountants, considerable difficulties could be experienced in getting their annual returns in within the stipulated periods. This amendment is therefore designed to give the Registrar power, in such cases, to fix a day in lieu of the annual general meeting in relation to which those returns are to be made up or the time for lodging them is to be calculated. The amendment will continue, to a limited extent, the principle contained in section 129 (6) of the present Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 14 *and* 15.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This clause as originally agreed to by this House permitted a company that has been wound up to destroy its books and papers within a period of five years after its dissolution only if, in the case of a winding-up ordered by the court, the court so directs, or in the case of a members' or creditors' voluntary winding-up, the members or creditors, respectively, so resolve. These amendments will have the effect of preventing the destruction of such books and papers within five years in every case unless the court orders their destruction.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 16.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This amendment only makes a drafting improvement without altering the intention of the clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 17 *and* 18.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Subclause (3) (*c*) of this clause as originally agreed to by this House required a liquidator of a foreign company appointed for this State by the court, unless otherwise ordered by the court, to pay the net amount of the assets of the company recovered by him in the State to the liquidator of that company for the place where it was formed or incorporated. This provision could react to the detriment of local creditors unless some provision were included to safeguard their interests and the requirements of the provision were restricted to foreign companies incorporated within the Commonwealth. These amendments restrict its application to such foreign companies and will prevent payment to a liquidator outside the State unless the court makes an order which may contain terms and conditions subject to which the payment is to be made.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 19.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Clause 125 (1) as originally agreed to by this House precludes a company from making any loan to a director except in the circumstances set out in paragraphs (*a*) to (*f*) of that clause. Paragraph (*f*) relates to a loan made by a company, whose ordinary business includes

the lending of money, where the loan is made in the ordinary course of that business. Because of the exemption of such loans from the operation of clause 125 (1) this amendment renders unnecessary any disclosure in the balance sheet of particulars relating to such loans.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 20 *to* 22.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This schedule prescribes requirements relating to take-over offers. On a take-over offer being made, both the offeror corporation and the offeree corporation are obliged to disclose certain particulars in separate statements. These amendments will place on the directors of the offeror corporation the same onus as to disclosures in its statement as is placed on the directors of the offeree corporation.

Amendments agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1464.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support the second reading of this Bill which makes it possible to appoint a second deputy master of the Supreme Court. The business of the Supreme Court has increased with the growth of the State's population and this provision is unexceptionable. However, in Committee I will do something about the powers and duties of a master as may be ordered by the court in the promulgation of rules subject to the Supreme Court Act. I hope that the House will agree to consider these matters.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider amendments relating to the powers of masters.

Motion carried.

In Committee:

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

New clause 2a.—

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

2a. Section 2 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words "Officers of the court" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "The Master and officers of the court".

What the Opposition wishes to empower the court to do is to give to the master the powers of a judge in certain specific matters which the court may provide for by rules of court. It would not mean that the master would have all the powers and jurisdiction of a judge in any particular case, but simply that the judges may make rules of court providing that the master in certain particular matters may have the powers of a judge. At present the masters have the powers of judges on any matters prescribed by rules of court where a judge in Chambers may deal with the matters. There are certain matters of substance to be dealt with by judges in Chambers, and the court may make rules of court, and has done so, empowering the master to exercise the powers of a judge on any matters to be dealt with in Chambers.

However, I believe that there is a case for empowering the master to do certain other things which judges do not do in Chambers. For instance, as things stand there is at least one judge and sometimes rather more engaged on dealing with 70-odd undefended divorce cases each month. It has been the custom in their jurisdiction to appoint commissioners to do this work and not to clutter up the work of the Chief Justice and the puisne judges of the court with undefended divorce matters which can be dealt with expeditiously by a competent officer. At present the court has no power to empower the master to deal with those matters, although he would be a perfectly competent and proper person to deal

with them. If he did deal with them—and, of course, if he has an extra deputy master he will be in a better position to be able to do so—it would release a judge to get on with the work of clearing up the civil list.

As it stands, the judges have to clear up the undefended matrimonial causes list regularly or it gets so hopelessly behind that there is chaos. At present there are some 200 odd cases on the civil list, and members know that from time to time cases are badly behind on that list because of the calls upon the judges. One difficulty facing us is that under the Commonwealth Constitution we must have somebody who is part of the court sitting in matrimonial jurisdiction. It has been decided by the court that the Commonwealth has to take the South Australian court as it stands in this matter. The court has power to delegate to the master certain of the work of the judges, and in that the Commonwealth takes the court as it stands. What we propose is simply to make the master not merely an officer of the court but an essential part of the court, although he is not one of the judges constituting the court. We do not change the sections of the Supreme Court Act in this respect, but if we say that the master is a part of the court by simply changing the wording of the introduction and the heading of the section dealing with the master, then we have coped with that difficulty.

The only other thing we intended to do basically was to cut out a qualification upon the master's jurisdiction by saying that the court was restricted to empowering him to deal only with matters which a judge could deal with sitting in Chambers. If we cut out "sitting in Chambers" everywhere, then the court is in the position to be able to make rules of court to say that the master can deal with this matter or that matter which is not just a matter that can be dealt with in Chambers. This, of course, still leaves the control of the jurisdiction of the court in the hands of the judges, and they would not empower the master to do anything other than was suitable to the judges and which they thought it was proper for him to deal with before the court. In this way the court could work very much more easily than it does at present, when we are faced with the difficulty that sometimes a judge is on leave and perhaps another one is sick and the list is getting behind. The undefended matrimonial cause list has to be dealt with and the civil list gets further back, and the only way out of it is to appoint an acting judge. Whom can we appoint as acting judge in those circumstances? At one time it was the Judge in Bankruptcy but (without any disrespect to Sir Kingsley Paine) he is reaching the age where it is not feasible or fair to ask him to undertake this jurisdiction.

Then there is the habit of appointing people who have retired from active practice; Mr. Acting Justice Hannan was appointed in this way. However, few people in South Australia could act in this capacity and it is not desirable to appoint somebody who has retired from active practice to do the onerous work of a judge of the Supreme Court. Nobody would be prepared to be appointed an acting judge unless he were certain that he would be appointed a judge in due course. It is impossible to ask a practising silk to leave practice and go to the bench and then to resume his practice. It is much better to do what is done in Western Australia from time to time, where the master is often commissioned by the court to undertake the work of a judge when some assistance is necessary. The court would have power to make certain rules so that the master could sit as a judge. The present Master of the Supreme Court has the confidence and respect of the judges, the profession and the public, and he is a man of great ability. I think this amendment will make it possible for the business of the court to be disposed of with greater expedition and facility. Under my proposal the master will be not merely an officer of the court but a constituent part of the court.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I think the purpose of the amendment is to facilitate hearings, particularly of cases under the Commonwealth Matrimonial Causes Act.

Mr. Dunstan: That is the main purpose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At one stage an amendment to our legislation was prepared that was designed to give the master wider powers so that he could exercise some of the powers of courts under that legislation. The Commonwealth legisation provided that cases under it should be heard by the courts of the various States, and many contrary views were expressed by eminent legal authorities about what power could be exercised in the administration of Commonwealth law other than by a court. In New South Wales a judge in bankruptcy was appointed. I believe one other State had a set-up similar to that which we had before the Commonwealth entered the field, when the master did much

preliminary work that the judges are compelled under the Commonwealth legislation to do. I am concerned about this matter (although not so much about the amendment) as it is obvious that the jurisdiction of a court must be unchallengeable. Otherwise, a divorce might be granted and the action be questioned, with all sorts of complications if the parties married again. In these circumstances the Government hesitated to pass legislation along the lines of this amendment.

If members study the statutory rules made by the Commonwealth Government they will see that they set out clearly what a judge may do and that the word "judge" is used everywhere. They provide, for instance, that "the judge shall hear the application", "where a judge is satisfied", and so on. To get over this problem, I think it would be necessary to make the Master of the Supreme Court technically a judge. The Law Society of South Australia wrote to me about this matter to the effect that if anything were to be done it should be done before the Commonwealth legislation was passed, as it could not be done afterwards. The Chief Justice at one stage said that the court had to be taken as it existed and that it could not be altered. In other words, he considered that after the Commonwealth law had been passed the court was the court as it existed then.

This is the problem that the Committee now has before it—whether the Commonwealth legislation or its application can be altered by an amendment made in this House that would allow the court power to make statutory rules to up-grade the master in certain of his duties. The problem is really whether we can overcome a statutory rule of the Commonwealth by allowing judges to delegate certain of their authority to the master. I suggest to the honourable member that rather than rush into this matter it would be better if he let it slide, and I shall write to the Commonwealth Attorney-General setting out what we desire to do and asking whether the Commonwealth concurs and, if it does, whether it will if necessary amend its rules or regulations accordingly. If the Commonwealth would do this, it would facilitate the work of our courts greatly because much of this trumpery work could be done by the master. We did not want the jurisdiction of the court, at some stage after a matrimonial cause had been decided, to be upset by a claim that it had been done irregularly as the court could not exercise the power in the way that it had been exercised. This matter would have to stand over until the beginning of next session but, if the Commonwealth Government were prepared to agree to it, it would facilitate the work of the court. It would mean that the Commonwealth statutory rules might have to be altered somewhat but, as they exist today, I doubt whether even if we passed the amendment it would be competent for the work to be done in the proposed way.

I believe that Western Australia is doing something along the lines that the honourable member wants so, if that is the case, we should not have any trouble in getting some agreement with the Commonwealth upon it. Let the honourable member consider that suggestion. If he is prepared to accept that, I ask the Committee at this stage not to pass the amendment and I give the assurance that I will see that the matter is taken up with the Commonwealth Attorney-General to see if we can make some satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. DUNSTAN: On that assurance from the Premier (and I am glad that he agrees in principle with the intention of our amendment on this score), I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1825.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support the second reading of this Bill, the purpose of which is to make the necessary administrative provisions for carrying out certain sections of the Commonwealth Marriage Act, which has so far not been proclaimed. Portions of this Act have been under challenge, a challenge which, apparently, has been successfully resisted. The effect of the amendments is to provide that the Registrar shall be able to make the necessary alterations on a register to allow for the legitimation of a child, not only that child whose parents were married, there having been no bar to the marriage at the time the child was born, but also that illegitimate child when there was some bar to the marriage of the parents at the time of its birth. They will be able to be legitimated, and the legitimation will not only remove some stigma from the child but will also have certain important ramifications where property is concerned.

Most testators, unfortunately, do not realize that, when they put the word "child" into a will, that means "legitimate child" unless there is something on the face of the will or something specifically arising from the circumstances which must have necessitated the testator's contemplating that "child" included "illegitimate child". Many children in South Australia have been deprived of property that I believe it was the testator's intention to pass to them, simply because of that provision. This alteration of the Commonwealth law by the carrying out of the provisions here will do something to remove an unfortunate situation for those people. It is a commendable Bill and should receive the support of every member.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill and ask the Minister if what I think happens now will still happen in the future. I had, prior to entering this House, sat many times on the adoption bench and listened to the cases being put forward for adoption. When parents were seeking to adopt a child or to legitimate the birth of their child, I always heard the magistrate advise them that the children should be told at a fairly tender age so that they would get used to the idea of what had happened, that their birth had been legitimated by the subsequent marriage of the parents, because in due course if for any reason those children had to produce a birth certificate, the fact of their birth having been legitimated was noted on the certificate of registration of birth. Will that practice continue or will this Bill remove what could be a stigma on a child in so far as the fact that it was an illegitimate child at the time of its birth still appears on the registration of birth?

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of principal Act, section 45."

Mrs. STEELE: In the past the fact of a child's illegitimacy has been recorded on its birth certificate, even though its parents' subsequent marriage legitimates it. This means that if, later, the child has to produce his birth certificate, this fact is noted on it. Frequently, when hearing adoption applications the magistrate pleads with parents to tell the child at an early stage in life that it is adopted otherwise it can have a disastrous effect on the child. Can the Minister say whether the Bill will affect this situation or will the practice of endorsing the birth certificate continue?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): As I see it, this Bill automatically legitimates children on the marriage of their parents. At present action has to be taken to legitimate a child, even though his parents may marry. That procedure will no longer be necessary. The Bill authorizes the Registrar to note the fact that a child's parents have married. This automatically brings in a train of consequential actions related to property rights and so forth.

Mrs. STEELE: At present the fact of a child's illegitimacy is recorded on the actual birth certificate and if later in life he has to produce that certificate that fact becomes known and is a stigma. If a child's birth is legitimated, why should his illegitimacy be recorded on the birth certificate? Will this Bill alter that position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A child's illegitimacy is noted on his birth certificate and the Bill does not alter that procedure. The later marriage of his parents will not remove the endorsement from the birth certificate. I think this is an aspect that might be examined to see whether this defect can be remedied.

Mrs. STEELE: Will this matter be taken up so that there will be no discrimination against a child who is subsequently legitimated?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The difficulty is that birth certificates contain a record of parents' marriages. The last form of certificate was published in the *Government Gazette* in 1948. In the original birth certificate of an illegitimate child no date of marriage is shown for his parents. The Bill will enable the Registrar to note on a birth certificate that a child has been legitimated. The fact that the parents were not married at the date of birth will still show unless an entirely new form is prescribed in which the marriage date is not required. That form, of course, would have to apply to every birth. This is a matter that needs to be examined.

Mr. QUIRKE: This is an important question, and something should be done about it. As I understand the position, if people adopt a child and later in life that child has to produce a birth certificate, the certificate reveals to everybody that the child was born illegitimate. Surely a form could be devised that would not reveal that information? With the present procedure an illegitimate child is branded for life, even though his birth may have been subsequently legitimated.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 and 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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.

BROWN HILL CREEK SPEED LIMIT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That the speed zone regulation respecting speed through Brown Hill Creek public pleasure resort, made on September 20, 1962, and laid on the table of this House on September 25, 1962, be disallowed.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I second the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This regulation imposes a speed limit of 15 miles an hour on the portion of a road extending for 34 chains through the Brown Hill Creek public pleasure resort. I point out to members who, like me, do not deal with chains very much that that is almost half a mile. The regulation of which I am now moving the disallowance on behalf of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, replaces a regulation that was similar in all respects except that it imposed a speed limit of eight miles an hour over the same amount of roadway. That regulation, laid on the table during this present session, was subsequently revoked by the Government after notice of disallowance had been given but not debated in this Chamber.

A caravan park is situated in the national pleasure resort at Brown Hill Creek, and although it has been a national pleasure resort for, I think, about 40 or 45 years, the caravan park itself was set up there only in about 1947 or 1948. Farther up the Brown Hill Creek road—up the gully itself—there are a number of market gardens and orchard properties. This is an old settlement and those properties have been worked in many cases for about 100 years, so they will ante-date by probably 50 years or so the national pleasure resort itself and by 70 or 80 years the actual caravan park. At present about 50 people—who, incidentally, are my electors (although that is not relevant here)—either work or live, or both, on these properties, and they must use this road on which the speed limit has been imposed to get into and out of their properties. They cannot go around by another road because there is none: there is no alternative way for them to get in or out. They are at the top of a gully, and they must use the road, upon which this speed limit has been imposed, that runs through the gully.

It was from representatives of those 50 or so people who live there that we first received complaints about the original regulation imposing an eight miles an hour speed limit. That regulation has gone by the board. This afternoon I tabled for the information of members the evidence given by the three representatives of those people—Messrs. Grigg, Tilley and Williams—and also the evidence given by Brigadier McKinna in his capacity as Chairman of the Road Traffic Board.

Mr. Clark: How long is the road?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About three miles. As I said, that evidence was tabled this afternoon. Evidence was tabled some two or three months ago by the same people and by Mr. Pollnitz (who is in charge of the caravan park by virtue of his official position as Director of the Tourist Bureau) on the old by-law, and that is still available for members to see if they wish to do so. That evidence shows that at the peak of the season, which is around about Christmas time, there are about 300 caravans in the caravan park, probably housing about 1,000 people.

Mr. Hall: Are they on each side of the road?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Jenkins: Do those people have to cross the road for camp facilities?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; there is a shop on one side of the road and the lavatories and bathrooms and other things on the other side. The evidence, which I think has been agreed by all parties, shows that the park is used only to any substantial extent from about September through to Easter time, reaching a peak at Christmas. The patronage is patchy, really: it is quite full at Easter and probably not very full at other times, and so on. At times other than from September through to Easter the park is used very little indeed. One of the members of the committee, during the visit of the King and Queen of Siam about two months ago, went up there himself privately to have a look, and he found at that time only one caravan in the park. Yesterday when the committee itself inspected the area we counted 16 caravans and two tents, which

appeared to be apart from the caravans, making a total of 18 groups of people in the park.

The original complaint we had from the residents at the other end of the creek was both as to the speed limit itself, which then was eight miles an hour, and as to the distance of the 34 chains over which it was imposed. It was submitted to the committee that neither was necessary to protect campers and that it was just an irritation to drive over this length of roadway at such a speed. The only complaint which, in the opinion of the committee, is now justified is the length of roadway over which the speed limit of 15 miles an hour is imposed. The committee does not disagree with the limit of 15 miles an hour where it is required to protect campers in the caravan park, but the length of roadway affected by this limit is 34 chains day in and day out all the year round.

Mr. Jenkins: How much of the 34 chains is occupied by the caravan park?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When we inspected the area yesterday there were 16 caravans over a distance that I paced with Black Rod at 140 steps, which is about 120 yards or six chains. Over that distance protection is required, and the committee has no quarrel with that. However, there is no need for a speed limit for the remaining 27 or 28 chains beyond the speed limit zone. Sometimes there may be only one caravan, or perhaps no caravan, and no limit is then required. At other times there may be 300 caravans there and the speed limit over the whole distance is probably justified.

Mr. Jenkins: This regulation cannot be varied, can it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it can. I have some suggestions to make on behalf of the committee.

Mr. Lawn: I can offer you a suggestion—you are wasting your time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so, and the honourable member is entitled to his opinion but I am sure he will agree that it is a complete aggravation to any motorist to have to observe a general speed limit when it is patently not necessary to do so. This makes people cross, and Parliament recognizes that. I remind members that certain speed limits are laid down in the Road Traffic Act passed last year that operate only at certain times. A speed limit of 15 miles an hour is imposed when passing a school or playground but it operates only at a time when children are proceeding to or from the school or playground.

Mr. Hall: For that reason it loses some of its effectiveness.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may, but as late as last year Parliament laid down a speed limit of 15 miles an hour past a school. That does not apply for 24 hours a day seven days a week: it applies only when there is danger—when children are entering or leaving a school. The limit applies at school pedestrian crossings only when the lights are flashing—again for the same reason. A speed limit is imposed when passing works in progress on roads, but it applies only when signs showing the speed limit are placed on the roads. This is done because it is an aggravation to a motorist to have to drive at a speed lower than the general limit when it is obviously unnecessary to do so.

Mr. Bywaters: Are you putting an alternative?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I shall come to that in a moment. Before doing so, I emphasize that the committee has no quarrel with the limit of 15 miles an hour past the encampment, however extensive it may be at any particular time. I remind members that under section 176 of the Road Traffic Act passed last year there is power to make a regulation that can be varied. Section 176 (1) provides:

> The Governor may make regulations for or with respect to all or any of the following matters, namely:
>
> (*m*) declaring that any regulation or any provision of any regulation made under this section shall be subject to limitations in respect to the hours, days, or period in which it applies, or the circumstances, roads, locality, or class of vehicles to which it applies;

It seems to the committee that there is clear power under the Road Traffic Act to make a regulation that can be varied to suit the requirements in this area. Section 49 (1) (*e*) lays down in itself, without any regulation, a speed limit of 15 miles an hour on a portion of a road between signs indicating such a speed. I consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman and he thought, after looking at the matter quickly, that I was right in assuming that it would be competent for the Road Traffic Board, if this regulation were disallowed, to put up signs on whatever areas were appropriate in Brown Hill Creek and move them from time to time. There is specific power to do that under this section without the necessity to make a regulation. Perhaps I am wrong in this, although I do not think I am. It is more likely that this power was overlooked when the regulation was framed.

It seems to me that a speed limit of 15 miles an hour between signs can be laid down and enforced.

Mr. Hall: The Road Traffic Board is not infallible, you know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the honourable member would be interested in the evidence given by Mr. McKinna (Commissioner of Police) this morning. I think what he said bears out my alternative contention. I asked him whether under that regulation-making power a regulation could be made providing for variations in time and distance, and he replied:

There is no reason why, if someone can control these signs, an area should not be contracted where only two caravans are situated and expanded where there are 2,000.

That is a slight exaggeration, of course. I then asked him:

There is power under section 176 (*m*) of the Road Traffic Act to make a regulation of that nature?

He said:

I think so. The hours do not matter because if a caravan is present the speed limit will apply for 24 hours a day, but the distance at which these signs can be placed apart will be the main problem.

I then asked:

Would it be possible to make such a regulation?

He replied:

In view of the fact that there is a caretaker there who can look after the signs, yes, if we can control varying distances. As it is done by persons working on the roads where road construction is proceeding, I see no reason why that should not apply in this instance.

My final question was:

Do you agree that probably for eight or nine months of the year it is quite unnecessary to have a speed limit covering the whole of this distance?

That, of course, has been my contention in this House today. He replied, "Very definitely." We cannot have more direct evidence than that. Our contention is that it seems completely unfair for those who have no alternative route to and from their homes to have to travel at 15 m.p.h. all the time for a distance of 34 chains when it is unnecessary in order to achieve the object for which the regulation has been passed: that is, to protect campers in the caravan park. It is unnecessary to impose that burden on those people when, as I have suggested (and I am confident that this is correct) there are at least two alternative ways in which they can be given the necessary protection when and over the distance for which it is required. I, therefore, sincerely ask the House to accept my motion. I emphasize again that as a committee (and this was a unanimous decision of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation) we are anxious to ensure the safety of those using the park—although, incidentally, it has a good safety record so far, but it could be done more effectively and more justly in another way.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I hope sincerely that the House will not agree to the disallowance of this regulation. I say advisedly that, if the House disallows it, it will be responsible for an occasion that I think is bound to occur this year. In the first place, the honourable member has mentioned that in his opinion there is no need for this regulation. He has said that many times. He suggests that on the opinion of somebody who does not live in the area. The caretaker of the reserve has never been called by the committee; no attempt has been made to get local informaion about why the regulation has been brought in, but the Commissioner of Police has been asked for some information about it. He could not know what the happenings were in this area or the reason for the promulgation of this regulation.

When this matter was previously before the House, the honourable member said he thought eight miles an hour was too low. I notice now that the official reason for the regulation (it was not a reason given by the honourable member in his speech) was that it was undue trespass on rights previously established by law. This land is Crown land. The Mitcham council has never taken over this road as a road, although it has been invited to. It runs through Government property and a tourist camp. The Government, desirous of meeting the wishes of the people who have used the road for so long, excluded it from the actual control of the Tourist Bureau. So we have now a road on Crown land going through a narrow Tourist Bureau reserve. The best evidence I can put before the House is that which came to me asking that this regulation be made. If any honourable member wants to read these documents, they are available to him. This is a report by the caretaker, who was not called to give evidence before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation:

I am hereby forwarding some notes of happenings with regard to the camping area speed limit on this reserve.

Views of Local Residents: When notice boards were erected to the approaches to this section of the reserve, the majority of people

living at the top of the reserve considered it was reasonable especially as young children often wandered onto the roadway. One person felt that, if it had not been for the notice and had he been travelling as fast after the notice as before, he most certainly would have run over a child. He was white and shaken as he spoke to me. There are approximately 15 families with vehicles that use the reserve road. There are five market gardens. One gardener felt that it was absurd to have a caravan park here. Another one's son was asked by me to please try and observe a reasonable speed. He was travelling approximately at 35 miles an hour with a heavy trailer fully laden. His reply, leaving out the bad language, was, "The notice and law was too silly to be of any value. The Tourist Bureau was just so much certain paper, he would not be bothered by any of them and he would drive through as he pleased." This person for some time would speed through the camp especially if he saw any of the N.P.R. men about.

Incidents of speeding through camp: During school holidays I have pulled up vehicles and the drivers have admitted to travelling at 45 miles an hour. Weekends, when campers are few—

this is the time when the honourable member says there is no need for anything to happen—

motorists out for the day take advantage of the lawns and playground; quite a few of these people have passed the remark that some of the speedsters were going to kill someone before very long. One girl was hit in the back by a motor cyclist. His estimated speed was 25 miles an hour. His motor cycle was 25 paces further on than the girl. (This did happen before notices were erected.) Christmas campers would total 200 families. The campers continually complained of the speed used on the camp area during this peak period. One truck driver I motioned to slow down in the camp just put his head out of the window and yelled . . .

I'd just had dinner too. The visitors were thoughtful enough to suggest it should be reported to the police, but as on many other occasions one must be mighty quick to obtain the number of a fast-moving vehicle, especially if you are expecting them to slow down. Some Sundays and quite often of a night, we have people racing each other. I have seen as many as five cars come down the road and swing on to the lawns to try and pass the car in front. Last Sunday—

this is one of the periods when the honourable member says that the camp should not be controlled—

August 5, 1962, two motor cars racing down the reserve road caused some boy scouts to get well off the road. The estimated speed was at least 50 miles an hour. At the entrance to the park there have been several accidents. One vehicle hit an electricity pole, concrete and steel. The pole needed replacing. The vehicle was further on. Almost at the same spot another vehicle failed because of speed to take the slight turn, hit a fence and turned over lengthways. These vehicles could not have come through the reserve at a reasonable speed to have been travelling so fast, so close to the reserve. The roadway referred to where the speed limit is requested is 18ft. wide. Campers and caravans are kept 10ft. back from the edge of the road, as requested by the Tourist Bureau.

Inquiries I have made to campers prove to me that this camp is very popular except for the speed. Every year, even in the off-season, I have known people to leave the reserve because it was unsafe. I would say that 90 per cent of holiday people are from various States, including people from all walks of life, and I would not be able to guarantee that any one of them would say the speed is reasonable. Victorian detectives who stayed here were amazed that it was allowed to continue. One visitor that left this area told me before he left that he would not be in my shoes for any money if some child were fatally injured. He kind of thought that I should pass it on to someone else before it happened.

"Lunatics". Unfortunately that was the most common name used. It was with regard to a crowd of young people in a motor vehicle, time approximately 2.30 a.m., a roaring motor, then a squeal of brakes, "Oh, so sorry, I think they have a speed limit hereabouts." This happened three times in half an hour. I waited on their re-entrance but they did not come back.

Before closing these notes I feel that as a pleasure resort it should be known that apart from the caravan people, the attraction of Brown Hill Creek for picnic parties, boy scouts, girl guides, schoolchildren in buses with teachers, leave the buses for nature study. Scotch College use the reserve for portion of their cross-country training. Other college boys out training can be seen every night running up and down the road if there are many campers, but they find it safer when they can to use camping area.

Locals speed. The people that live in Brown Hill Creek do speed, but at peak periods they do show more consideration than some of the young chaps that are strangers to the district. A point of interest as to the popularity of this park by interstate visitors as a holiday resort—since 1956 to 1962 approximately 19,500 receipts have been issued.

I have a similar report written at another time drawing attention to the foolish speeds and the reckless behaviour of motorists on this narrow road through a popular resort. Campers have to cross the road to get to facilities. What is more important is that children play on the sides of the hills and once they start running down a hill they cannot stop until they get well out on to level ground. The honourable member suggested previously that we had provisions relating to driving to the danger of the public, but convictions cannot be obtained for this offence unless an accident happens, and so far as I am concerned it is too late then. It has been

suggested that a speed limit of 15 miles an hour is irksome, but how often do motorists have to stop at stop signs?

Mr. Shannon: What distance is involved at the reserve?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Only 34 chains, or two minutes in time.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you provide for a 15 mile an hour limit past schools all the time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This camp is occupied all the time. The honourable member has referred to his committee, but I point out that this has become more of a district matter than a committee matter, because this notice was given before the committee even considered the regulation.

Mr. Fred Walsh: A small part only of the district is involved.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That may be so, but the fact remains that this is an area used extensively by children, and not only children from the camp but by schoolchildren as well. This area was purchased for recreation purposes, but the Government did not want to inconvenience landholders further up the creek so it provided a right of way. I do not think the local landholders would object to the proposed speed limit seeing that the Government provided that right of way. If they drove through the area as fast as they could it would probably take them one-and-a-half minutes in any event. The Government withdrew a previous regulation when the member for Mitcham suggested that the proposed speed limit of eight miles an hour was too restrictive, but I doubt whether under all the circumstances that speed was too restrictive. However, I referred his objection to the Road Traffic Board and subsequently the present regulation was introduced. The honourable member has suggested that the speed limit area could be changed from day to day, but evidence from the caretaker's report indicates that motorists are always speeding and that such a proposal would not meet the circumstances. In the interests of the safety of children I ask the House not to disallow this regulation.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I endorse what the Premier has said. I have camped in this area which is undoubtedly one of the best camping areas, if not the best, in South Australia. It is extremely popular. When I was there I noticed that some motorists did speed. Incidentally, I have traversed that road to its limit—as far as the market gardens—and I know what it is like. If no caravan park were there, 30 to 35 miles an hour would be the safest top speed to drive on that narrow, winding road. I totally disagree with the suggestion that movable signs could be provided, because children do not confine themselves to crossing the road where the caravans and tents are sited: they wander anywhere along that road. It would certainly not meet the requirement to move the signs from time to time.

I believe that the suggestion of inconvenience has been greatly exaggerated. At Whyalla we have a quarter of a mile of good bitumen road that passes a playground—and not a school playground—on which a 15 mile an hour limit applies. That speed limit has to be observed when children are playing in the playground. It is not easy to see whether children are there because of the trees, but that limit works well and no-one complains about it. It is not true to say that this regulation would cause great inconvenience, particularly when we have regard to the few people involved. If motorists cannot slow down for a couple of minutes there is something wrong with them. Surely their lives do not depend on their getting through a narrow road two minutes faster than they could if this regulation did not apply? The regulation is perfectly sound and I hope members will oppose the motion for disallowance.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the motion. I think the House should consider the fact that whilst we all admit that it is the inalienable right of the House to disagree with any recommendations of its subordinate committees, surely we appoint committees for some purpose, and the Subordinate Legislation Committee has genuinely and sincerely gone into this matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It called evidence only from the Commissioner of Police regarding the necessity for the regulation.

Mr. Millhouse: No, we called evidence from Mr. Pollnitz, too; I tabled that evidence two months ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Enfield.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is rather interesting that the Premier seems much more agitated about this matter than its importance warrants; that surely is significant in itself. The Premier has suggested that the caretaker should have been consulted. Admittedly, the committee did not consult the caretaker, but surely if the caretaker had some evidence to offer he had plenty of time and capacity to get

in touch with the committee. I think it is fairly obvious from the Premier's remarks that he has not been along the road in question lately. References have been made about being up the creek, but I think it is fairly obvious that the Premier has not been on that road lately.

Admittedly, there are great dangers in this area; I think we all agree on that. We went there in a Government car with a professional driver, and we asked him to keep his speed down to 15 miles an hour in this restricted area, but when we looked at his speedometer we saw that he was doing 20 miles an hour. I think that shows very clearly that the regulation is quite absurd, and I do not think it could work. Somebody—I think it might have been the Premier—referred to foolish drivers, reckless behaviour, and so on; but, Mr. Speaker, the point about this is that no law will prevent fools from driving at an excessive speed, and no law will prevent reckless driving either. That, surely, should be in the discretion of the driver.

Mr. Bywaters: Wouldn't spoon drains overcome it?

Mr. JENNINGS: I should not like to make any more hazards on the road than there are now. I believe that the motion should be agreed to.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): This has certainly developed into an interesting debate at the end of the session, as all traffic problems develop at such times. When I first heard of this disallowance motion my first thoughts were to oppose it because it is better to err on the side of safety. Then I was practically convinced otherwise by the member for Mitcham's very good exposition of his motion for this disallowance. However, since hearing the report given by the Premier from that very loquacious caretaker who is so proficient at writing reports, I am sure now that the evidence points back to my original thoughts of opposing the motion.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member seconded the motion.

Mr. HALL: Does that preclude me from speaking against it, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No; the honourable member only seconded it *pro forma.*

Mr. HALL: I did so because at that time I was 90 per cent in favour of the motion.

Mr. Hughes: That shows how much you studied the question.

Mr. HALL: I have not been to the area in question, but am I to be influenced by personalities or by the evidence presented to me? I listened to the evidence as presented.

Mr. Hughes: You had no right to second the motion.

Mr. HALL: Nonsense. The crucial point of this is the vote.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Gouger is quite in order; he seconded the motion *pro forma.*

Mr. Fred Walsh: Does he support it?

Mr. HALL: I wish to make myself quite plain. The member for Mitcham has said that if this regulation is disallowed we can perhaps leave it to the Road Traffic Board to bring in some other regulation. That is the essence of his substitute arrangement. I have faith in the Road Traffic Board to do a reasonably good job, but the board is not infallible: it does not do the right thing on every occasion. I can point to instances where the board has failed to act and serious accidents have resulted from that failure to act; it has only been through Ministerial intervention that it has acted in the end. We will be leaving a loophole that will jeopardize the safety of the people who use this camping area if we leave it once more to the Road Traffic Board to protect the area. I am sure that it is up to members to support the regulation, because by so allowing the regulation to stand at least there will be immediate protection for this area.

Mr. Millhouse: You will at least hold your mind open awaiting my reply?

Mr. HALL: I cannot see what more significant evidence the member for Mitcham has.

Mr. Millhouse: I think I can demolish much of what the Premier has said.

Mr. HALL: I am not fully convinced by the Premier's argument. The member for Mitcham has said that if we have a movable sign we can alter the length of this restricted area according to the use of the camp.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Do you think you could keep the children always inside those limits?

Mr. HALL: I do not think that comes into it. There must be some defined area, and the children will always tend to get away from it. Obviously the restriction on 34 chains will not be sufficient to protect all the children in their wanderings from the camp. If we alter this length, perhaps from day to day or from week to week, we will not have strict observance of the regulation. It is one of the failings of school crossings that they operate for only a limited period of time, and undoubtedly that leads to non-observance of the law by many

motorists who think that it is only perhaps five minutes before or after the operative time and they speed by. If the law is to act fully it must act similarly all the time, and in this case it must act for the same length of distance all the time. I hope I have made myself quite plain. I seconded this motion, but I have had a good look at it and I now oppose it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this motion, and am amazed that such a matter should come before this House. The choice is between two minutes and a life. This is a most popular pleasure resort and at any time many people may be there.

Mr. Bywaters: If only one caravan were there, that would be sufficient to justify this limit.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, because even then there could be children who could wander away and be knocked down. If the member for Mitcham studies traffic statistics he will see that accidents occur not in Rundle Street where there are many people but on the open road where there are few people and little traffic. This happens because people think that, because traffic is light, they can travel at a high speed.

Mr. Millhouse: Then perhaps the limit can be taken off in a busy time!

Mr. HUTCHENS: I shall not be drawn into an argument by the interjection. The tourist trade is important to the economy of this State and I am sure every member would do everything possible to increase it. This reserve is acknowledged as an attractive place but, no matter how attractive an area in scenery and facilities, if it is a death trap people will not take their families there.

Mr. Jenkins: We would take our mothers-in-law there.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Then the honourable member's experience has been different from mine. I respect my mother-in-law, whom I have never given any reason to be unkind to me. I should not be prepared to take my mother-in-law or anybody, particularly a child, to this reserve unless there were a speed limit. I think this motion has been motivated by something other than consideration for others, and, in the interests of the safety of people who will visit it, of the tourist trade and of the economy of this State, I hope the House will reject it.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I oppose this motion. The area we are discussing is a pleasure resort that is also a means of access to certain houses, but the owners of those houses realize that the road they use goes through a public pleasure resort. Because of this, they cannot expect to have the facilities afforded by a highway.

Mr. Millhouse: These properties were there 50 years before the pleasure resort.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but it is a pleasure resort now, and nothing is more likely to keep people away from a resort than cars speeding through it. If people take children to a place where there are speeding cars it is a place not of relaxation but of worry and concern. At double the speed provided in the regulation, it would take two minutes to travel the 34 chains of this road. The saving by lifting the limit would therefore be only one minute, and to obtain this saving the protection of the area as a safe place for campers and children to enjoy themselves would be removed.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I, too, oppose the motion. One must have some knowledge of the area to appreciate the position. I cannot understand why the mover has persisted now that the original regulation has been disallowed. I would have agreed with the original motion to disallow a speed limit of eight miles an hour because that would have been too restrictive, but I think 15 miles an hour is a reasonable speed. A person driving at this speed can stop within a yard or so. Although the Premier read from the caretaker's report that people travelled at 50 miles an hour on this road, I do not think this is possible after passing the bridge. Because of the winding nature of the road, a driver travelling at this speed would finish in either the hospital or the morgue. Perhaps motor cycles could travel at this speed, but they, too, would be taking a risk.

Although the pleasure resort is limited to the caravan park and its surrounding area, and the speed limit applies to only 34 chains, children and adults walk along the gully almost up to the place where private property is situated. I would not object if the road on which the limit is imposed were extended right up to the entrance of the market garden at the end. A dairying property is situated along the road and the occupier could be concerned about the possibility of speeding vehicles colliding with and injuring his cattle.

In opposing this regulation, I think the committee has been unable to forget that the original limit was eight miles an hour. I think the later provision should have caused it to change its mind, particularly because, as

we all know, a certain tolerance is allowed on any speed limit. In all the years in which I have been a member of this House I have never known a member to second a motion and then oppose it. I did not know that this conformed to Standing Orders, but apparently it did, as you, Mr. Speaker, accepted it. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) was confused when he seconded the motion and again when he spoke. Perhaps he is always confused.

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

Mr. FRED WALSH: Finally, it is obvious that the motion for the disallowance of this regulation was prompted in the interests of four or five, or six at the most, landholders as against the interests of the people who use that resort. The theme of the regulation is the protection of people who use the resort for pleasure and the protection of children, about which we all, even the member for Mitcham, are concerned. I credit him with being just as concerned with the protection of children as any of us. We have to continue to think of the safety of children. These landholders who are complaining about the regulation receive the benefit of the Tourist Bureau's taking over this area and the provision of the road in its present condition.

Mr. Millhouse: The road has been there for years.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I know, and I can remember when it was not really a road; it was nothing but potholes. If the Mitcham council was responsible for it, it never carried out its obligations; it was not concerned about the landholders although they were the ones paying the rates in those days. But, even then, before the Tourist Bureau took over, this area was used as a tourist resort—and not only where the present caravan park is but all the way along to the private gateway at the end of the road. The House needs to consider the motive behind the regulation. I should not have supported it had the original restriction been adhered to but, as it has been altered to 15 miles an hour, which is reasonable, I oppose the motion.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I oppose the motion. I have been associated with camping grounds for many years—in fact, with what would probably be the premier camping ground in South Australia. Although there is no public road through it, about 3,000 people go there during the busy times of the year. A 5 miles an hour limit operates on the roads inside the camping ground. Apart from the attraction of such a fine reserve as this to tourists, a camping ground of this nature provides a holiday for the man with a family who cannot afford to go to a seaside resort and stay in a hotel because of the charges. Therefore, if he is to be denied safety for his children, this will deter a family man going to this place for a holiday. The first consideration must be the safety of the children, anyway. A 15 miles an hour limit in this area is reasonable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): First, I thank honourable members for their interest in this matter and for the attention and fire that has entered the debate so far. I want to clear up some points because I am afraid there is much misconception about the motives prompting the committee to move for the disallowance of the regulation and what we propose in its place. The Premier, who unfortunately opposes the motion, said one or two things to which, frankly, I did not take kindly (if I may use that neutral term). He first of all suggested that the committee called no-one who knew the local conditions. Perhaps I could point out to him that the landholders who gave evidence know the local conditions. I happen to have some nodding acquaintance with the conditions in this area, which is in my district, a district in which I have spent practically the whole of my life. I know the Brown Hill Creek reserve and the caravan park. I claim to have some idea of the local conditions. But, be all those things as they may, let us remember what I said in my speech when I moved this motion, and which was conveniently forgotten: that we had before us two months ago on the regulation that preceded this one Mr. Pollnitz (Director of the Tourist Bureau) to give evidence about the conditions in this area and whether there was the need for a regulation. I mentioned that when I moved the motion. This caravan park comes under his jurisdiction and control. He knew the facts and he quoted to us from reports he had received from the caretaker of the park. I propose to refer the House to several passages in his evidence. I say that definitely because it has been suggested that I should not: but I propose to do it because the Premier, when he was speaking, used some of the remarks I had made in questioning the witness. I suggest that he should not have done that, if he did not desire me to have the right to use that evidence, too. What did Mr. Pollnitz say on this matter? I asked:

What are the busy times of the year in this park?

He replied:

The Christmas school holidays particularly and Easter is also busy, and the May and September school holidays to a lesser extent. Brown Hill Creek is used largely by interstate visitors.

He was replying not to a leading question; I was simply eliciting information. My next question was:

You would agree that in the slack times there may be only two or three caravans in the park?

He replied, "That is so." I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members note the next sentence:

It is one of those difficult things where you need only strict control when conditions warrant it.

That is precisely what I said in moving the motion and is precisely the object behind the motion itself and what was in the minds of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. I then asked:

How do you suggest that we get over that?

He replied:

I think I made a previous confession that I did not know the answer to that one.

I have already suggested two alternative methods to get over it. I have deliberately quoted from his evidence to refute the Premier's suggestion that we did not take any evidence on local conditions in this area. The Premier made much about the safety of children, and other members have properly done the same. Let me repeat what I said earlier, that no-one is more anxious to protect the safety of children than am I. The other members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee feel the same. We all have children of our own, and even if we did not we would have that anxiety. Don't let it be said again that we are careless of the interests of the children in this area. I know this area well. Indeed, 20 years ago I was one of the children who played in the area, as was, apparently, the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). Incidentally, the children in the area do not run up and down the hill as the Premier thinks they do. Like the children of my day, they use motor car mudguards to slide on. We played there when there was no speed limit in the park and before there was a caravan park. Children have used that area for many years. In all seriousness I ask the Premier and the other members who have spoken, how many children would they expect to find playing in this area at 5 o'clock on a winter's morning? How many would they expect to find there at all at that time of the year? Of course, the answer is "None", yet this speed limit will apply all the time. It will apply as much during the winter as it will apply at Christmas when the area is filled with children.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The honourable member does not want it to apply unless there are thousands of children there. He proposes to disallow the regulation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. As I have said, tomorrow morning the Road Traffic Board, under section 49 (1) of the Road Traffic Act, could erect signs there without any regulation. It could erect signs at places and at times of the year when it was convenient to protect those who were in the caravan park.

Mr. Coumbe: What would the speed limit be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The speed that is laid down under that section—15 miles an hour.

Mr. Coumbe: Then why persist in this motion for disallowance?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because specific power is in the Act to cater for these circumstances and to permit the moving of the speed signs when it is convenient to do so.

Mr. Dunstan: You want the speed limit only at certain times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want it whenever there are caravans in the park and wherever it is necessary to protect those who are in the caravan park, even if at certain times the distance involved is half a mile.

Mr. Clark: Who would decide the times?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have quoted the evidence of the Commissioner of Police who is the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board. He answered that question. The caretaker of the park—the man who wrote the report—is there all the time and it would be his job. He knows the conditions, and he knows how many people are there.

Mr. Shannon: Why didn't you call him as a witness?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We called Mr. Pollnitz.

Mr. Shannon: But the caretaker would know—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The caretaker has not the slightest power—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course he has.

Mr. Coumbe: What did Mr. Pollnitz say?

The SPEAKER: Order! If we had one speaker at a time we would get on better.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier said that the caretaker has not the slightest power, but I should like the Premier to get a report from the Crown Solicitor—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We did, and the regulation is the Crown Solicitor's production.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was the production of the Road Traffic Board.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is a regulation advocated by the Crown Solicitor.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps we had better adjourn and make up our minds.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps the Crown Solicitor overlooked section 49 (1).

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I read the signs of the House aright, I am not getting a sympathetic hearing.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is the best judge of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I am.

Mr. Clark: I don't think you are getting through somehow.

Mr. Dunstan: Well, that is not entirely his fault.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you! I am glad of that interjection.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You are drawing a little support from an unexpected quarter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I always get support from the member for Norwood when he thinks I deserve it. Let me remind members of the position at schools. I mentioned this before, but it was conveniently brushed aside by all members. The speed limit of 15 miles an hour past a school does not apply the full 24 hours of the day, but only when children are going in and coming out of school. Surely there is the same degree of danger there as there is at this reserve.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Children do not camp in schools.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but they are entering and leaving school to some extent all the time. If members wanted to make that safe they would provide for a speed limit of 15 miles an hour past schools all the time.

Mr. Heaslip: Nonsense! Children are in school most of the day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and most of the time they are not at the caravan park.

Mr. Hall: Their presence at school is far more predictable than at a caravan park.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last year, in introducing the Road Traffic Bill, the Premier, when referring to speed limits, said:

> Good reasons have been advanced for each of these repeals. The level crossing limit has been very unpopular and is regarded as being unnecessary at numerous crossings where there is a clear view and few trains.

Of course, the speed limit was imposed originally in the interests of safety. I ask members to note the Premier's next comment:

> Motorists feel it is unjust to be punished for conduct which they consider to be safe and harmless.

That is the very point here. For eight and perhaps 10 months of the year it is perfectly safe and harmless for motorists to drive through this area—or nine-tenths of it—at speeds exceeding 15 miles an hour, yet they will be prohibited from doing that at any time.

Mr. Heaslip: What do they lose if they can't?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. I have never driven with the honourable member and do not know whether he drives fast or slowly. How would he like it if every time he left his home he had to drive a distance of almost half a mile at 15 miles an hour when there was no reason for it and no-one else about? Would the honourable member like to do it? Of course he would not. It is a complete irritation and aggravation, and all of us know that very well. These people must use the road: it is their only means of getting in and out of their houses and the places where they work.

Mr. Shannon: What really is the time factor involved: about two minutes, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that would be correct. At 5 o'clock on a cold winter's morning, when primary producers—and I have some in my district—are going to work, one minute is a considerable time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interruption.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can see that there is very little sympathy for those people in my district. There has been sympathy, much of it uncritical, for those who go to stay in the park, but very little, I am afraid, for those who live in this area and are affected by this regulation.

Mr. Clark: They have lost two minutes!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they have indeed. It is all very well for the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) to say that few people are involved in this. We, as members of this House, should be aware of the interests of the minority, even if only one person is involved, and to shrug them off carelessly, as the member for Whyalla did, is entirely wrong. Just because only a few people are involved, some people adopt the attitude that it does

not matter, and that is entirely wrong. I do not know how many members have heard the Premier tell the story of an experience he had when he was away at the First World War.

The SPEAKER: Is this Parliamentary?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is entirely above reproach, Mr. Speaker. Very frequently when I am considering matters in preparation for a Subordinate Legislation Committee meeting I think of the Premier's story about what happened when he went to the House of Commons at a very dark and serious time during the First World War. The Premier has often told us that when he went to the House of Commons he found that most of the day was taken up not with war news but with the case of Mary Smith, who had been arrested the night before under circumstances that did not warrant it. In other words, the House of Commons—and I can see the g'immer of recognition in the Premier's eye now—during the darkest period of the war was prepared to spend this time debating the rights of only one person. Yet here in this case, apparently, the rights already established by law are to be taken away. The Premier reflected on this matter, too. I remind the House that these people and their forebears have been farming this area, in the same way as the Premier and his forebears have been farming another part of the hills, for about a century.

Mr. Hall: They are not prohibited from using the area.

Mr. Loveday: What about the Aborigines? They were there before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure which tribe was in that area. These people are having rights previously established by law taken away by this regulation. All I wish is that I could induce the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) to spend a month up there; if he had to drive through this area over that period he would change his tune very quickly.

Mr. Shannon: Didn't they get their road through Government property for nothing?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This State is 130 years old, and every road has gone through Government property at some time or another. I suppose there are many roads in the district of Onkaparinga which were once on Government property. Does he think they should not have a road there at all?

Mr. Shannon: I understand that this road was specially made for these people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that the honourable member's understanding is incorrect.

Mr. Shannon: Wasn't this road constructed to give these people access when the reserve was established?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This road was there long before there was a national pleasure resort, and longer still before there was a caravan park. The people I am speaking of were there first.

Mr. Clark: What was the condition of the road before?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. Clark: I mean, at what speed could you travel over it before?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have allowed myself to be diverted time and time again—

The SPEAKER: I think you had better get back to the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I had better. The last point that I make in this fighting reply is this: I invite members of the House to consider what is likely to happen if this regulation stands. Do members seriously think that it will be observed, as every regulation or law that we put through here should be observed? Of course it will not be.

Mr. Shannon: Mr. Pak Poy says that it will be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a bad principle of the law that we should deliberately allow to stand a regulation that we know with almost complete confidence will be ignored for five-sixths of the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had better conclude; he is only making a reply, not a new speech.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have come to my last point, Mr. Speaker. It is a very bad principle for this House to sanction something that will be observed more in the breach than in the observance, and that is what will happen. There has been much levity over a matter which to me and to members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee is very serious. I admit that this is a matter that concerns my district, but I make no apology for that fact.

Mr. Hughes: You admit now that it is a district matter?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course it is.

Mr. Hughes: You shook your head this afternoon when the Premier suggested that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The same action would have been taken no matter which district had been concerned. I point out that this was not a motion that I moved on my own behalf: it

was a motion moved on behalf of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, after the committee had considered the matter carefully. We considered it our duty to move for the disallowance of the regulation. The matter has been aired in the House, and thereby I suppose we have discharged our duty. I have no regrets at all for bringing this matter forward, and I am still convinced—and I ask the House to support me in this—that the regulation should be disallowed.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (8).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Dunstan, Freebairn, Jennings, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Quirke, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (25).—Messrs. Brookman, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Hughes, Hutchens, Laucke, Lawn, Loveday, and McKee, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Riches, Ryan, Shannon, Tapping, Teusner, and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Frank Walsh. No—Mr. Jenkins.

Majority of 17 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 15 (clause 3)—After "Any" insert "authority or licence (other than an authority or licence given by a company) to take possession of personal chattels contained in any".

No. 2. Page 2, line 25 (clause 3)—Leave out "which" and insert "where such".

No. 3. Page 2, line 26 (clause 3)—Leave out "notwithstanding" and insert "or an agreement which would be a hire-purchase agreement but for".

No. 4. Page 2, line 46 (clause 3)—Leave out "indictable" and insert "punishable".

No. 5. Page 3, line 1 (clause 3)—After "purchaser" insert "or hirer".

Consideration in Committee.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I ask members to agree to these amendments, which are purely of a drafting nature and which in my opinion and in the opinion of the Opposition improve the Bill and carry out the intentions of the measure that left this House.

Amendments agreed to.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, line 27 (clause 16)—After "Aborigines" insert "Protection".

No. 2. Page 5, line 28 (clause 16)—Before "1939" insert "1934-".

No. 3. Page 9, line 23 (clause 29)—Leave out "its" and insert "his".

No. 4. Page 9, line 38 (clause 29)—Leave out "the board" and insert "him".

No. 5. Page 9, lines 39 to 43 (clause 29)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 6. Page 10, line 29 (clause 30)—Before "1939" insert "1934-".

No. 7. Page 10, line 29 (clause 30)—Leave out "Aborigine" and insert "Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I have examined the amendments made by the Legislative Council. They are all drafting and consequential and I ask the Committee to accept them.

Amendments agreed to.

DEATH OF THE HON. A. C. HOOKINGS.

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

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Allan Charles Hookings, member for the Southern District in the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased member of the Legislative Council the sitting of the House be adjourned until tomorrow.

I have just been notified that the Hon. A. C. Hookings passed away a few minutes ago. His death is most untimely. He was another of our young men who showed much promise in the political world. He was prepared to devote his time to his work and, although not a member of this House, he had won the respect of members of Parliament generally for his fair-minded approach to all problems. It grieves me greatly to have to report to the House two deaths of members of Parliament in the course of two days. I suggest that this House express its sympathy to his widow and relatives and that you, Mr. Speaker, convey the sympathy of the House to his widow on behalf of us all, who grieve at his loss.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): It is with deep regret that I rise to second the motion moved by the Premier. We who had known Mr. Hookings had admired him for his fairness and his willingness to apply himself to the interests

of the public. Although he had not long been a member of Parliament, he had been a member long enough for us to appreciate that he was a man who had come here to serve his country; and he served it well. Outside Parliament, as a rural man he had served the people in his calling and had won their admiration. So highly thought of was he that he was elected a member of the board of Goldsbrough Mort and Company Ltd., which of itself proved that he could have been only a man of the highest calibre to attain such a high position. On behalf of members on this side of the House, and in fact of all members, I express my sincere sympathy to the widow and friends of the late Mr. Allan Hookings.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I endorse the remarks of the Premier and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This sad news shocks me deeply. I had known the Hon. A. C. Hookings all my life; I knew his parents and had always admired him greatly. Allan Hookings was generous, affable and fair, and I am deeply shocked to learn he has been taken suddenly in the prime of his life. I, too, express my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 1, at 2 p.m.