# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 10, 1960.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Acts:

Bush Fires.

Hawkers Act Amendment.

Real Property Act Amendment.

## QUESTIONS.

### HIRE-PURCHASE FINANCE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The following is an extract from an article which appeared in yesterday's *Advertiser*:—

In the Cabinet room and in senior Treasury and banking circles today, however, the debate on Government financial policy continued. Two facts emerge. First there is no intention to restore import licensing this year although the Government is maintaining a nucleus organization. Secondly, many suggestions raised by advisers and Ministers are hampered by lack of Federal power. This affects such problems as hire-purchase companies which cannot be described as bankers without a court challenge, employment, and those "restrictive practices" regarded by some Treasury officials as contributing to the current economic difficulty.

The unsatisfactory state of affairs we envisaged when seeking to introduce a maximum on interest rates for hire-purchase transactions has now developed. I will not quote actual cases because they are so numerous, but the daily newspapers now carry advertisements seeking funds, on either first mortgage debentures or fixed deposit, and offering interest rates of up to 10 per cent per annum depending on the term of the debenture or the deposit. Much of this money is required for hire-purchase transactions and I see that one of the banks is seeking £1,000,000 solely for this purpose. In my opinion the hire-purchase companies are willing to pay such high interest rates on borrowed funds because, at present, they can hand the additional charges on to their customers without fear of Government interference. As there is no Commonwealth legislation to control the operation of, or the interest rate charged by, hire-purchase companies will the Premier introduce legislation to set maximum interest rates which may be charged by hire-purchase companies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will put that question on notice I will see whether I can get some information for him.

### SCHOOL CROSSING LIGHTS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Following recent legislation, uniform pedestrian crossings have been installed to protect children crossing roads near various schools. Since the introduction of that legislation there has been a controversy between local government bodies and school councils about who should meet the cost of the lights. Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government intended that school committees should pay half the installation costs of the lights? Does he consider that a committee is acting correctly if it spends in that way moneys raised from the public on the undertaking that such funds will be used for providing and improving facilities on school premises? Would a committee be acting correctly if it entered into an agreement with any council or municipality installing lights to pay half the cost of the installation with the repayment of the loan being spread over a period?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to examine the question and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible; but, in the meantime, I can say that applications for the type of lights mentioned must be made by the council controlling the area concerned and, whilst there is no obligation on the part of the school to pay half the installation costs on safe crossing lights, it is understood that in some instances councils, when approached to install such lights, have asked school committees if they would be willing to pay half the installation costs. In some instances it is known that school committees have paid the full amount whilst in other cases councils have met the full costs themselves.

I have just received a letter from the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association raising the same point. A portion of this letter, addressed to me by the secretary of the association, states:—

We have protested on the matter and have pointed out that in the opinion of this Association the education regulations do not provide that school committee and council funds shall be used for such purposes. I have now been requested by my Association to obtain a ruling from you in respect of Part 10 Division 4, section 41, of the Education Department regulations, which states that moneys raised by a committee

or council are to be used only for school purposes. In view of this provision in the regulations, we would like to know whether it would be considered lawful for school committees or councils to make contributions towards the costs of authorized school crossings and any other road safety signs that may be required under the Road Traffic Act, as some school committees and councils may have already committed themselves in this matter. Your early attention will be greatly appreciated.

I have already promised the honourable member that I will examine the matter and give him my considered reply. I here and now promise this Schools Committees' Association the same thing. I say offhand that the words "school purposes" in the regulations would be given a liberal interpretation even though the crossing devices, signs or warnings were not actually on the school premises. On the other hand, it raises an important problem. The Education Department itself has been requested by some large metropolitan councils to make a great contribution to the cost. A letter that I have just received from one council states:—

The estimated cost of such installations is approximately £1,150, and I have been instructed by the council to apply to your department for a contribution towards the expenditure.

I have no funds voted by Parliament for these purposes and I would not make funds available even if they were legally available to me. It is a question of considerable importance and I hope it will be clarified during the present session by legislation that is now, or shortly will be, before the House.

## HOUSING TRUST FLATS.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question regarding the policy of the Housing Trust in the construction in country areas of houses or flats with common facilities for single persons?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The report from the trust is as follows:—

The South Australian Housing Trust has found that, so far, the houses built under the Country Housing Act by means of the grants made available by the Government have provided the most suitable housing for country towns, as these houses can be made available either to elderly people, or to such as widows with a family. And it can be said that, whilst the houses under the Country Housing Act have not met all country requirements, the position in country towns is now much easier than it is in the metropolitan area where the demand is very great. The flats referred to in the question involve the sharing of some facilities and are suitable only for occupation by elderly women living alone. If built in a town where the demand by this limited class came to an end, the flats would not be suitable for letting to others. It also remains to be seen whether the flats, with their shared facilities, will prove satisfactory. Accordingly, the trust considers that, for the time being, it is better to build in the country the type of houses now being built rather than small flats with shared facilities.

Mr. RICHES—Will the Premier ask the trust to conduct a survey of the larger country towns, particularly Port Augusta and Port Pirie, to determine how many single women desire to occupy these flats? So far, the trust has been unwilling to accommodate any elderly women living on their own. Some such accommodation is needed in my district, and I take it that that would apply also in other districts. It seems to me from the reply given that the trust is not fully aware of this need. Will the Premier ask that a survey be made so that this need can be demonstrated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The trust is in constant touch with this problem and is receiving applications from all types of people all over the State for houses for purhase, renting or special social purposes, which the honourable member has mentioned. So, the trust has in the course of its business many applications, and has a good appreciation of the amount of pressure in any town. I will refer the question to the trust. A survey of the type suggested would be impossible as it would be necessary to ask individual people whether they wanted a house of this type. Obviously, that could not be done. Those wanting housing facilities do, in fact, apply to the trust and their applications are assessed.

## X-RAY EQUIPMENT.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question relating to the registration of X-ray equipment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member asked me to obtain a report, and I have got one from the Director-General of Public Health. It states:—

Under the Health Act Amendment Act, 1956, the Government set up a Radiological Advisory Committee to advise the Minister of Health regarding regulations for the safe use of radioactive substances and irradiating apparatus. Draft regulations were submitted for comment some time ago to the British Medical Association, the College of Radiologists, the X-ray Manufacturers' Association, and the Crown Solicitor. The comments have been considered by the committee, and a final draft is now being prepared for submission to the Crown Solicitor.

Under these proposed regulations it will be necessary for all X-ray equipment to be registered and all users to be licensed. The granting of licences will be the duty of the Director-General of Public Health, who will ensure that

the apparatus is safe for the purpose for which it is to be used, and that the operator is competent. Medical practitioners, dentists and qualified radiographers will no doubt easily establish their competence. Trainees of various kinds will be able to work under competent supervision. Other persons will have to produce evidence of their competence before receiving a licence.

## SAWDUST DISPOSAL.

Mr. CORCORAN—I understand that the Minister of Forests has the information I sought yesterday about the disposal of sawdust.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Some time ago the honourable member introduced to me the District Clerk of Port MacDonnell, who inquired about the powers of district councils to control sawdust heaps. I said that I understood there was power in the Local Government Act. I followed this up, as requested by the honourable member. Under section 669 (7) of the Local Government Act municipalities have the power I mentioned, and under section 670 (5) district councils have the same power to make by-laws for the suppression and extinguishment of fires. This would include the power to direct that sawdust heaps do not accumulate. It would also enable a district clerk or town clerk who considered that sawdust heaps were accumulating and creating a fire risk to direct that those heaps be removed or disposed of.

## JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.

Mr. BYWATERS—I was interested to read in today's *News* that the Minister of Education had commented on a proposed booklet to be issued to students over the age of 13 years in Western Australia and had said that it would possibly be a good thing for South Australia. He has promised to get a copy of the booklet and investigate the matter. Would he care to comment further on this in view of a recent statement by the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, or would he like to add to what has already been said in this House?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no great desire to do so. The first I heard of the report was when the *News* approached me on the telephone this morning and explained it to me briefly. I said that I was intensely interested in it and would endeavour to procure a copy of the booklet, and that if it were thought suitable we would perhaps use it as a pattern for a similar publication in South Australia, after consultation with the Director of Education, Teachers' Institute and Public Schools Committees Association. I do not know that I can carry it much further, other than to say that I take the view that the alleged spread of juvenile delinquency amongst our school-going population is grossly exaggerated. I think that what we have to remember is that thousands upon thousands of very good and decent young girls and boys in our schools, and teenagers generally, do not hit the headlines and do not make the news because their conduct is proper and a credit to them, to their parents and to the State. It is only the infinitesimal minority of children, who copy the very bad behaviour of their parents and their elders, who make the headlines, and as a result they cast discredit on the whole generation of young people. I absolutely deplore the vague generalizations which are made by so many people, whether they be magistrates, commissioners, deputy commissioners, the police, or welfare councils. I think they are far too vague and sweeping, and not based on solid foundation. During the last seven years I have had probably a greater opportunity than any other person in South Australia of seeing thousands upon thousands of young children at work and at play, and I have a tremendous admiration for them. In my opinion the youth of this present day and generation are immeasurably superior to the youth of my day and generation, and I think they are infinitely superior to the adult population of today.

## KNOT WEED.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on October 27 regarding the possibility of knot weed being proclaimed a noxious weed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following reply from the Deputy Director of Agriculture:—

The Weeds Adviser has investigated the distribution of nut-grass (*Cyperus rotundus*) from loam supplied to home gardeners in the suburban areas and has submitted the following report:—

Nut-grass, sometimes called knot-weed or knot-grass, is a very serious summer growing weed. However it requires ample supplies of water during its growing period and for this reason is not a serious weed of agricultural areas. For this reason also it has not been proclaimed a noxious weed. Inspection of pits from which loam is taken has shown that some are heavily infested with nut-grass, particularly those along the Torrens River. The largest pit now being worked belongs to Mr. Simmonds, a building contractor who is supplying the major garden suppliers around Adelaide. He has recently received many adverse reports of nut-grass becoming established from his loam supplies and is most concerned. He now employs Houghton & Byrne to fumigate all

loam, before it leaves the pit, with methyl bromide which is 100 per cent effective. Invoices supplied with soil which has been treated in this way now carry Houghton & Byrne's guarantee. It costs approximately 3s. per ton extra. It is therefore recommended that buyers should be advised to purchase loam only when it carries a guarantee that it has been fumigated, and a press release will be made to this effect. If further complaints continue to be received by this department then further consideration will be given to proclaiming nut-grass a noxious weed under Schedule II of the Weeds Act, 1956.

## BEE SANCTUARY.

Mr. QUIRKE—Last year I submitted to the Minister of Agriculture a request from people in the Hilltown area that the bee sanctuary in that area be removed or cease to be a proclaimed sanctuary. This request was made because of the great influence that bees have on the fertilization of lucerne for seed purposes. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—This matter was investigated following on the honourable member's representations. The sanctuary was for Italian bees and it was decided that it was not serving a particularly useful purpose and that a benefit would be achieved by abandoning it. Consequently, this morning His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor in Executive Council proclaimed that the area in the hundred of Andrews would no longer be a sanctuary for Italian bees. This will give wider opportunities for the fertilization of lucerne in that area.

## ROAD WORKS.

Mr. CLARK—Some weeks ago a constituent of mine, Mr. A. J. Simmonds, of 233 Main North Road, Elizabeth, rang me to complain that road and embankment works were contemplated by the Housing Trust in front of his home. These works will virtually deny him access to his home from his front entrance to the Main North Road and force him or anyone visiting his home to drive around a complete block before entering Main North Road. I arranged an appointment for Mr. Simmonds with a senior officer of the Housing Trust and hoped that the difficulty had been overcome. However, I am now informed that the project is being carried out to the great concern of Mr. and Mrs. Simmonds and that piles of earth are in front of their home, making it almost impossible to get to the gate. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Housing Trust and see whether Mr. Simmonds' problems can be obviated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

## BUSH FIRE DANGER.

Mr. HALL—I have been informed by the clerk of the district council of Blyth that the council is most concerned about the fire danger that exists in a property adjacent to the railway system, and this morning I received a phone call from Mr. Coffey, of Lake View, who is concerned about the fire danger in that area. These people ask whether something can be done to reduce the number of trains drawn by steam locomotives. It is realized that no doubt the dieselization programme has not gone far enough to enable steam engines to be eliminated, but these people ask whether there is any way in which steam locomotives can be replaced on the dangerous lines on days on which a very high fire danger exists. They ask whether the matter can be examined with a view to running as few steam trains as possible in the summer, especially on days of very high fire risk.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer this question to the Minister of Railways. I am sure the Railways Commissioner will be anxious to co-operate in every possible way within the limitation, of course, of available diesel rolling stock and of being able to run his train schedules to give the necessary service.

## FLUORIDATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS—An article by John Miles in the *News* of November 8, headed "Let South Australia have Fluoridation Now", stated:—

> The Dental Association has . . . been clamouring for fluoridation for the past eight years. Its President, Dr. T. Bruce Lindsay, says lack of it causes about 2,000,000 unnecessary cavities in South Australian children's teeth every year. Our Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. J. R. Dridan, thinks: "It's rather a shame that fluoride is not used in our water at present."

The article went on to say that a committee convened by world health authorities resolved at its meeting that fluoridation of public water supplies be commended to all public authorities as the most effective public health measure available for reducing safely and economically the incidence of dental caries, particularly in the younger age groups. In view of this very strong evidence in favour of fluoridation, has the Minister of Works considered the early application of fluoride to our water supplies?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I saw the article to which the honourable member has referred. Indeed, one could hardly have escaped seeing it. I agree that it presented a very strong case for the addition of fluoride

to our drinking water, but, as expected, this morning I received a copy of a letter which a certain organization had prepared for the purpose of publication in the *News*. I was also forwarded a copy of a letter which the organization was forwarding to the Editor of the *News*, requesting the Editor to give equal prominence to their case as was given to the case mentioned in the article referred to by the honourable member. I still feel that despite the fact that a strong case has been presented for fluoridation there are also arguments, propounded by a large section of the community, against it.

Mr. Hutchens—Was there any medical evidence produced by the organization you referred to?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I only saw the letters this morning before going to Executive Council and I did not have time to finish reading them. However, I know their purport. I do not wish to be critical of those who submit arguments, but I think there is a tendency sometimes to over-stress the possible benefits of such a procedure, especially as a number of children, even in towns with reticulated water supplies, do not drink the reticulated water. As a matter of fact, we have had requests from some country towns for schools to be equipped with rainwater tanks, perhaps because the reticulated supply is considered too hot for drinking in the summer, and so on, and those requests have been acceded to. To suggest that fluoride in water is likely to have anything like the benefit which the article in the *News* claims it will have is possibly overstressing the matter. I repeat that I have no objection to the addition of fluoride in water, but I somewhat doubt the efficacy of it because I think that more tooth brushes and possibly fewer sweets would have a much more beneficial and widespread effect.

An interesting experiment—if one can call it such—is now in progress in this State. The water from the Uley basin near Port Lincoln is supposed to contain, I think, the precise amount of fluoride which would be artificially added to water. That water has now been available to residents in and around that distrist for some years, and I should think that its beneficial effects, if any, should now be evident in the town of Port Lincoln and in the children who attend school there. I have considered asking the Minister of Health to obtain a report, possibly in conjunction with the Minister of Education, to see what the findings are in that particular area, because I think if this substance is as beneficial as claimed we should have some tangible evidence from the town and district at this stage.

## RULING ON AMENDMENTS.

Mr. STOTT—In a debate in the House on October 19 the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) desired to move an amendment to a motion before the House but you, Mr. Speaker, ruled that the amendment was out of order. When further questions were asked you ruled as follows:—

I am afraid that the Opposition is too late in moving that amendment. The Treasurer has moved an amendment striking out certain words and inserting other words after the word "House". A member cannot move an amendment to the first part of the question after an amendment has been proposed to the latter part of the question as has been done by the Treasurer.

That ruling meant that the member for Norwood was precluded from moving a further amendment. Last night, when we were debating a question in Committee, the Chairman of Committees quoted from page 529 of Erskine May as follows:—

"Safeguarding of amendments." Whenever several amendments are about to be moved to the same part of the clause the Chairman if necessary proposes an amendment to leave out words in such a form as not to exclude any later amendments. With this end in view the question is therefore proposed: that certain only of the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause. If this question is agreed to, that is, if the Committee decides that the words proposed to be left out should stand part, it is still possible to move to leave out subsequent words. On the other hand, if the question is negatived and the proposed words are left out the effect is precisely the same as if the question had been proposed in full. The remaining words covered by the amendment are struck out without any further question being put and the subsequent amendments which it was desired to safeguard fail.

When you gave your ruling, Sir, there was some confusion and doubt as to whether a member was precluded from moving a subsequent amendment. With the ruling given by the Chairman of Committees last night we now have two different interpretations of the Standing Orders. So that it will be recorded in *Hansard*, and in order to avoid confusion and doubt as to whether a member is precluded from moving a further amendment, provided it is done in the right sequence, I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you have further considered your ruling, which, as I understand it, is that after an amendment is moved to the latter part of the question a subsequent amendment to earlier words is out of order and

cannot be moved. Whether or not it precludes a further amendment was not made clear in your ruling. Have you, Mr. Speaker, further considered that ruling?

The SPEAKER—The ruling that I gave on the occasion mentioned was correct and in accordance with Standing Orders and Erskine May's decisions. The other decision the honourable member referred to was one given by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, and I am not fully acquainted with the circumstances. It appears to me, from what the honourable member said, that the two cases are not analogous but, in view of the importance of the matter he has raised and with a view to having clarity so that honourable members may know exactly where they stand, I shall be happy to examine the cases raised by the honourable member and give a considered intimation to honourable members in connection therewith.

Mr. STOTT—If my memory serves me correctly, some time ago in another place a ruling of the President created some confusion on members' rights to move amendments. I understand that this question was referred to the House of Commons for a ruling. I am pleased to know that you, Mr. Speaker, will examine this matter to try to clarify the position. If you have any doubt about the matter will you refer it to the House of Commons for a ruling?

The SPEAKER—Referring to the decision given earlier this year, I am confident that it is covered by Erskine May and by Standing Orders. The honourable member will remember that that amendment had been proposed by the Treasurer five or six weeks before the subsequent amendment was moved by the member for Norwood. I shall consider the honourable member's request.

## USE OF SCHOOL OVALS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Recently I asked a question about the use of recreation reserves (under the joint scheme) in certain districts. I agree with the Minister of Education in the confidence that he has expressed in the youth of today. Believing that the youth of today desires more recreational facilities and bearing in mind the number of ovals directly under the control of the Education Department, will the Minister favourably consider allowing the use of these recreation areas at week-ends, particularly on Sundays, providing their use does not conflict or interfere with any religious services that may be conducted in the area?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Over many years there has been a departmental practice not to allow school ovals or recreation grounds to be used for any sporting or recreational purpose on Sunday. As far as I can ascertain, there is no authority under the Education Act or the regulations on which this decision is based, nor have I been able to find any Cabinet decision dealing with it. Nobody in the Education Department can place anything before me regarding it. However, that practice has been followed for many years and, since I have been Minister, in accordance with precedents established I have refused permission on a number of occasions. Some applications have been for organized or commercialized sport and others for demonstrations. I received one recently that was strongly supported by a prominent minister of religion in an eastern suburb and by the police. That was in the nature of a demonstration rather than sport. I declined that until there was some general decision. The applications are becoming so frequent and there is such a strong public opinion being formed on the matter that I intend to have the whole matter raised before Cabinet so that a proper authoritative decision may be laid down for the future.

## MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RALSTON—Recently I received letters from the Mount Gambier city council, sitting as the local board of health, and from the Mount Gambier high school council. Both letters referred to the lack of change rooms and toilet facilities for girl students at the Mount Gambier high school playing fields. For some years change rooms and toilet facilities have been available for the male students at the playing field but none has been available for girls. The playing fields are separate from the school grounds and, although toilet facilities are provided in the school grounds, they are usually locked when students wish to use them at week-ends.

I was present when the Public Works Standing Committee visited Mount Gambier in connection with the proposed additional wing at the high school and I noticed that the plans provided for change rooms and toilet facilities at the playing fields. Will the Minister have this matter examined with a view to providing these essential facilities as soon as possible and will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to take the matter up with the

Director of the Public Buildings Department and, if necessary, with my colleague, the Minister of Works, having regard to our future school building programme at Mount Gambier. It can be related to what we have in mind in building new schools there and it could be part of the major building programme and perhaps be completed before the actual building.

## GOVERNMENT HOUSE GUARDS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Recently I asked a question about Government House guards and since then the military has been performing guard duty there. I am not sure whether that is part of a recruiting campaign or whether it is a temporary arrangement. The report from the Commissioner of Police stated that the Police Association had advised that it opposed the use of policemen as guards at the Government House gate and also duty by the officers inside Government House. I have since been advised that that is not so, but that the police are concerned that those duties are being performed by persons other than ordinary policemen. Police officers who have been on duty at Government House for periods ranging from two to seven years do not regard the work as monotonous or distasteful, as has been suggested. As I understand that the Premier received a letter from the Police Association, will he have the matter further reviewed with the object of keeping police constables on duty at Government House gates?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I received a letter from the Police Association stating that the information I had previously received about its attitude on the matter was not correct, and I am investigating that. I have not yet had a chance to check the letters on the file, but I feel that the Commissioner would be careful not to give me incorrect information. In the meantime, I do not think any action has been taken in connection with changing the guard.

## MALLALA-BALAKLAVA ROAD.

Mr. HALL—There is a relatively short distance of road, approximately 13 miles, between Mallala and Balaklava as yet unbituminized. This has been on some sort of priority for attention for a few years. One obstacle to the construction of this road has been the lack of suitable material for supplying crushed screenings, but during the last year a supply was found nearby in an ideal position relative to the road. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether any timetable has yet been fixed for bituminizing this section of road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will ask for a report.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS BILL.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL—There appears in today's *News* a glaring inaccuracy in the reporting of a matter debated in this House yesterday and last year. The report, which concerns the 10 per cent deposit in hire-purchase transactions, states:—

> The clause was inserted as a result of an amendment moved by the Labor Party in the Assembly, supported by one Government member, the late Mr. George Hambour.

That is not so, and it appeared prominently in a different form in the same paper last year. I should like to put the record straight by saying once more, although it has been said a number of times already, that this amendment was moved by the late Mr. George Hambour and supported by four other members on this side of the House, as well as by the Opposition. In a controversial matter like this, it is not proper that we should have the basis for the legislation misconstrued in this way.

## SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## ROAD TRAFFIC BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Second reading.

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

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

It is a consolidating and amending Bill. It has three main objects. One is to improve the form of the road traffic law. Honourable members are well aware of the need for this. The

present statutory law consists of the Act of 1934 with thirty-two amending Acts. The numerous amendments and additions made over a long period have inevitably led to complexity and inconsistencies, and changing conditions of traffic have made some of the provisions obsolete, or unsuitable for the needs of today. There is, therefore, a strong case for re-writing and re-arranging the law.

Another object of the Bill is to achieve more uniformity with the laws of the other States. In preparing the Bill, regard has been paid to the recommendations of the two committees which for some years have been engaged in promoting uniformity in the laws of the Australian States about the equipment and standards of motor vehicles and the rules of the road. One of these committees, the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee, has drafted a Code relating to vehicle construction, equipment and performance standards, and this Code has been used as a basis in preparing Part IV of the Bill.

The other committee, called the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee, has made a number of decisions as to what should be included in a uniform road traffic code, but has not yet commenced the actual drafting of the code. The Committee is now examining the Victorian Traffic Regulations and the Uniform Vehicle Code of the United States as precedents for an Australian Code, and it seems likely that much of the present Victorian law will be accepted as a satisfactory basis. For this reason the Victorian Road Traffic Regulations, which were consolidated and gazetted on January 1 of this year, have been taken into account in drafting this Bill and there is a good deal of similarity in both substance and language between Part III of the Bill and the Victorian Regulations. But it is clear that progress towards uniformity will be gradual. It is a question of not only drafting a uniform Code but having it adopted by six Governments. This is not likely to happen quickly and I believe that, on the whole, this Bill goes as far towards uniformity as is possible at present.

The third object of this Bill is to make improvements in our law based on the experience of South Australian traffic authorities. In the preparation of the Bill, the Government has had the advice of traffic engineers and traffic administrators in the Police Department and the Highways Department. It has also included in the Bill recommendations made by the State Traffic Committee and has received valuable advice from the Royal Automobile Association, which is much appreciated.

I will now give honourable members a general summary of the Bill, and shall be glad to supply further details of any clause on request. Part I contains the preliminary matters including provisions for bringing the Act into force by one or more proclamations, and the interpretation clauses. I draw attention to clause 8 which provides that persons in the service of the Crown as well as others are bound by the Act. Part II (clauses 10 to 39) contains administrative provisions collected from various parts of the present law. It embodies the law as to the constitution and powers of the Road Traffic Board, traffic control devices, the creation of speed zones, closing roads and granting exemptions for road races, and the provision of weighbridges and weighing instruments for motor vehicles. It also provides for the appointment of inspectors by the Commissioner of Highways, and empowers the police to search for stolen vehicles and vehicles which have been involved in collisions and to make inquiries as to the identity of drivers of vehicles. These powers exist at present and are not widened by the Bill.

Part III (clauses 40 to 107), which is headed "Duties of drivers and pedestrians", sets out the rules of the road. Clause 40 provides that these rules apply to riders and drivers of animals in the same way as they apply to riders and drivers of vehicles, except in cases where a particular provision cannot, because of its nature, apply in relation to animals. Clause 41 deals with the exemptions from traffic rules which are granted to drivers of vehicles used by fire brigades, ambulances and members of the police. In order to make the position quite clear to Parliament, the exemptions are expressed not by reference to section numbers but by stating in words the nature of the provisions from which the drivers are exempt. The scope of the exemptions is the same as at present, with the exception that they will extend to the new speed limit of 60 miles an hour and the special speed limits in zones. No drivers, however, are granted any exemption from compliance with the laws as to careless or dangerous driving. Clauses 42 to 47 deal with compliance with police traffic directions, stopping after accidents, illegal use of motor vehicles and careless and dangerous driving. The only point which I would mention in connection with these clauses is that clause 45

makes it clear that the offence of unlawfully using or interfering with a motor vehicle may be committed either on a road or elsewhere. Otherwise, these clauses are in accordance with the present law.

Clause 48 deals with driving vehicles under the influence of liquor or drugs. It is a combination of two separate sections of the present Act, one applying to horse-drawn vehicles, the other to motor vehicles. The offence is the same in each case, but the penalties are different and, while combining the two offences, the Bill retains the difference between the penalties.

Clauses 49-55 group together the numerous provisions of the present law relating to speed limits. Two alterations in the law are proposed. The first is that the speed limit of 20 miles an hour within 50 yards of level crossings will not apply at crossings equipped with wig-wags, flashing light signals, or gates or barriers. Requests have been made for the complete abolition of this speed limit but the proposal is not favoured by traffic experts. It is considered, however, that the duty of a motorist to stop while wig-wags or flashing light signals are operating is a sufficient precaution at the level crossings where these devices exist, without having a special speed limit.

The other alteration affecting speed limits is in clause 55 which imposes special speed limits on heavy commercial vehicles. These speed limits vary according to whether the vehicle is within or outside a town, and also according to the weight of the vehicle. The present law is complicated by the fact that the classification of vehicles according to weight, which determines the speed limit in towns, differs from the classification which determines the speed outside towns. The classes on which speed limits outside towns are based are as follows:—

(*a*) vehicles not exceeding 7 tons;

(*b*) vehicles between 7 and 15 tons;

(*c*) vehicles exceeding 15 tons.

The classes on which speed limits inside towns are based are as follows:—

(*a*) vehicles under 7 tons;

(*b*) vehicles between 7 and 11 tons;

(*c*) vehicles exceeding 11 tons.

The Bill substitutes for these classifications a single classification applying both within and outside towns. The new classification is as follows:—

(*a*) vehicles up to 7 tons;

(*b*) vehicles between 7 and 13 tons;

(*c*) vehicles in excess of 13 tons.

In other respects the speed limits for heavy vehicles are retained. Clauses 56 to 62 contain the rules about driving on the left of the road and passing other vehicles. Our law at present does not allow overtaking on the left except where the vehicle in front is about to turn to the right. The Bill, however, proposes a new rule which will permit a vehicle to overtake another vehicle on the left when the vehicles are on a carriageway which has marked lanes for vehicles proceeding in the same direction and when the overtaking vehicle is in a lane on the left of the lane in which the other vehicle is proceeding. In these circumstances the Bill proposes that overtaking on the left will be permissible provided it is safe to do so. A similar rule has been introduced in Victoria. Clauses 63 to 69 collect together the main rules about giving the right of way. An explanation of what is meant by giving the right of way is set out in clause 63 and by reason of this interpretation it has been possible to simplify the language of a number of other clauses dealing with right of way.

Clauses 70 to 73 contain the rules about right turns. There are two points to be mentioned in connection with these clauses. One is that the Bill does not provide that the diamond turn—that is a right turn made on the right side of the centre of the intersection—shall be adopted as a general rule. In recent years the diamond turn has become popular, and is in force in Victoria and Tasmania. However, conditions are not the same in all the States and traffic authorities in this State are not satisfied that the diamond turn would be satisfactory as a universal rule. This being so, it has been thought wise to retain the existing law for the present. The Bill re-enacts the provision under which the diamond turn is compulsory at places where the road is marked with arrows or otherwise to indicate that method of turning.

The other point about right turns which I should mention is that the Bill retains the rule that a vehicle turning to the right in a double road must give the right of way to oncoming traffic in all cases. Nobody doubts the value of this rule on single roads or on the Anzac Highway, but it has been held by the

Supreme Court not to apply on the Port Road. This decision was no doubt influenced by the unusual width of the Port Road. However, the decision of the court raises doubts about duties of drivers turning right on a number of other roads, and it is desirable to maintain the general rule that a driver turning right must always give the right of way to traffic coming from the opposite direction. It seems likely that before long the difficulties in applying this rule on the Port Road will be removed by the installation of traffic lights.

Clause 74 deals with driving signals. It provides for the existing methods of giving signals by hand, trafficators and winking lights. The question of making the right turn signal compulsory where a driver intends merely to diverge to the right, but not to turn, has been considered. The view of the Government's traffic experts is that while it is desirable that in some cases drivers should voluntarily give such a signal before diverging, there are objections to making it compulsory in every case and a law for that purpose could not be generally enforced. In these circumstances it has been thought wise not to provide for such a signal in this Bill.

Clauses 75 to 79 set out the duties of drivers as to obedience to traffic signs and traffic lights. There are two new provisions. One makes it a specific offence to disobey signs forbidding turning at intersections. The other makes it compulsory to keep to the left or right of signs placed on roads and containing the words "keep left" or "keep right". These signs are not specifically provided for in the present law.

Clauses 80 and 81 deal with the duties of drivers at level crossings. One alteration is made. The present law requires a vehicle carrying inflammable gases to stop at level crossings. It has always been doubtful whether a petrol wagon with petrol in it is a vehicle carrying inflammable gas within the meaning of this rule. It is provided in the Bill that the duty to stop at level crossings should apply to vehicles carrying inflammable liquids as well as inflammable gases; but this rule will not apply to a vehicle carrying petrol only for use as fuel for its own engine.

Clauses 82 to 86 set out the general rules relating to the standing of vehicles in streets. The Act now requires a vehicle which is stationary on a carriageway to be as near as practicable to the left hand side of the road. This general rule is embodied in clause 82 with modifications. Firstly, it is provided that on a one-way carriageway, not forming part of a double road, vehicles may stand near the edge of the carriageway on either side. Secondly, it is provided that it shall not be an offence to stand a vehicle in an area appointed by a council as a place for standing vehicles. This provision removes a doubt which has been raised about the legality of centre of the road parking. Thirdly, it is provided that clause 82 does not restrict the operation of any Act, regulation or by-law prohibiting or restricting the standing of vehicles.

Clause 86, which deals with the removal of unattended vehicles on roads, contains an extension of the existing law on this subject. By section 150 of the present Act members of the police force or officers of councils can remove unattended vehicles which are likely to cause danger or obstruct processions, but they have no power to remove vehicles which only obstruct ordinary traffic. Clause 85 will extend the power of removal to any vehicles likely to obstruct traffic.

Clauses 87 to 90 set out duties of pedestrians walking on roads, and at level crossings and pedestrian crossings. Clauses 91 to 103 re-enact the laws about a number of hazardous practices such as opening doors of vehicles so as to cause danger, riding on the roof or bonnet of a vehicle, various forms of dangerous conduct by cyclists, driving from an unsafe position, boarding and leaving vehicles in motion and leading animals. Those provisions are substantially in accordance with existing law. Clauses 104 to 107, which deal with the protection of roads, take the place of Part VII of the present Act. The experience of the officers of the Highways Department who police these provisions has shown that a substantial number of them are now obsolete and it has been found possible to state the law much more briefly. The object of these clauses is to prevent damage to roads and structures on roads, including traffic control devices and direction signs, and also to prevent persons from creating dangerous conditions by depositing oil or other material on roads.

Part IV of the Bill contains the rules relating to the equipment, size and weight of vehicles and safety provisions. The first topic dealt with is lights. The Bill sets out, in general terms, all the lamps which must be carried on vehicles. The details about the illuminating power of the lamps, their exact position on the vehicles and other like matters, have been omitted from the Bill on the ground that they are more appropriate for regulations, particularly as changes are being made from

time to time by manufacturers. Some alterations are proposed in the laws about the lighting of vehicles. The first is the introduction of a requirement that the lamps on a vehicle must be lighted at all times when the vehicle is on a road between half an hour after sunset and half an hour before sunrise. It is proposed that the present exemptions which allow vehicles to be parked near street lights with their lamps turned off, or to be parked near the kerb with only the rear lamp showing, are omitted. It is, of course, not proposed that motorists will be prevented from turning off the main beams of the headlamps and relying solely on parking lamps.

Another new provision of Part IV is in clause 120 which provides that every bicycle and every sidecar must have one red reflector on the rear, and every other vehicle must have two red reflectors. This was recommended by the State Traffic Committee, and also by the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee. It appears that the present law as to portable reflectors and rear lights has not been sufficient to prevent drivers from driving their vehicles into the rear of stationary vehicles, and that some additional warning device is desirable. The Bill also proposes (by clause 119) a rule that motorists must dip their headlamps when driving on roads lit by public street lamps. This rule is in the Vehicle Standards Code and also in the laws of Victoria, New South Wales, and Western Australia. The next matter dealt with in Part IV is brakes. The clauses on this subject are based on the recommendations of the Australian Motor Vehicles Standards Committee. The Government is informed that modern vehicles generally comply with the proposed requirements, which are not likely to create any hardship.

Clauses 130 to 135 deal with other miscellaneous items of equipment such as warning devices, mechanical signals, windscreen wipers, reflecting mirrors and silencers. As regards reflecting mirrors, a new provision is inserted to the effect that the mirrors must be on the outside of the vehicle in cases where the vehicle is a passenger vehicle with seating accommodation for eight persons or more, or where the mirror fixed on the inside of the vehicle would not give a satisfactory view to the rear.

The next matter dealt with is the size of vehicles. The rules on this topic are in clauses 136 to 140. There are two amendments of the law in these clauses. The first is the inclusion of a provision that in determining the width of a vehicle, a rear vision mirror or a signalling device on the side of the vehicle shall not be regarded as part of the vehicle. This provision settles a controversy which has been going on for some time as to whether a vehicle eight feet wide can lawfully have a rear vision mirror projecting on the right hand side. The proposal in the Bill is to exclude the projection of the mirror or signalling device in computing the width of the vehicle. This is in accordance with a recommendation of the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee. The other amendment in these clauses is that exemptions from the requirements as to height, width, or length will in future be granted by the Road Traffic Board.

Clauses 141 to 153 take the place of Part IV of the present Act which deals with width of tyres. The existing law contains complex provisions restricting the weight of axle-loads and vehicle-loads by reference to the width of tyres, and was designed in the days when there were numerous horse-drawn vehicles with iron tyres, and motor vehicles with solid rubber tyres. These restrictions are not suitable for modern vehicles with pneumatic tyres and they will be repealed. The new clauses contain three basic rules limiting the weight of vehicles, as follows:—

(*a*) The axle load on an axle fitted with solid tyres of any kind must not exceed five tons, or seven hundredweights for each inch of the width of the tyres, whichever is the less.

(*b*) The axle weight on the axle of a vehicle fitted with pneumatic tyres must not exceed eight tons.

(*c*) The total weight on all the axles of a vehicle other than the front axle must not exceed 32 tons. In applying this rule any combination of vehicles drawn by the same hauling unit is treated as one vehicle.

These provisions are based on recommendations made by the Commissioner of Highways having regard to the carrying capacity of South Australian roads. On specific roads lower maximum weights may be prescribed by regulations.

The Bill empowers the Road Traffic Board to grant exemptions from the weight restrictions in cases of heavy machinery or merchandise which cannot be taken apart. Before granting an exemption the board must satisfy

itself that the roads on which the exempt vehicle will be driven are capable of carrying the vehicle and its load without danger or damage. The Bill reproduces the administrative provisions for the enforcement of the law as to maximum weights, without any substantial alteration. Clauses 154 and 155 set out the requirements for towing vehicles, and restrictions on the number of trailers, and are the same in essence as the present law.

Clause 156 deals with the examination and certification of vehicles used for carrying passengers for hire. It is proposed that in future these examinations and the grant of certificates of safety will be under the control of the Commissioner of Police instead of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. The Registrar has been in control of them in the past, but in practice much of the work has been done by police officers. It is provided that every police officer in charge of a station more than 15 miles from the General Post Office will be an authorized person for granting certificates of safety and also that the Commissioner of Police may appoint other authorized persons.

Clause 157 is a new clause similar to a law of New South Wales dealing with defective vehicles. It empowers members of the police force to arrange for the examination of vehicles which they consider not to comply with the law, or to be unsafe. If, after examination, a vehicle is found not to comply with the law or to be unsafe a defect notice may be issued to the owner or person in charge. This notice will specify the repairs which have to be made and will direct that until the repairs have been made the vehicle must not be driven on roads except as permitted in the notice. Clauses 158 and 159 which deal with securing of loads and the duty to paint information on commercial vehicles reproduce the present law.

Part V, comprising clauses 160 to 173, contains the legal provisions about offences and prosecutions, disqualification of drivers and the making of regulations. In connection with the disqualification of drivers, I draw members' attention to clause 165 which provides for the compulsory disqualification of drivers for second offences against certain provisions of the Act. Under the present law disqualification is prescribed for the offence of reckless and dangerous driving, exceeding the 35 miles an hour speed limit in a municipality or town, and failing to give way at an intersection or junction. It is proposed to extend the list of these offences by including failure to stop after an accident, exceeding the speed limit of 60 m.p.h., and exceeding the speed limit in a declared zone.

An important provision of Part V is clause 172 which empowers the Governor to make regulations. Regulations will be required for amplifying the requirements of the Bill as to lamps and equipment of vehicles. In addition it may be necessary as time goes on to make regulations for the management of traffic, prescribing rules to be observed by drivers and pedestrians in addition to those mentioned in the Act. The Bill provides that this can be done. A somewhat similar provision has always been in the law and has been used as occasion required. Under this Bill it is proposed that regulations declaring new speed limits on any particular road or part of a road will only be made by means of the zoning system and on the recommendation of the Road Traffic Board. The principle that the Road Traffic Act and the regulations made under the Act prevail over by-laws of councils is retained.

In the preparation of this Bill the Government has considered the question of penalties and does not propose any increases. In recent years almost all the penalties for traffic offences have been reviewed and, where thought necessary, increased by Parliament. There is a general penalty of £50 for all ordinary motoring offences, and specially heavy penalties for the more serious offences such as driving under the influence of liquor, joy-riding, dangerous driving, failing to stop after an accident and so on. There is also a general discretionary power for the court to disqualify drivers for any motoring offence, and compulsory disqualification for certain second offences. All these penalties are in the Bill. For some less serious offences, however, mainly those committed by pedestrians and pedal cyclists, lower penalties are proposed, for example, fines of £25 or £10. I wish to publicly thank Sir Edgar Bean for the tremendous amount of voluntary work that he has done in connection with this Bill. When Sir Edgar retired from the Public Service he said that he would, in the public interest, undertake the task of consolidating the Road Traffic Act and bringing the legislation up-to-date. This Bill is a monument to his industry and zeal. It is a remarkably good measure and when it becomes law, with, I hope, the support of all members, it will enable the motoring public to have for what I think is the first time in one measure a clear exposition of its duties

and obligations under the Act. The Bill contains many provisions, some of which are new. We are in the latter stage of this session. I have given the second reading explanation of the Bill today, but the Government does not intend to proceed further with it this session, but will do so next session. That will give members much time to familiarize themselves with the contents, as well as give interested parties ample opportunity to make research and bring forward matters that they believe should be altered. I inform the Leader of the Opposition that there is no need for him to prepare a second reading speech on this Bill now, because the Government does not intend to go further now than place it on the file so that everybody will know what it contains and have the opportunity to study the provisions. Obviously such an important Bill should not be be passed without proper consideration.

Again I emphasize how much we are indebted to Sir Edgar Bean for his work, which was done voluntarily. Sir Edgar served Parliament for many years as Parliamentary Draftsman, and after vacating that position he intimated his willingness to undertake this important work in the interests of good government. This reflected great credit upon him, but it was only in keeping with his work whilst occupying the position of Parliamentary Draftsman.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:—

Clapham Pumping Station, and Clapham-Springfield Water Main.
Mount Gambier Technical High School.
Mount Gambier High School (Additional Buildings).

Ordered that reports be printed.

## LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 9. Page 1731.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—I support the second reading, after giving the Bill much consideration. Some members may not entirely agree with all of its provisions, but personally I cannot see that serious objection can be taken to them. It is not often that amendments to the Licensing Act are placed before us. The first principal amendment authorizes the lessee of the chalet at the Wilpena National Pleasure Resort to sell and supply liquor with meals within specified hours. No-one can object to that, because it carries on a principle that already exists in connection with hotels. People who know the resort at Wilpena Pound believe that this is a necessary amendment. If people going to the Pound want to drink liquor there they must take it with them for it is a long way to Hawker, the nearest place where liquor can be obtained. I do not think anyone would go to Wilpena Pound merely for the purpose of indulging in a drinking bout. I speak for the moderate drinker, the person who likes a glass of wine, or of spirits or of beer with his meals. As I say, the drink must be taken to the Pound. Whether that is bad or good is a matter of opinion.

The amendment deals with the sale and supply of liquor with meals, but it may not be a bad idea to ultimately licence the chalet, seeing that it is far removed from licensed premises, to sell liquor in the same way as licensed premises. That would be an advantage, but there would need to be some protection for other tourists to the Pound. I was there at the beginning of June for a week and I took with me some liquor supplies because I knew they would not be available at the chalet. I found them most valuable to me, for the weather was cold. I do not know what I would have done if I had not been able to have a drink before and perhaps after meals. I do not drink to excess, so the views I put forward are those of a moderate drinker. New section 14a (7), which defines "meal", provides:—

In this section "meal" means a meal of at least two courses at which the persons partaking thereof are seated at a table and which includes fish or meats other than in sandwich form and cooked vegetables and for which the charge is not less than five shillings.

The charge does not concern me and I do not object to the provision that the meal must be of two courses, but in saying that the meal must consist of fish and meat we are trying to tell a man what he shall eat. A person may be a vegetarian or may not care for fish, but he should not be denied the right to have a glass of liquor with his meal because of that.

Clause 8, which enacts new section 149a, is an entirely new departure in South Australia, and perhaps Australia, although it is common practice overseas, particularly in the larger hotels or those that cater for tourists and visitors. It provides:—

The Licensing Court may at any time make or revoke any order exempting from the provisions of section 148 or section 149 or both of the said sections any store, shop or room used for the purposes of a hairdressing salon, beauty parlour, tourist service, banking agency, travel agency, dry-cleaning service, laundry service or any other like service or any shop or stall for the sale of books, magazines, newspapers, stationery, cigarettes, tobacco, toilet requisites, flowers, curios or souvenirs.

That is a recognized practice in any overseas country where the hotels cater for tourists and travellers and I therefore see no objection to its inclusion in this Bill. It gives the right to a licensee, particularly in the larger hotels that cater mainly for overseas visitors, to cater for their customers who sometimes arrive late in the evening when facilities available during ordinary trading hours are not available to them in other places. I would be the last to interfere with the provisions of the Early Closing Act. If this provision infringed that Act I would object to it but, as I do not think it does and it is common practice overseas, I do not object to it.

Perhaps the member for Ridley, who has travelled extensively, and the Premier have stayed at the Ambassadors Hotel in Los Angeles. This hotel provides everything; even bungalows can be rented there. It is the nearest approach to the Rockefeller Centre of any hotel in America. By this new section the Government is providing something that is necessary for travellers and does not encroach on the ordinary laws.

The provision extending the time for drinking liquor with meals from 9 until 10 p.m. is long overdue. Anyone who has had experience in our local hotels knows that as soon as it is 9 o'clock stewards go around picking up glasses and bottles and even though some glasses and bottles may be partly full they are quickly removed, if the liquor in them is not consumed immediately. The Bill extends to 10.30 p.m. the time in which liquor can be consumed after purchasing it. He cannot purchase liquor after 10 p.m. unless a permit is in force but after that time he has a reasonable time in which to consume liquor and is not forced to gulp it down, as is the case now. Although I am not expressing a view on the extension of general trading hours, I think the Government should consider allowing a reasonable time to consume liquor after 6 p.m. I do not suggest that it should be sold after 6 o'clock, but, as most people, particularly those in the country, know, much depends on how zealous is the local police officer. He can enter a bar on the stroke of six and order everyone to leave. In most places the police officer is reasonable and allows, say, five or 10 minutes to consume drinks purchased before 6 o'clock, but I see no objection to allowing the customer sufficient time to have his drink without being forced to gulp it down. I think the Government could well consider this in future so that there would be no chance that the licensee would be prosecuted by an overzealous police officer for allowing liquor to be consumed after the permitted time. I suggest that 10 or perhaps 15 minutes could be allowed so long as the drink was purchased before 6 p.m. and was not removed from the bar. In this way the privilege could not be abused. That in itself provides something that is not at present in the Act, and I think it is very good. Some people who go to a hotel for an evening meal like a glass of liquor with their meal, and before they properly settle down it is 8 o'clock or perhaps a little later. It is getting on for 9 o'clock before they know where they are, and they cannot after that time consume liquor with their meal. I point out to those who may object to certain of the Bill's provisions that it does not necessarily mean that any abuse will take place. I know that regard must be had for those diners who do not drink, and that it would be wrong for the drinkers to make a nuisance of themselves in the non-drinkers' company. I believe there is control in the very fact that most people who frequent hotels for dinner are the type who go there just for the convivial gathering or for a meal in a hotel with the facility of being able to have liquor, and not for the purpose of any over-indulgence. That in itself controls the position from the point of view of those who may be afraid that the provisions of this Bill will allow excess drinking. I do not think they will.

Mr. Jenkins—They could improve conditions.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. Many people wish to do the right thing, and between 8 o'clock and 9 o'clock they obtain liquor, but the amount they consume in that period could be about the same as they would consume between 8 o'clock and 10 o'clock if this provision were passed. Therefore, we need not consider we are creating a privilege for people to indulge to the extent some people might suggest.

Another amendment is the clause that exempts hotels from the provisions governing the consumption of liquor at dances. I am

one who is all for the banning of liquor at dances. I do not believe in liquor being consumed in motor cars or anywhere else near a dance hall, for I think it is bad. Parents allow their children to attend a local dance and they assume that those children are behaving themselves, but if liquor is allowed to be consumed in or near dance halls it could easily lead to trouble. I should not like to encourage that, and I oppose any further freedom in that regard. The exemption is to extend to hotels, and with the passage of time we shall find an increasing tendency on the part of hotelkeepers—as the city grows and becomes a little more modern—to put on floor shows which provide for dancing. It is common practice for the hotels overseas that cater for the tourist trade to have a small dance floor in the dining room where the diners, between courses, can indulge in a quiet evening's dancing amongst themselves. Generally, those in a particular party dance only with others in the same party. Allowing the sale of liquor at hotels and exempting hotels from the provisions of the other part of the Act under those circumstances is something that in my opinion is warranted.

The other amendment of any consequence, and one about which a song and dance was made some time back, concerns wine-tasting. Certain winemakers desired, either collectively or individually, to allow their customers to taste their wares, without any desire to encourage them to purchase. I do not suggest that it was smart salesmanship, as I am sure that that was not intended. Wine-tasting took place until the police felt that a breach of the Act was being committed. I do not recall whether there were any prosecutions, but nevertheless that practice had to be discontinued. The provision in the Bill to permit wine-tasting is a wise one. It is realistic because it does not place undue restriction on those people who are endeavouring to place their wares before the public.

I believe that the Bill generally can be accepted, for it provides for things in keeping with modern trends. I think it is about time we in South Australia started to appreciate that we cannot continue to isolate ourselves more or less by restraining our own citizens from doing certain things which people in the other States of Australia and other parts of the world have absolute freedom to do. I am confident that with the passage of time the restrictions we have imposed on our citizens by this and other legislation will have to be lifted. Members know my views regarding controls in certain matters that we debate here from time to time, but outside of that my view is that it is in the best interests of the State that there should be as little restriction as possible on the people. We should not go out of our way to place restrictions on our people. I do not believe anyone subscribes to regimentation, which is one of the worst features of a Communist society. Without strict regimentation Communism could not possibly succeed, even in predominantly Communist countries, and in fact I doubt whether it is succeeding there to the extent the Communist authorities would like it to succeed.

I believe we should impose as few restrictions on the freedom of the people as possible, provided that the normal rights and interests of the majority of the people are at all times safeguarded and that no person makes a nuisance of himself or inconveniences anyone else in any way. If I thought there was any objection to this Bill I would have stated it but I believe I can support the second reading of the Bill and I hope that my remarks will be considered in future.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I support the Bill and consider it is timely and well founded. I wish to speak briefly on two clauses that deal with the liberalization of hours during which alcoholic beverages may be taken with meals and with the wine-tasting section. It is incongruous that in South Australia, which produces approximately 80 per cent of the nation's wine, a diner has his glass whisked away from the table at 9 p.m. That practice has been badly received by interstate and overseas visitors and it is an intrusion on the individual rights of people to an unnecessary degree.

Mealtime is the correct time for wine to be taken and the liberalization of the law relating to consumption of liquor with meals is important to the State's wine-making industry. South Australia produces just under 80 per cent of the nation's wine. In 1959 our production was 25,132,000 gallons of the nation's production of 33,067,455 gallons. I represent a grape-growing district and it is good to observe the interest that is growing in light wines of a low alcoholic content. In 1955-1956 the consumption of these table wines amounted to 1,753,000 gallons, of which dry white accounted for 511,000 gallons, dry red for 894,000 gallons and sauternes and other similar wines for 348,000 gallons. That

figure has grown since 1955-1956 and has now reached 2,679,000 gallons. The consumption of dry white has increased to 666,000 gallons, dry red from 894,000 to 1,419,000 gallons, and sauternes from 348,000 to 594,000 gallons.

The liberalization of the licensing law will result in an opportunity for these desirable low alcoholic content wines to be consumed when they should be consumed—with food. They may now be consumed in the extended time during which it is permissible to have wines at the table. The old 9 p.m. restriction will, under this legislation, be replaced by 10 p.m. with half an hour's grace to consume liquor that has been purchased before 10 p.m. I commend the Government for introducing this legislation because it is a move in the right direction. I have no fears that any abuse will arise from the liberalization of the law but, on the other hand, it will have a good effect on the interest shown in, and the consumption of, these lighter alcoholic content wines.

South Australia can be justly proud of its high quality table wines and I refer to the recent successes of the industry at Ljubljana in Yugoslavia where the Barossa Valley wines gained 12 major awards including a gold medal for the best pearl wine in competition with wines from all over the world. Not only does that reflect credit on the local vignerons but it has a good effect on Australia generally. It indicates that we can produce goods of a quality equal to, and possibly better than, those produced anywhere else in the world. Those achievements are important because they underline to our overseas buyers that Australians can produce the world's best in primary products.

I am pleased that wine-tasting is to be legalized. Doubts have been expressed in the past as to the legality of wine-tasting and there were unfortunate happenings in Adelaide last year. Wine-tasting is a form of wine promotion that has great public appeal and it is a most effective way of educating the public in the proper use and appreciation of wines. Wine-tasting is not only important here, but in England it is proving a major avenue for the extension of our sales in that country. I am happy that we are going to allow wine-tasting under permit, because it will be appreciated by those who desire to generally further their knowledge and appreciation of wines. It will also be of assistance to the industry.

The member for West Torrens covered all the points raised in the second reading explanation of the Premier, and I do not wish to reiterate what he said, although I agree with his statements. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo)—Unlike the two previous speakers I oppose the Bill. I do that with great respect to my colleague, the member for West Torrens, who has a great knowledge of this question and who has grown in wisdom so far as it is concerned. However, even that will not permit me to agree with some arguments he placed before us this afternoon. The Premier intimated through the press long before the House resumed last August that he was going to introduce legislation to amend the Licensing Act. I have a press report before me this afternoon dated July 13, 1960, and it may be seen from the cutting that all the issues contained in the Bill were known then. It made a great display on the front page of the *Advertiser* on the date mentioned. The article headed "Liquor laws may change", stated:—

Two important amendments to South Australia's liquor laws are expected to be considered by State Parliament in the session to resume on August 9. They are:—to permit the sale of liquor with meals until 10 p.m., to permit the sale of liquor to house guests at tourist chalets which are many miles from a hotel. These requests have been made by the liquor trade and are being considered by State Cabinet. It is understood that Cabinet has approved that the proposed amendments should be submitted to Parliament. Under the present law liquor may be served with meals until 9 p.m. About 10 minutes is usually allowed for guests to finish their glasses. Under the proposed new legislation liquor could be served with meals until 10 p.m. and it is understood that liquor would be permitted to remain on the table until it is consumed. This would extend the actual time for drinks to more than a one-hour extension because guests would not have to rush their drinks at the last minute. The Government is understood to have no objection to later liquor service with meals, because South Australia is now considerably out of line with other States in this respect. Diners in hotels and licensed restaurants have been able to have drinks with meals until 9 p.m. since December, 1954. Before an amendment to the Licensing Act enabled this extension, liquor could be served with meals only until 8 p.m.

I knew that the press report was only a feeler to find out the reaction of the public, and that the Bill would be introduced in what one would call the dying hours of the session, so that it would slip through the House without much debate.

Mr. Jenkins—What a lot of rot!

Mr. HUGHES—I do not think so. I have already explained that through the press the Premier had intimated before the House resumed on August 9 that he had some idea of introducing this legislation, so I cannot see how it is a "lot of rot". The Premier is in a cleft stick. No doubt he is being pressed by those who stand to gain by an amendment of the Act; but there are the people of the way to be reckoned with, the people who look to the Premier to set an example, people upon whom he relies to enable him to form a Government. On this occasion I do not think the Premier can pass the buck to any of his departmental heads, as was done only last week when I asked him a question about children being banned from beer gardens. Here again the Premier found himself in a cleft stick but on this occasion he was able to pass it over, on some excuse, to the Commissioner of Police. But, in view of a public statement made by the officer in charge of the South Australian Police Traffic Division, I am afraid the Premier will have to carry the outcome of this proposed legislation on his own shoulders, because Inspector J. A. Vogelesang is reported in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, July 12, 1960, as saying:—

"Driving and drinking don't mix." A high percentage of one-vehicle accidents was caused by drivers who took cars on to roads while they were under the influence of liquor, the Police Traffic Division Chief (Inspector J. A. Vogelesang) said yesterday. He was commenting on the unusually large number of arrests for this offence in Adelaide over the week-end. He said studies showed that motorists who had only two or three drinks were twice as likely to have an accident as when they were driving sober, while five to eight drinks could increase the accident hazard 10 times. He added: "Drinking and driving certainly don't mix—and, if you add speeding to drinking and driving, the mixture is very dangerous indeed."

The officer went on to illustrate certain prosecutions that had taken place during June. I should like the House to note that the report of the inspector appeared in the press on July 12. The very next day there appeared another statement: that Cabinet had approved that the proposed amendments should be submitted to Parliament. Apparently, in the course of their deliberations, members of Cabinet are not prepared to accept reports of top-ranking officers of the State. Even if the report was not placed before Cabinet as an official report, every member of Cabinet would have read that report in the next morning's paper. Apparently, they were so hard pressed by the liquor trade that, despite the warning given that a small percentage of alcohol was a menace to road safety, they gave a statement to the press that they would introduce an amendment to the Act for an increase in the hours of liquor consumption.

If this Bill passes, it will allow people who do not mind spending a few pounds to have an open slather. The hours of eating meals have not changed to the extent that it is necessary for the Act to be amended to allow people to have dinner until 10.30 p.m. I know that the Bill states "10 p.m.", but in his second reading explanation the Premier said that 30 minutes would be allowed after the prescribed time.

Mr. Quirke—Does it say what type of meal?

Mr. HUGHES—I am not talking about the type of meal; I am talking about the extension of hours for consuming liquor. Diners will have a double course meal if they so desire. Some people have a late dinner, but they are not the people that this legislation will affect to any degree. Should this Bill become law, what is to stop parties arranging an early dinner and then for about two hours just sitting around watching some sort of entertainment and consuming liquor? An increase in drinking hours will mean that more parties will be going to hotels and restaurants for dinner because it will be their entertainment for the evening. Common sense alone teaches that the higher the standards of conduct, the more peaceful the living conditions of the people. I am trying only to safeguard certain people who at times cannot look after themselves.

I have here a booklet that I received some time ago entitled *The Challenge Ahead.* It is the E. S. Meyers Memorial Lecture delivered at a meeting of the Queensland Branch of the British Medical Association and the University of Queensland Medical Society. The lecture on this occasion was delivered by a Mr. L. J. J. Nye, M.B., Ch.M., F.R.A.C.P., F.R.G.S.A., Brisbane. The following is taken from the booklet:—

When the request was made to me, I asked myself what type of lecture Errol would appreciate if he were with us. The answer I found to this question arose from the thought that he was always a progressive thinker, always taking up some new challenge. To me it seems that the greatest challenge that faces us all today is not in the realm of medicine, but in the future of our nation. It is concerning this, therefore, that I propose to speak. What I have to say is an extension of a thesis Professor John Bostock and I put forward in a book we published in 1934. I

make no apology for elaborating it tonight, for I believe it deals with a problem that we should keep constantly in our vision.

The lecturer spoke at some length and referred to immigration, decentralization, education, the press, trade unions, inflation, defence and world government, and he also had the following to say on alcoholism:—

Alcoholism is becoming a very serious menace to health and happiness throughout the Christian world. In a country like Australia, whose climate and working conditions give so much time for developing interest in the arts and crafts, sports, gardening and other forms of real recreation, there is no logical reason for the extensive use of alcohol.

The recently formed Foundation for the Research and Treatment of Alcoholism has shown that there are approximately 300,000 chronic alcoholics in Australia; and the numbers are increasing at such an alarming rate that it is estimated that one in every 14 drinkers in Australia either is or will become a chronic alcoholic.

A. T. Pearson (1957), in Perth, has shown how very serious and menacing are the effects of alcohol in causing road accidents. In that city, since 1950, it has been the practice to take estimations of the alcohol in the blood and urine of all persons killed in road accidents with the following alarming results:—

> ". . . out of 218 tests performed, 92 (42.2 per cent) revealed alcohol in the blood. If a blood alcohol content of 0.1 per cent (100 milligrammes of ethyl alcohol per 100 millilitres of blood) is taken as the level of insobriety for the purposes of driving a motor vehicle—and this is the level accepted in other countries (for example, Denmark)—then 39.4 per cent of these people killed were under the influence of alcohol. In simpler terms, four in every 10 fatal traffic accident victims were dangerously under the influence of alcohol at the time of the accident".

We, as a profession, should take a lead in the fight against alcoholism and set an example, either by abstaining from taking any intoxicating liquor (as is done by all good Mohammedans, Buddhists and Hindus), or by using it in moderate amounts only immediately before or with meals. We should go further and recommend that every person who gets drunk should be considered mentally unstable and should have psychiatric advice. This step alone, I feel sure, would be a very helpful deterrent to the alarming increase in social drinking, which often results in chronic addiction.

I draw attention particularly to his final sentence. That should emphasize to members the danger of social drinking. I respect members who have been interjecting because perhaps they are some of the few people who know how to drink in moderation, but there are others who do not exercise proper control, drink more than is good for them and then go out on to the highways and byways to become a menace to safety.

Recently I asked the Premier a question regarding children in beer gardens. I do not think he is being very consistent respecting concern for the safety of children. A hindrance to social progress can be expected when the State's Leader is not consistent in his outlook. The following is portion of his reply to my question:—

I should hate to think that any legislation the Government introduced could result in leaving children unattended at home, where a serious fire could break out in the house and serious loss of life could result. I would be very upset if I felt that as a result of some legislation we had subjected children to physical danger.

When he introduced the Bill the Premier would have known that with the extension of one hour for consuming liquor, children would also be concerned. Yet, there is not one reference to this in his speech. Therefore, I say that he has not been consistent regarding the licensing laws.

Recently members of this House were privileged to visit the lovely Wilpena Chalet. I am broadminded and have no objection to drinking by people during meals at the chalet, but I strongly object to the hours permitted. If I know anything about it, the chalet does not rely upon providing liquor to make it more beautiful or enticing to tourists, because already it has built up a good name. When making a speech at Quorn, the Premier mentioned that in one week alone the chalet had been visited by about 6,000 people.

Mr. Quirke—I bet that the first week after this legislation becomes law it will be visited by 12,000.

Mr. HUGHES—That may be so, but it did not take liquor to build up the chalet's name. I do not deny a man the right to have a drink if he wants one, but I do not think it is necessary for a licence to be issued to the chalet to enable people to consume liquor until 10.30 p.m. No-one will convince me that people will sit in the chalet having dinner until that hour. They do not go to the chalet mainly to eat and drink. They have other things to do. I consider that the licensing hours should be cut down to 8 p.m. or 8.30 p.m. at the latest. I believe it would be wrong to permit the chalet to sell liquor until 10 p.m. and to permit the patrons to consume that liquor until 10.30.

Mr. Quirke—The patrons would not be driving motor cars.

Mr. HUGHES—That may be so, but I think harm could be done to our tourist trade. The

Pound will not rely solely on tourists from overseas and from other States. Indeed, many South Australians patronize it and the host has informed me that business is so good that he will be building other huts to accommodate more visitors that he expects in future. It would be a retrograde step to permit the sale of liquor after 8 or 8.30 p.m. with dinner at the Pound. I have received letters from people and organizations in my district protesting at any increase in the hours for consuming liquor. I have made investigations to ascertain the views of respected persons on this subject. Professor Norval Morris, the dean of the law school at our University, when speaking at the first Australian Conference on Alcoholism, being held at the University of New South Wales, said:—

Almost half the annual commitments to Australian gaols and a quarter of the running costs of gaols came from sentences of a few days or a few weeks imposed for minor drunkenness charges. Every prisoner serving such a brief time in gaol is proof of our failure to handle intelligently this difficult problem. We should abandon the sentence of brief imprisonment and substitute for it more protracted incarceration in institutions. Probably 50 per cent of those convicted of more serious crimes were, at the time of the commission of the crime, under the influence of alcohol sufficient to have an appreciable effect on their inhibitions. There was a close relationship between crime and alcohol. Australia seemed immune to emotional disturbance in response to the slaughter of hundreds of people each year on the roads. Evidence that drinking drivers caused between a third and a half of the fatalities was becoming very strong.

Mr. Quirke—That, of course, is not correct.

Mr. HUGHES—I do not know whether or not it is correct. The honourable member may be able to refute Professor Morris's statement.

Mr. Hall—Did he mention hours of sale?

Mr. HUGHES—That has no bearing on the argument.

Mr. Hall—If not, it has no bearing on this debate.

Mr. HUGHES—No matter how much I might like to support this legislation, because of the principles I have followed over the years I am unable to do so, and I strongly oppose the second reading.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support the Bill for several reasons, primarily because, by necessity and interest, I am concerned with the problems of the wine industry, as is the member for Barossa. I admit that the Barossa produces fine wines, but the electorates of Chaffey and Ridley produce much of the material from which they are made.

Mr. Quirke—Chaffey produces one or two good wines, too. Why write your own district down?

Mr. KING—I am not writing my district down. The member for Burra no doubt finds our wines and spirituous products attractive. Mr. Hughes complained that this legislation has been introduced rather late in the session, but his own remarks clearly indicate that the public has had ample notice of its proposed introduction to enable them to communicate with their members. Most of the opinions I have received have been that this legislation represents a sensible approach to a problem and is in keeping with the times. Much has been said about the fact that many of our court offences are associated with drunkenness. That may be so, but I point out that most of the people hailed before the courts for these offences are persons who have been drinking between meals. Any experienced person knows that it is foolish to drink to excess on an empty stomach. This legislation will enable people to drink with their meals in a civilized manner. At present, if people wish to take wines with their meals they must often obtain permits, and these frequently permit the consumption of liquor until 11 p.m. and later. Under this legislation 10.30 will be sufficient for their purposes.

We have a number of community hotels in the River Murray areas which are regarded as community centres. People frequently celebrate birthdays and other occasions on Saturday evenings and use the hotels for the purpose. The hotels are famous for their cuisine and for the wines they serve with meals. If Mr. Hughes wants to broaden his outlook further he should attend one of these functions and obtain first-class information on the drinking of wines with meals without any danger to the persons partaking thereof.

Recently I read a press report that in Victoria it had been found that blood tests, which had been held out to us as being the standard for measuring drunkenness, were useless because blood taken from various parts of the body did not have the same reading. Therefore, those who base their argument on blood tests may have to reconsider the matter. I support the Bill. I do not think it will increase the sale of wines to any extent, but it will make the position much more civilized.

Instead of creating offences, which matter seems to worry the member for Wallaroo, I think it will have the opposite effect.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the second reading. The member for Chaffey represents a district where there is wine, music and birthdays, and he has given us some serious thoughts on the Bill. Many years ago I was like the member for Wallaroo and believed that the answer to this drinking problem was a restriction of trading hours. However, I have since travelled to other States and I am now convinced that where there has been an extension of trading hours there has been a more orderly consumption of liquor, and that there has not been the same undesirable swill that we have in South Australia. Some years ago my wife and I travelled from Brisbane to a little beyond Cairns and we were impressed by the orderly way in which liquor was consumed in hotel lounges and with meals. We looked for people affected by liquor but at the end of one month we could say that we had seen only two people affected in an undesirable way, and all that time we lived in hotels. I believe that the permission to consume liquor with meals for a longer period will result in reduced intoxication rather than add to it. For the successful development of our tourist trade there must be greater liberties in the consumption of liquor. I believe in moderation in liquor consumption and that if people are allowed to consume liquor with their meals until a later hour there will be more moderation, much more than is possible when people stand at the bar and swill. I am concerned about one proposed relaxation of our liquor laws. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:—

The next amendment relates to those sections of the principal Act which were inserted in 1945 after the cessation of the National Security Regulations prohibiting the consumption of liquor at dances in public premises without a special permit to be granted on certain conditions.

The proposed amendment will permit the consumption of liquor and dancing to take place at the same time in hotels. I am concerned about our young folk. All members will agree that various forms of entertainment, particularly dancing, are indulged in for the purpose of relaxation and for getting away from every-day cares.

Mr. King—People under 21 years of age cannot be served with liquor in hotels.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The member for Chaffey has much wisdom and no doubt he has profited from his experiences. All men with intelligence must do that. When young people relax by consuming liquor they throw discretion to the wind and I fear—I have had no experience of this—that it can bring distress to themselves and to their families, and create regrettable conditions in home life and in the community generally. I shall refer to this matter to a greater extent when the Bill is considered in Committee. I shall then determine my attitude on the provision in the light of information given.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I rise not with the object of influencing other votes on this matter but merely to explain my own convictions on the subject and my attitude towards the Bill. I am sorry that I seem to be out of step with other members, but I stand with the member for Wallaroo. I do not find it easy to address myself to this Bill. It is easy for people to say that members who are not happy about the provisions of the Bill are adopting a superior air and a "holier than thou" attitude, but that is not so. Any measure that will tend to increase the consumption of liquor is not for the benefit of the State. It is because I hold that conviction firmly, and only because of that, that I cannot support this Bill. I am not asking anyone else to agree with me, or adopting the attitude that I am right and others are wrong, but this is my opinion and, because I hold it, I cannot support a measure that I think will inevitably encourage the consumption of liquor, in some cases under conditions that I think are not helpful.

Members know that for years I have taken a keen interest in the development of tourist traffic in the Flinders Ranges, so it is not easy for me to oppose what I know my good friends regard as a measure that will stimulate tourist traffic in that area. I do not suppose anyone has been a more regular visitor to the chalet than I, and I think it would be a great pity if the picnic atmosphere that is part of the charm of a visit to the Flinders Ranges were interfered with in any way. I am not convinced that it is necessary to give the chalet the right to sell liquor from 6 to 10.30 p.m. or that that will add to the attraction of the chalet. I have spent several holidays at Mount Buffalo in Victoria, and the fact that it is not licensed has not detracted from its appeal as a tourist resort. As a matter of fact, I think members know that rooms are allotted for the whole of Australia and that in order to obtain accommodation in January a ballot is held in June.

Mr. Harding—I would say more grog was consumed at the chalet than at any other place I have ever visited.

Mr. RICHES—The honourable member must speak for himself, but the chalet is not licensed. I have spent many happy holidays there and I would be sorry indeed to see a licence granted for it. I do not think the granting of a licence at Wilpena will add to its attractiveness or make any contribution to the holiday atmosphere for those who enjoy that type of holiday. For the same reason, I cannot accept the proposal to extend the hours of consumption of liquor with meals in hotels until 10.30 p.m. I cannot say that the present provisions have been abused; I do not know whether they have or have not been abused. I have not seen anything objectionable about them but on many occasions I have been told that 9 o'clock is late enough because by that time dinners are completed, except those for some social circles in which I frankly admit I do not mix and know nothing about. I want more justification than the mere fact that these provisions would suit the convenience or desires of a section of the community. I believe the present law is better than this Bill for the great bulk of the people of this State. For these reasons I do not support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the Bill, and at this stage would like to give the member for Stuart a little reproof. I think he was mistaken in thinking that anyone in this House would think him the odd man out because he holds the views he does. I respect him for his views and, if they are his strong convictions, let him hold them for as long as he wishes. That applies also to the member for Wallaroo. Because my views are different, that does not mean that I think there is anything for which I should look down on any member; I think that applies to every member of this House.

I will now reply to the member for Wallaroo. There is in existence today a much exaggerated impression about the results of having a drink or two. I promised the honourable member that I would give some figures and, although I will not quote them all, they are here for him to see if he wishes. These figures are issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics and give the number of accidents, persons killed and persons injured. I ask him to look at some of these figures and he will find that they are different indeed from the supposititious figures, which would be alarming. These statistics do not in any way support the figures he gave. As they would occupy a great deal of space in *Hansard*, I do not propose to ask that they be inserted, but they are available for the honourable member. This Bill permits drinking with meals in certain hours, and even lays down the type of meal a person must have. One cannot have a sandwich and a biscuit but must have a proper meal of at least two courses.

Mr. Jenkins—And at a cost of 5s.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes.

Mr. Jenkins—That applies at the chalet.

Mr. QUIRKE—It does not apply only at the chalet; it is necessary to have a meal at a hotel to obtain a drink. I will now give the member for Wallaroo a little advice. Does he know what I think is wrong with him? I think that if I prepared a meal of a nice steak, slightly rare, with some new potatoes and green peas and half a bottle of nice dry red wine, he would be reformed. If he would like to make the experiment I will undertake to supply the wherewithal and to cook it, and I have no ulterior motive in saying that. I agree with many comments of the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh). Both the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) and I represent grape-growing districts. Everyone knows that I have interests in the wine industry, and I suppose no good purpose would be served by my extending my support, for everyone knows my support is there. I merely wished to say these few words, particularly in view of certain members' comments with which I do not agree. I hope my disagreement with those members' views will be taken in all kindliness, and if they accept my offer they can name the day.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I support the Bill. Although there is no particular virtue in uniformity, we find nowadays that we do not live alone, State by State; Australia is one country, and customs cannot be kept entirely within State borders. As travel becomes more and more popular a great influx of people is coming to this State. Further, many of our people travel to other States and become aware of, and accustomed to, conditions existing there. Therefore, I am sure that in much of our legislation we have to consider the practices in other States. The consumption of liquor is a social custom that cannot be denied by State boundaries. I believe in certain restrictions, and I adhere to 6 p.m. closing at this stage.

Mr. Hughes—You would not advocate 10 o'clock closing?

Mr. HALL—No. I believe in some amelioration of our laws, but I do not believe that we should go all the way in this matter. We have to compromise, and we are doing so in this matter of drinking with meals, which concerns visitors from other States more than anything else, because when they visit here most of them stay at hotels and other places that are concerned with his matter.

Mr. Hughes—Are they restricted if they stay in hotels?

Mr. HALL—This Bill represents a compromise with the wishes of some of our people, and as we do not live in isolation it should be accepted as a compromise in the hope that it will indicate that this is a State that can progress with the rest.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (25).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, Jennings, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nicholson and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Ralston, Ryan and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Frank Walsh and Fred Walsh.

Noes (2).—Messrs. Hughes (teller), and Riches.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Bywaters.

Majority of 23 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 14."

Mr. RICHES—What is the reason for the provision that permits the consumption of liquor at the chalet for four hours with the evening meal?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The hours are the standard hours provided for restaurants and hotels. The chalet is not a hotel and there is no obligation on the part of the lessee of the chalet to sell liquor. If the meal is finished before the time mentioned there is no obligation on the part of the licensee to sell liquor up to that time. There may be two sittings, because it is not always possible to seat everyone at the first sitting on occasions. The reason for the provision is that the hours are those provided for restaurants and hotels, but the licensee may only supply liquor with meals. When the meal is finished that is the end of the supply.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Amendment of principal Act, section 199."

Mr. HUTCHENS—This clause exempts hotels from certain restrictions relating to the serving of liquor in association with dancing. Dancing is a form of relaxation that may provide an escape from reality, and some young people may be tempted into doing things that may later prove distressing to themselves and their families. What attempt will be made to prevent the possibility I have referred to?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There has always been some doubt whether hotels were exempt under the Act. The history of this provision goes back to the war years when a national security regulation introduced by the State Government under Commonwealth powers prohibited the drinking of liquor in conjunction with dancing in public halls. That was a desirable provision when so many unattached people moved from place to place. The provision was successful and there was strong agitation for it to be retained for public halls where dances were held. It is still the law, and it also applies to motor cars parked near public halls in certain areas. However, there was some doubt whether this prohibition applied to hotels, and one magistrate held it was permissible to drink in a hotel near a dance hall. The Government believes that there is a difference between dance halls, where many young people aged between 15 and 16 years attend, and hotels. Young people may be induced out into cars where liquor is served and that is not desirable. On the other hand, people in hotels have to be over 21 before they may be supplied with liquor and hotels are under the control of the management and the licensing law is strict on the conduct of hotels. People do not have to go to the hotels and those who do attend have usually reached the age of discretion. They are not young teenagers who may not have the balance they should have in this matter. That is the reason for the clause: it clears up an ambiguity.

Mr. Riches—This deals with sale, not consumption.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The sale is, of course, for consumption. At present there is some doubt whether refreshments can be charged for. The Parliamentary Draftsman advises that the principal reason for the clause is to make it clear that the refreshments may be charged for. It is a charge not for admission but for refreshments. The Government does not intend to run wild on this. It realizes the benefits of good social laws but, if our laws are too restricted, we shall get into trouble.

Clause **passed.**

Remaining clauses (13 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 9. Page 1732.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading. Labor members do not oppose increases in salaries.

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

## CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 9. Page 1733.)

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I have looked at this Bill closely with the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and other members on this side who have had some experience on the land and are anxious to determine just what the effect of the Bill will be. We see no objection to it in its present form. The Government is dealing generously with the situation. The Bill is rendered necessary largely by the alteration that has taken place in money values, and the amount of Crown lands that can be leased to an individual applicant is determined by the money value of the land. As that value alters, so does the area that can be held. The Government has gone a little further than it need have done in lifting the amount of permissible valuation but we do not see that any real purpose would be served by restricting the Government further at this stage. The whole idea of the legislation was to ensure that too large areas would not get into the hands of too few people. We have examined the Bill to make sure that the amending legislation on this occasion will not encourage that. After our investigations and discussions with officers of the Lands Department, we are satisfied that that is just as adequately safeguarded as it is under the present law.

Mr. HALL (Gouger)—I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. The necessity for it was brought to my notice on Monday by a gentleman who was having difficulty with a land transaction. He could not sell his land to a person because the intending purchaser already had land of an unimproved value of more than £7,000. When I rang him on Tuesday and told him about the Bill he was pleased. Many farmers now have an unimproved value of more than £7,000 and yet they are only what might be termed one-man farms. It has meant that a person wishing to purchase land for a son or sons has been unable to do so because he owns a property of an unimproved value of more than £7,000. This has greatly hampered people in setting up members of their families in agriculture.

The Bill raises the maximum value of land that can be held to £12,000. This is not an over-generous gesture, although an extremely good one. Near the city land values have increased greatly. Some people on small farms who are growing wheat or running sheep are restricted by the present limitation in setting up their sons on the land. This would apply in the South-East. I think that the amount should be doubled, because money values have more than halved since the limit was originally fixed. The Bill is a step in the right direction. I thank the Minister for introducing it and heartily support its provisions.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria)—I, too, strongly support the Bill and congratulate the Minister on introducing it. I do not consider that the £12,000 proposed is very liberal. I could quote instances where a father has found it impossible to transfer land to his son because of the present provision. I strongly oppose the aggregation of large areas. Most Crown lands are in the poorer areas where larger properties are required to enable a man to earn a livelihood. The proposed amount of £12,000 is not over-generous.

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

SALARIES ADJUSTMENT (PUBLIC SERVICE AND TEACHERS) BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1328.)

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—When this matter was previously before the Committee the Leader of the Opposition asked why the amendment should not be retrospective. That complaint could be made regarding practically every law that has been passed. It is not the Government's policy to make retrospective legislation. However, I want to show that in this matter the Government has not been ungenerous to the officers concerned. The classification return, published in the *Government Gazette* of March 31, 1960, providing for increases, stated:—

Date of operation.—The salaries prescribed by this return shall be payable as from and including the 7th day of March, 1960, but shall not apply to any person who has ceased active duty by resignation or retirement earlier than the fourteenth day after the date of publication of this *Gazette*.

These matters were actually the subject of a Public Service Board return, but some questions were raised by the Public Service Association which the Government considered and, as a result, we decided to pass legislation to clarify the position not only regarding the present case but of future cases. That is the Bill's history. The Government does not propose to make the legislation more retrospective. The Public Service Commissioner has frequently discussed this matter with me and in his latest minute concerning it stated:—

It is not suggested that retrospective increases should be applicable to persons who resigned of their own accord from the Government service at any period.

The Bill confers substantial benefits upon public servants who have retired and who may retire in future.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—I know that certain retirements occurred in 1959 and that some persons obtained benefits and others were requested to make repayments. In 1956 an Appropriation Bill had to be introduced to meet a position similar to that which we seek to cover now. We can look forward to the fact that, in future, when salary increases take place and officers retire during the period they are recommended and before they become operative, they will be protected and there will be no need for special appropriations.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 15, at 2 p.m.