HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, November 5, 1963.

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

POLICE ACTION.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I instructed the Leader of the *Hansard* staff to omit the statutory declaration made by one Edwin Ross Ives from the official report of the debates of last Thursday. The House gave leave for this declaration, together with others, to be incorporated in *Hansard* without its being read to the House. Subsequent examination of this particular declaration revealed that it contained statements of a nature which it would not have been proper to have read to the House. I informed the honourable the Premier, the honourable member the Leader of the Opposition, and the honourable member for Norwood that it was my intention to have this objectionable matter omitted from *Hansard*, in which they concurred.

QUESTIONS.

ADELAIDE JUVENILE COURT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times I have raised with the Minister of Works the question of accommodation for defendants and their relatives and witnesses at the Adelaide Juvenile Court. Has the Minister a report about improving this accommodation?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The report on this matter came to me yesterday. Consulting architects were appointed to draw up plans for additional accommodation and two schemes were submitted by them. These schemes have been examined by court authorities and the Attorney-General, who have agreed on one of the schemes. This has been submitted for approval of expenditure, and I have approved the necessary expenditure to enable tenders to be called for the work.

BEEF EXPORTS.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what alterations, if any, are likely to be made to the Gepps Cross abattoirs as a result of the proposals put forward by the American authorities regarding the import of beef into America?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot give details of the alterations likely to be made at the abattoirs but, as honourable members know, the United States authorities are insisting on a particularly high standard of hygiene for all establishments that will export meat to the United States. No-one will object to an insistence upon these higher standards of hygiene. The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board will meet those requirements and is making arrangements to do whatever is necessary but, at this stage, I cannot say what the details are. Even though the meat may not be sent to the United States, it seems reasonable that abattoirs in this country should develop hygiene to the same standard, and that is what the board intends to do. I will ask the board what are its intentions, and will let the honourable member know soon.

KYBYBOLITE SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about work to be undertaken at the Kybybolite school?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that the delay in installing the lighting plant at the Kybybolite school head teacher's residence has been caused by difficulty in obtaining a suitable quotation for the erection of a shed. However, in view of the school committee's offer, and following a discussion with the head teacher, plans and specifications for the shed are being forwarded so that the committee may submit a quotation for consideration.

LAND SPEED RECORD ATTEMPT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I notice that another inquiry is being made regarding the speed trials at Lake Eyre. In view of the need for all the machinery of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to be engaged on the badly needed road repairs in my district and also in other members' districts where the Highways Department does not operate, and as the benefits from such trials mainly accrue to oil and tyre companies, can the Premier assure the House that no further Government expenditure will be made in respect of such speed trials?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has had no request for assistance since the abortive attempt made earlier this year. I am not sure why the honourable member has posed his question. He referred to the need for roads and other facilities. There would be expenditure by the Government for police protection for the public to keep them off the course while the trial was being conducted. I do not think the honourable member's intention in asking his question was to

prevent that expenditure. Normally police protection is given to the public wherever and under whatever conditions a speed trial is held, frequently when no request for protection has been received. The Government would have to accede to such a request out of consideration for the safety of the public, if for no other reason. No request has been received for expenditure other than what would be required for normal services, and I do not contemplate any. The Government became involved in this matter earlier this year because no access to the lake was available. Access was provided then, so it need not be considered again. The Government would not be interested in spending anything on the preparation of the lake. I cannot imagine any request being preferred but, if one is, I assure the honourable member that the Government is not enamoured of spending money on this project.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. COUMBE: Some time has elapsed since I introduced a deputation from the Prospect council to the Minister of Works seeking improvements to the sewage farm outlet to cope with the floodwaters from Prospect. Can the Minister say whether any recommendation has been made on overcoming this problem? If it has not, when is a decision likely to be made?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As promised the deputation and the honourable member at the time, I referred the question to the Engineer-in-Chief. He reported that the solution of the problem was not as simple as I, from a layman's point of view, thought it might be. I have discussed this twice with Mr. Dridan. He is endeavouring to formulate a scheme to provide some worthwhile alleviation, but he has not yet come forward with a final answer. In view of this question I will again seek his views so that I can give the honourable member some more definite information later.

WINDSOR GARDENS HOUSING.

Mr. JENNINGS: Last Sunday morning at the request of several constituents who have purchased Housing Trust houses in Welkin Street, Windsor Gardens, I inspected their houses, which have been occupied for three or four years. They are of an extremely attractive design and are in a good location. I was pleased to see that the purchasers had been well looked after in that the houses were good, both inside and outside. However, there is a severe fault: the houses are cracking badly and numerous structural faults are obvious, even to a layman such as I. I have seen these places, so I am not depending on hearsay evidence or on letters I have received. I asked my constituents to write to me detailing their specific complaints. I now have seven letters with me. If I give the Premier these letters, will he take this matter up with the Housing Trust to see whether the defects can be remedied?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about progress on the proposed rebuilding of the Port Augusta gaol?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department, as follows:

The project is being designed by a firm of private architects and they have advised that the working drawings and specifications will be completed within the next few weeks. When these have been completed it will then be necessary for a bill of quantities to be prepared. Subject to approval of funds being given it is anticipated that tenders could be called for the work early in 1964.

FERRIES.

Mr. BYWATERS: Gates are installed at the approaches to most ferries along the River Murray. These are designed primarily to prevent vehicles from entering the river. The gates are worked in various ways, mainly hydraulically. Most approaches have these gates, although I know of at least one that has not. Can the Minister of Works say whether the provision of these gates is compulsory, whether they are installed by the Highways Department or the council, and whether the ferry operator is obliged to see that the gates are shut? Will the Minister take this up with his colleague and let me have a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. CURREN: I have been approached by several residents of the Upper Murray, who have pointed out the inadequacy of the present signs at the Kingston ferry as to location and visibility. I, too, have often observed this when I have used this ferry. In view of the fatal accident that occurred at the ferry in the early hours of Sunday morning, will the Minister of Works request his colleague, the Minister of Roads, to have an examination made of the road signs at the approach to this ferry, particularly the western approach?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Minister of Works will recall that during the Address in Reply debate, and subsequently by question, I drew his attention to the need for an additional ferry at Mannum. At that time, we were informed that two additional ferries were to be made available to serve the Upper Murray at Kingston and Berri (no doubt they are needed, too). It is apparent that another ferry is needed at Mannum, particularly during weekends and holidays. The position during these periods is intolerable, particularly for local residents, because of the large number of tourists. Of course, tourists are welcome, but a need for an additional ferry exists to cope with the heavy traffic. Often long delays occur and people returning home to milk or using the facilities of the town are prohibited because of the situation. Will the Minister again take up with his colleague the urgency of providing another ferry at Mannum? I realize that only two punts will become available from Blanchetown, but it should not be beyond the Government's power to have another ferry built.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will bring the honourable member's remarks to my colleague's notice.

FERTILIZER BOUNTY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the payment of a subsidy on Wooltana fertilizer?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bill providing for the bounty on superphosphate was passed in the Commonwealth Parliament just before it prorogued. In order to get the information for the honourable member I had to ring Mr. C. R. Kelly, M.H.R. He said that under the Act, as passed, the Wooltana fertilizer did not qualify for the bounty. The Minister for Primary Industry, however, assured the House of Representatives that if further investigation showed that there was a real place for Wooltana fertilizer the position would be reviewed. The Minister was going to inquire into this matter as soon as possible.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. CLARK: During the last few days the headmasters of several high schools in my district have expressed concern about the public examinations that are to be held soon. They are being inundated with telephone calls from parents who are in the dark about where and how the public examinations are to be held. I realize that it may not be easy, but will the Minister of Education make an official statement to clarify the position and save headmasters from these constant telephone calls?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I will see whether it is possible to make a public statement soon.

TRAFFIC PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about traffic prosecutions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a report from Sergeant Menz. I point out that the courts determine the penalties to be imposed and that the Administration has no control over penalties. The court decides the severity of a fine. I doubt whether Parliament or the Administration should be able to question the decisions of the court. Parliament can alter the law, if that is considered necessary. However, I personally think that the court must be free to administer the law as it sees fit. The report states:

Mr. Damato of Campbelltown was charged at Gawler court on October 28, 1903, before Mr. J. J. Redman, S.M., on Form 4A as follows:

Count 1.

On September 1, 1963, at Willaston in the said State, being the driver of a vehicle namely a motor car on a road namely Redbanks Road who was approaching a give way sign at the intersection of the said road and Gawler by-pass road from the direction in which the sign was facing did not give the right of way to a motor station sedan approaching the said intersection from the right. Contrary to section 64 of the Road Traffic Act, 1961.

Count 2.

On September 1, 1963, at Willaston in the said State, drove a motor car on a road namely Redbanks Road without due care or attention or without reasonable consideration for other persons using the said road. Contrary to section 45 of the Road Traffic Act, 1961.

The summons was served on Damato personally on October 12, 1963. Damato signed a form 4A, duly witnessed, and received at this court on October 15, 1963, on which Damato pleaded guilty without making any comment or statement thereon.

The prosecution arose as the result of a collision at the intersection of the Redbanks Road and the Gawler by-pass road at Willaston on Sunday, September 1, 1963, which resulted in the death, at the scene, of Mrs. Allard, the wife of the driver of a Holden van with which the car driven by Damato collided.

I prosecuted, and when opening, I shortly addressed the magistrate stating that I felt that I had to be careful in fairness to the defendant, who was not present, as to how far

I should go in placing particulars before the court because, even though the consequences resulted in the death of a woman passenger in one of the vehicles involved, the facts were very simple and such as applied to many similar accidents in which only minor damage occurred.

The statements of Mr. Allard, Mrs. James and the independent witness Linke, who was driving his car easterly on the by-pass in the vicinity at the time, and the police questioning of the defendant were read to the court. Some of the police observations such as width of roads, lines of vision, road surfaces and position of the sun were submitted to the magistrate, whose remarks in summing up were very brief.

He stated that the consequences were tragic and unfortunate, that he felt that he could only deal with the facts as placed before him, that he felt that the position was quite clear and that he did not feel it necessary to view photographs. The circumstances were only such as applied to numerous accidents. A fine of £10 with £2 5s. costs was recorded with 21 days allowed to pay.

As is usual in a case where the more serious charge is proved, the second charge was withdrawn. The report concludes:

The charge of "due care" is an alternative charge in case other charge dismissed through some technicality. It is normal to withdraw it if first charge proved.

That other charge was withdrawn.

BARLEY STORAGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the possible receival of bulk barley at the new silo at Port Adelaide. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received the following reply from the General Manager of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited:

I have pleasure in advising that of the 38 cells (24 main, 14 interspace) in the 2,000,000-bushel terminal silo at Port Adelaide, half will be allocated to barley and storage available for 1,000,000 bushels of barley in bulk. This State bulk grain handling authority has arranged with the Australian Barley Board to receive barley in bulk direct from growers at the terminal silo during the coming harvest.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, say whether the survey work on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie gauge standardization has been completed? If it has not, will he obtain a report on the progress made?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The question is not small, as the survey work is a big project. I will refer the question to my colleague with a view to bringing down whatever information is available.

COWANDILLA ROAD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked recently concerning the reconstruction of Cowandilla Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that it is intended to reconstruct Cowandilla Road from Brooker Terrace to Marion Road as soon as plans have been completed and the necessary land for widening has been purchased. It is expected that this work will be commenced during the current financial year. Most of the land has already been acquired, and where land is needed for widening but not yet acquired, all landholders have been notified. It is expected, because of the staggered intersection, that land will not be required from the shops at the north-western corner of the intersection. However, this cannot be definitely stated at this stage until the plans are completed.

MALLALA ELECTRICITY EXTENSION.

Mr. HALL: A group of people living to the south and south-west of Mallala are becoming worried, and in some instances wrathful, about the continued delay in connecting their properties with the electricity system. Those people were more or less promised that their properties would be connected during the last year or so, but this connection date seems to be continually set back. Many of those people understood their properties would be connected by Christmas, but now it seems that the date of connection will be the middle of next year, perhaps even later. They point out that one holiday resort in particular was hardly built when their scheme was first considered, but that it now has electricity connected. In this present connection to the west of Mallala there is also the question of connecting holiday shacks at Port Parham with electricity. Many permanent residents in the district I have referred to are becoming worried, even wrathful, that holiday shacks may be connected before those permanent residents of the district receive connections. Will the Premier obtain a substantial forecast as to when these people will receive connections? Further, if possible, will he hasten this project in accordance with promises already given?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will obtain a report.

TEACHERS' SALARIES.

Mr. RYAN: I have been informed that at some schools last Friday, which was the normal pay-day, a number of teachers did not receive their pay and some of them were thus placed in an embarrassing financial position. These teachers probably received their pay on the following Monday, but this would have left them without it over the weekend. If this unfortunate event occurred, as I believe it did in a number of cases, will the Minister of Education see that the position is rectified and that such a happening does not recur?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. I understand that this did happen in some instances, and I assure the honourable member that it will not occur in the future if I have any say in the matter. I received a letter this morning from the South Australian Institute of Teachers urgently calling my attention to this matter. I, in turn, referred it to the Director of Education and the Secretary of the Education Department, and I am seeing the executive officers of the institute on Thursday afternoon to discuss the matter and to ensure, as far as possible, that such a thing does not occur again.

APPRENTICES.

Mr. LANGLEY: I recently received the following letter from a constituent:

I sat for the Islington apprentice entrance examination on September 25. On Wednesday, October 23, I received a letter from Islington to say I had passed and an appointment had been made for an interview on Friday, October 25. I was taken to the waiting room and a gentleman took my letter and report book away and, after some time, I was taken to a room and interviewed by three members of the board. They asked me how I first became interested in woodwork, and I told them. I was then told that all apprenticeships for the woodwork section at Islington had been filled but my second choice—Mile End, for carpenter and joiner—was still open. I was told that my father should be proud of me with such a good report book. They then asked me how I missed so much school in 1961 and I told them I was a diabetic. I was then asked to leave the room, and they would recall me.

On being recalled, only one member was present, and I was told that they rang the doctor who does the medical examination and, without being seen, that I would not pass the medical test. Being a controlled diabetic, I am sure I would be a better proposition than a person that has been passed medically, as I am always under a doctor's supervision and, being a diabetic, I would be more diligent in my work, as I know I would have to keep fit to retain the position and trust I was given. A letter has been received by the Diabetics Association from the Secretary of the Public Service Commissioner in July stating that diabetics would be accepted as members of the Public Service.

As the Government often claims that it is anxious to help people who have some infirmity, will the Minister of Works refer this letter to the Minister of Railways so that the matter may be investigated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; if the honourable member will let me have the letter, I shall have the matter investigated.

HOWARD MEMORIAL APPEAL.

Mr. SHANNON: On October 16 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to the Howard Memorial Appeal fund sponsored by members of the Agriculture Department and headed by Professor Donald (Professor of Agriculture at the University of Adelaide). I then mentioned the possibility that benefits might result to South Australia from the appeal fund in the way of possible scholarships, or any other aspect that might be within the ambit of the proposed fund, once established. Will the Minister of Agriculture, after investigating this matter, now give some explanation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Professor Donald, who is chairman of the committee, has written as follows:

I enclose a statement regarding the general objectives of the A. W. Howard Subterranean Clover Memorial Appeal and also a statement of the proposed rules of the A. W. Howard Memorial Trust. The money raised by the appeal will be placed in a permanent trust fund and the income from this fund will be used to encourage and promote research and investigations relating to the development of Australian pastures. The appeal is on an Australia-wide basis and we have committees operating not only in South Australia but also in Victoria, Tasmania, Western Australia and the Australian Capital Territory.

The trust will encourage pasture development in any part of Australia whether for sheep or for cattle; whether for wool, beef, fat lamb or milk production. Research and investigation on any type of pasture and on any aspect of pasture establishment, production, management or utilization will be eligible for assistance. It is hoped both to establish the A. W. Howard Memorial Fellowship and in addition to make grants towards equipment for pasture investigations or towards travel or conferences associated with pastures and pasture development.

The headquarters of the Federal appeal are in Adelaide and it is intended also that the management committee of the A. W. Howard Memorial Trust will have its office in this State. The committee of management of the trust specifically names its *ex officio* members and, of these, five will be located in South Australia, namely—the President, South Australian Branch, Australian Institute of Agricultural Science; the Director, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, South Australia; the Director, Department of Agriculture, South Australia; the Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural Science, University of Adelaide; and the

Principal, Roseworthy Agricultural College, South Australia. I think it will be clear from these details that, while the trust will be concerned with pasture development in any part of the Commonwealth, South Australian interests will at all times be adequately represented.

ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: New temporary rooms are being erected at the Elizabeth High School pending the submission to the Public Works Committee of plans to erect a new block there. Four rooms are being erected now, and I understand that it is urgent that they be completed in time for the commencement of the Public Examination Board's examinations to be held shortly. Six more rooms are also to be erected, and it is most urgent, because of the numbers that will be attending this school in the new year, that they be erected in time for use at the beginning of the 1964 school year. Also, it has been stressed that, as over 100 additional children will be at the school for the public examinations, preparation is urgently required of the ground between the two quadruples and the existing tarred area. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the four rooms being erected will be ready in time for the public examinations, whether the six rooms will be ready for the beginning of the next school year, and whether some preparation around the rooms could be made because at present the area is rough?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall have a report for the honourable member tomorrow.

WINE SALES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On October 23, following a report in the *Advertiser* headed "Threat over South Australian Wines" in which it was claimed that the New South Wales Wine and Brandy Producers Association had been engaged in certain restrictive trade practices to the detriment of the sale of South Australian wines in Canberra, I asked the Minister of Agriculture to investigate this matter. I understand that he now has a report.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have two reports. I asked the Director of Agriculture for a report and, among other things, he stated that the matter was discussed in the House of Representatives and was first raised by Mr. J. R. Fraser, M.H.R. The Minister for the Interior stated that most grocers in Canberra had ceased selling the South Australian wine, and the matter was being examined by the Minister for Customs and the Attorney-General. That is the relevant portion of the report. In addition, the Chairman of Directors of the Renmark Co-operative Growers Distillery (Mr. F. H. G. Hunt), called on me recently. He has informed me that the Hotels Association in New South Wales and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association of New South Wales have zoned New South Wales, starting with zone 1 around Sydney, and each subsequent zone is a farther distance from Sydney. Canberra, A.C.T., falls within their zone 3. For each zone they have a set of retail prices for various wines. The retail prices of Renmark wines are lower than those set by this association. This is because Renmark Co-operative purchased the Murray Vale Company. The Murray Vale Company sells wine in Canberra and the previous owner bought wine from Renmark. Now that Renmark partly owns Murray Vale, (I think it bought a share of Murray Vale) it can reduce the number of transactions and can sell direct to retailers. The result is that Murray Vale wines can be sold readily at about 2s. 6d. a flagon less than other wines. The Wine and Brandy Producers Association of New South Wales has threatened the retailers with loss of supplies in other lines if they continue to do business on this basis with Murray Vale. Some of the smaller retailers have been shaken by this threat and have given up dealing with Murray Vale. However, Murray Vale is still doing good business. Mr. Hunt strongly objects to being put under this form of pressure. As well as being Chairman of the Renmark Co-operative, Mr. Hunt is also Chairman of Murray Vale Wines.

GOODWOOD SUBWAY.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the flooding of the Goodwood subway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been informed by my colleague, the Minister of Roads, that the pumping facilities at the Millswood subway were the responsibility of the Municipal Tramways Trust. Some time ago the Government approved of this responsibility being transferred to the Highways Department. The pump installed at the take-over had a discharge capacity of approximately 5,500 gallons an hour. It was discovered that this was quite inadequate, and a new pump has now been installed and came into peration towards the end of June this year.

The pump is situated in a large sump below road level, and its discharge is dependent on the head. With water up to road level in the sump, the discharge capacity is 14,000 gallons an hour, when the pump works at low speed.

If, because of heavy rain, the water rises above road level, the rated discharge capacity at higher speed is 49,600 gallons an hour. It is expected that in future very little trouble should be experienced because of flooding.

The hole which has developed in the pavement was not caused from surface water but from seepage. The maintenance of the pavement is the responsibility of the Corporation of Unley, and this has been brought to the notice of that body after some preliminary investigations had been made by the Highways Department.

STURT HIGHWAY.

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Roads a report concerning the Highways Department's plans for improving and rendering more safe the Sturt Highway between Gawler and Lyndoch, more particularly the bend immediately east of the Sandy Creek school at which accidents occur almost daily?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

WHYALLA BRIDGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a new bridge at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the contract for the construction of the bridge over the tramway at Norrie Avenue, Whyalla, has been let and, in accordance with the terms of the specification, work should commence thereon early in November.

SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question concerning assessments in the Western Division of the South-East drainage scheme?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The South-Eastern Drainage Board has arranged for officers of the State Land Tax Department, who were engaged in the preparation of the assessment, to visit the South-East and discuss the assessment with the landholders who have lodged appeals against the assessment. It is expected that the officers will proceed to the South-East on November 4, 1963, and in due course arrange a suitable time to discuss the assessment with the landholders concerned.

The discussions would not prejudice the right of appeal of the appellants in any way. The officers would not be authorized to discuss any other problems associated with the drainage of the Western Division.

CORNSACKS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the improvement in crop prospects predicted by his department following recent rains over the cereal-growing areas, and in view of the need for much of the crop to be harvested into cornsacks, will the Minister of Agriculture obtain a report on the availability of cornsacks for the forthcoming harvest and assure the House that there will be no trouble in obtaining them?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a report.

NARACOORTE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about the Naracoorte electricity supply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The only information I have on this matter is that the object of this particular transmission line would be to provide a firm point for the distribution of power in the Padthaway-Keppock area. There is at the present time no concentrated requirement for power and no transmission line available between Keith and Naracoorte. The line would be taken to the area from Keith and it may later be extended to provide supply to Naracoorte but this has not yet been decided. There is an alternative possibility of supplying Naracoorte from Mount Gambier.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS.

Mr. SHANNON: I was pleased to notice in this morning's press a report that the University of Edinburgh had appointed a full-time professor of general practice in medicine. A survey of general practice throughout the Commonwealth indicates that this is one branch of medicine that is suffering from, shall we say, a Cinderella complex. Due consideration should be given to placing more emphasis upon the training of medical students for general practice rather than for specialized work where they may enjoy higher incomes and more favourable working hours. The country is safer when men are prepared to go out and serve as general practitioners. If men are properly trained and are skilled they can fill a gap for the country resident that no-one else can fill. As one who favours giving this service to people who are less favourably placed than those living in the metropolitan area, I think that with a little emphasis in our teaching on this aspect of the profession we could encourage young men to accept the responsibility of becoming general

practitioners. I do not know just what is in the mind of the University Senate in this field.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. SHANNON: The practice in the Old Country in this respect, it appears to me, is a desirable one and could be followed here. Will the Premier take up with the Minister of Health the question of encouraging this field of medicine?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that the honourable member appreciates that the Government is not represented on the University Council or the University Senate. These bodies are controlled by an Act of Parliament, and the Government has no direct authority in any of the matters that deal with the day-to-day work of the university, the courses it prescribes, or how it prescribes them. Parliament has some representation upon the council, but the Government has none. The Government has been most concerned about the lack of medical practitioners in certain country areas, and it has actually considered whether it should introduce legislation to deal with the matter. It considers that in one or two areas in the State today there is a great need for additional medical help and advice, and that unless that can be provided we will have difficulty in developing the country areas and maintaining the country population. That legislation, if it comes forward at all, will not be in time to be dealt with by this House before the Christmas adjournment. The matter has been the subject of discussion between the Minister of Health and the Australian Medical Association, and I assure the honourable member that we will do everything possible to accede to his request that there be more adequate general practitioner advice available, particularly in country areas.

SOUTH-EAST DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government intends to implement the recommendations contained in the Land Settlement Committee's report on South-Eastern Lands Development, Counties Buckingham and Chandos? If it does, what steps are being taken to give effect to the recommendations and when is the land expected to be open for allotment?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: First, the matter of increasing the area of wild life reserves in this locality is proceeding and certain areas have been referred to the advisory committee for report. Secondly, the survey of that portion of the Lameroo to Keith road, which runs through the land recently reported on by the Land Settlement Committee (a distance of about 30 miles), has been completed in the field and diagrams prepared ready for examination. It is understood that the Highways and Local Government Department proposed to construct about 12 miles during 1963-64, being the portion from section 44, hundred of Allenby, southerly to connect with the existing track to Emu Springs and thence to Tintinara. Surveys of deviations of the Bordertown to Pinnaroo road have also been effected by surveyors of the department and by private surveyors for the Highways and Local Government Department. This road is nearing completion and construction is proceeding. Before any land is offered in this locality, detailed soil classification surveys would be considered desirable to provide the evidence on which designs of subdivisions providing for living areas could be prepared. Allowing for this requirement and the subsequent subdivisional surveys it is estimated that with the existing staff it is likely to be about two years before any land in this area could be ready for allotment.

ABORIGINAL EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. Have any pastoral properties employing Aborigines or persons of aboriginal blood in the Far North and Far West of the State been visited by officers of the Aboriginal Affairs Department?

2. If so, what are the names of such properties visited in the years 1940 and 1950 and each year since 1950?

3. What is the nature and purpose of visits by departmental officers to such properties?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. Periodic visits were made by the Secretary prior to the appointment of a welfare officer at Port Augusta in 1959. This officer has since visited the following 28 stations at varying periods: Oakden Hills; Mount Eba; Mahanewo; Arcoona; Andamooka; Stuart's Creek; Anna Creek; Mabel Creek; Nilpinna; Mount Barry; Todmorden; Granite Downs; Everard Park; De Rose Hill; Macumba; Mount Dare; Allandale; Etadunna; Leigh Creek; Wertaloona; Wirrealpa; Angepena; Beltana; Balcanoona; Puttapa; Frome Downs; Billa Kalina; and Copper Hills. The welfare officer appointed to Andamooka late in 1962 has recently visited the following stations: Purple Downs; Roxby Downs; Parakylia; Billa

Kalina; Miller's Creek; The Twins; Arcoona; Mount Eba; North Well; Kingoonya; Glendambo; Coondambo; Wirraminna; and Andamooka.

3. (*a*) To exercise general supervision and care over all matters affecting the welfare of Aborigines and persons of aboriginal blood.

(*b*) To maintain personal contact with all Aborigines and check the health of children. Inquire whether it is practicable for them to attend a school and ensure that child endowment is being drawn by the mother.

(*c*) To establish liaison with station manager regarding availability of employment.

(*d*) Assist Aborigines to make applications for service benefits for which they may be eligible.

(*e*) To ensure pensioners receive maximum benefit from pension moneys enjoyed by the pensioners.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): How far have preliminary plans advanced for the construction of a new bridge to replace the Jervois bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The design of the Jervois bridge is well in hand, but plans have not yet been drawn.

ETHELTON CAUSEWAY.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. What progress has been made on the causeway being constructed from the Old Port Road to Ethelton?

2. What is the approximate date of completion?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. Approximately half of the embankment has been constructed across the Port River. The Harbors Board is at present constructing a flood opening, which is expected to be completed towards the end of February.

2. It is expected that the embankment will be open for traffic towards the end of this financial year.

FLINDERS RANGES.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. How many fauna and flora reserves are there in the Flinders Ranges or adjacent areas?

2. What is the location and area of each reserve?

3. How are the reserves controlled?

4. Who is responsible for their development?

5. Are any of the reserves open to the public?

6. Is so, which?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: There are no flora and fauna reserves or wild life reserves located in the Flinders Ranges or adjacent areas. There are, however, forest reserves and waterworks catchment areas situated in the Flinders Ranges, viz.: In the hundred of Gregory there is an area of forest reserve containing about 12,000 acres. This is known as the Willowie Reserve and, while a small portion is planted to pines, most of it is in its virgin state. This area is situated south of Wilmington and is nearly all leased on terminating tenure. A similar-sized area of forest reserve in the hundred of Darling is being used for the production of pines. This and a further area of 1,500 acres in the hundred of Howe comprises the Wirrabara forest. There is also an area of about 12,000 acres in the hundred of Howe in its virgin state and timbered mostly with gums. This is a waterworks catchment area, being the catchment for Beetaloo reservoir. Further to the above, there is an area of forest reserve of about 4,000 acres in the hundred of Woolundunga, situated east of Port Augusta. This area, which is known as the Mount Brown Reserve, is mostly in its virgin state, and is leased under terminating tenure.

HONEY BOARD.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice):

1. Was the former Secretary of the South Australian Honey Board dismissed or requested to resign?

2. If so, for what reason?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The South Australian Honey Board reports that at a meeting on October 27, 1958, it was resolved:

That in the best interests of the board it would appear that the position of Secretary should be held by a person who is not holding office in any agent packing organization and to this end Mr. Gardiner endeavour to make arrangements in the next six months accordingly.

PORT AUGUSTA POLICE STATION.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. What progress has been made in the proposed rebuilding of the Port Augusta Police Station?

2. When is it anticipated that building operations will commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. Plans have been completed and specifications are nearing completion for the project.

2. It is anticipated that tenders will be called shortly and building operations will commence early in 1964.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. What progress has been made on plans for the building of a new hospital at Port Augusta?

2. Will this project be referred to the Public Works Committee?

3. When is it anticipated that building operations will commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The replies are:

1. Revised preliminary sketches incorporating amendments requested by the Director-General of Medical Services are now nearing completion and will shortly be referred to him for formal confirmation that the scheme meets with his requirements.

2. This will depend upon estimates of costs when available.

3. Design work has not reached a stage where it is possible to estimate when work might commence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE BILL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In last Friday's *Advertiser*, under the heading of "Rural Loans Bill," I was reported as saying that I opposed the measure. I desire to make a correction: even if I did not go out of my way to give the Bill the blessing it deserved, at least I did not oppose it. I think that my speech indicated that I supported the Bill.

KLEMZIG PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Klemzig Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

HECTORVILLE CHILDREN'S HOME.

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

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE ACTION.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a commission of inquiry should be appointed to inquire into the actions of Detective McEachern and other police officers relating to the matters mentioned in certain statutory declarations of Miriam Caroline Anstey, Joseph Daniel Anstey, Margaret Joy Anstey, Frederick Charles Ives, Edwin Ross Ives, and Peter McGowan.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the honourable member proceeds with his motion, I must have his assurance that there is nothing in the motion that is *sub judice*; nobody but the honourable member, and perhaps the Government, is in a position to know that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, there is not.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Norwood.

Mr. DUNSTAN: This motion arises out of a charge that was originally laid on either May 25 or May 26 at Port Lincoln. The case arising out of that charge came on for hearing at a preliminary inquiry on Wednesday, June 5 of this year, before A. F. Loring, Esq., J.P., in Whyalla. The prosecuting officer for the police was Detective Stanford, and the informant in the information that then proceeded was Robert Clark. I do not know where he comes into the matter, except that he happens to have laid the information. The information that then proceeded was an information for attempted carnal knowledge, but that was not the information originally laid. Regarding the information originally laid, I will read from page 8 of the evidence:

The same morning he, the defendant, was charged with carnal knowledge and that charge was withdrawn; and he is to be charged with attempted carnal knowledge even though he made an admission to me—

He goes on to detail the admission, the effect of which was that there was complete carnal knowledge. The girl in the case was called in evidence. At the outset she denied that there had been any carnal knowledge of her by the defendant or any sexual intercourse by her with the defendant or that he had ever attempted to have sexual intercourse with her. Upon the application of the prosecuting officer, she was declared a hostile witness and was then cross-examined. The cross-examination revealed that the police were putting to her that in fact on the night of May 19 (she had been arrested on May 25) an act of complete sexual intercourse had taken place and that she had admitted that to the police. She agreed that she had admitted it to the police but she

denied that it had taken place and she said that she had made this statement to the police because she had been told that the defendant had admitted the offence. She said (and I am reading from the evidence):

I denied it when they said anything had happened between myself and Ross. After I was told what Ross was supposed to have said, I agreed that it had happened.

She was examined on May 25 by Dr. Liddell, at Whyalla. I do not want to go into detail. Dr. Liddell goes into much detail, however, and his evidence is available to members. It is that he examined her both visually and manually and that it was clear from the examination not only that no sexual intercourse had taken place but that he saw none of the signs which, from the nature of this girl's body, he would have expected to see if there had been any serious attempt at sexual intercourse. His evidence was clear that the state of the girl as he found her was, he would think, inconsistent with her admission, and he said he thought it would be impossible for the allegation she had admitted to to have been true.

Detective McEachern gave evidence of an admission by the defendant of a completed act of intercourse on the night of May 19. This was disputed in cross-examination and, strange to say, when counsel for the defendant called for a copy of Detective McEachern's original notes (which he admitted in evidence were in the prosecutor's file on the bar table) the prosecutor (Detective Stanford) refused to produce the original notes. There was a dispute in the affidavit of the defendant between the detail of what he says was put to him in questions and what was given in evidence by Detective McEachern. Precisely why the notes were not produced is not clear from the evidence, but the notes define the events, and it is the normal course of events to produce these notes; had the matter been before a magistrate, I imagine that the prosecuting officer would have been ordered to produce them. He certainly could have been made to produce them simply by his being called into the box and on it being demanded that he produce them. However, they were not produced, and, although there is some dispute there, there is no dispute that that night the boy made an admission which was inconsistent with the physical evidence produced in the court by the doctor and which the boy subsequently denied and which he has denied very strenuously ever since.

The girl's evidence in the court was that she had been induced to make what was clearly, on the face of the evidence, a false confession by being told that the boy had confessed. The boy's sworn declaration is that he made the admission only after being told that the girl had confessed, that it would be made easy for him if he were to co-operate, and that the girl's name could be kept out of it if he pleaded guilty. On the face of that in itself, one would think there was some basis for an inquiry. In the evidence before the court, Detective McEachern agreed that there had been initial denials by both these young people. Clearly, if police officers, by misrepresenting the fact of confession from one person in questioning another, induce a false confession, that in itself is improper. Although the evidence was in the form I have outlined, the defendant was committed for the Port Augusta Sessions, but prior to the Sessions the Attorney-General signed a certificate that he was unwilling to file an information in the matter. Previously I told the House that a *nolle prosequi* had been entered, and that is as I then understood the position. However, I understand that was not the case: the Attorney-General signed a certificate that he was unwilling to file an information in the matter. The fact is that the charge against the boy had by then received publicity in newspapers in Port Lincoln, and the girl and boy had been subjected to this unpleasant procedure. At that stage of the proceedings, after the matter had been disposed of at the Port Augusta Sessions, I raised the matter in this House. I said that I considered that here was a case for an inquiry. Allegations, which have since been deposed to in sworn declarations, were made that in the course of the interrogation not only was the inducement (of a kind which I outlined this afternoon) given to the people who made these false confessions, but some physical violence was used against the boy and another youth as well. The Commissioner announced next day that he intended to have an immediate investigation. It was obvious to him, after what had been said in the House by me about the case, that some investigation appeared to be called for. I think that all members would agree that an investigation was called for in the circumstances that I have outlined.

Then came the question as to the nature of the investigation. There may be, and doubtless are, numbers of things that were done by police officers in investigating this matter about which I do not know. I think the House and the public should be told what they are.

Suffice it to say that in the matters that are within the knowledge of persons who have made statutory declarations referred to in this motion, certain aspects of the police investigation do not seem to have been what one would call "satisfactory" from the public's point of view. Those incidents having occurred in the way I outlined them, for any police officer to have attempted to persuade this girl and her mother that the girl's sworn testimony before the court should be altered, and for them to have abused her seems to me to be an extremely undesirable practice indeed. This girl has been subjected to much strain. She is a girl who appears, so far as I have been able to ascertain (and no doubt the member for Whyalla will be able to tell the House something from his personal knowledge of his own constituents), to have borne a good reputation: she is a school girl doing the public examinations. This sort of thing is extremely undesirable if what took place is as deposed to in the statutory declarations.

Mr. Shannon: Can the honourable member say where the statutory declarations were made?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, in Whyalla. Let me tell the honourable member how they were prepared.

Mr. Shannon: I think the House should know that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I agree with the honourable member. After I had raised this matter in the House at the request of the member for Grey (who was seen originally by Mr. Ives, the father of the boy concerned), Mr. Ives communicated with me subsequent to the visit of police officers to Eyre Peninsula, and he expressed concern and asked to see me here. He came to the House and gave me information that alarmed me. From what he told me I considered that I should also see the mother and the girl concerned in this House. They flew from Whyalla and saw the member for Whyalla and me in Parliament House. Mr. Ives, the mother and the girl then gave me instructions, notes of which I have here, as to the matters that were within their knowledge or which had been told to them. They requested that I prepare draft statutory declarations. This I did, and sent certain of them to Mr. Ives and certain to Mrs. Anstey asking them to check the statutory declarations to see whether there were any inaccuracies or anything wrong with them in any way, and then, if they were prepared to, to return them to the House.

Eventually I received the statutory declarations, with one exception, in sworn form before justices of the peace at Whyalla or at the other places mentioned in the statutory declarations. One was not returned to me—the statutory declaration prepared for a boy named Sharrad. I believe his father is a justice of the peace on Eyre Peninsula. According to the information of Mr. Ives, Sharrad, when questioned, had told the police that he had not been in the room when any physical violence had been shown to anyone being questioned, but that he had no need to be because he could hear it. The statutory declaration was prepared in that form. Mr. Ives sent it to the boy for signature and was later communicated with by the boy's father who said he did not believe this was the truth and the boy would not sign it. Mr. Ives informed me. I think the House should have that information along with the other information that I have given it. The remaining statutory declarations, which were sworn, are here in the House, or at least they were. I handed them to the Premier. They were sworn at the places set forth in them, so far as I know.

Those statutory declarations set forth a method of procedure that I think called for some answers. The Premier said on Thursday that he wanted to be certain of what I was accusing the police. At this stage, I do not think the facts are sufficiently established for an accusation to be made. If I thought they were, then I would be moving not this motion but another. I believe that the facts set forth, both in the sworn evidence before the court and in the statutory declarations I have tendered to this House at the request of the persons concerned, call for a public inquiry. If the things which I have mentioned and which have been set forth in evidence and in the declarations took place, as they appear to have done, then further action is called for. If an adequate answer is available, then it should be publicly established and not be hushed up. The inquiry should be not merely an administrative or departmental one, but something public. If the police officers are innocent of what the sworn evidence says concerning them, then that should be established publicly. It would be in their own interests that it be established publicly in the course of a public and full-scale inquiry.

Mr. Millhouse: What precisely do you mean by "commission of inquiry"?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I mean a commission of inquiry appointed under the Royal Commissions Act. The Government has power to appoint a Royal Commission and I think it should. I believe there are ample grounds for appointing such a commission at this stage of the proceedings. I am not content with leaving the matter now, although I was originally as I hoped that a departmental inquiry would dispose of this matter satisfactorily. As these people have protested that this inquiry has not proceeded as one would desire, then the only way to satisfy the public now is to have a public inquiry. I have sought to have departmental inquiries into matters somewhat akin to this on other occasions, but unfortunately somehow those inquiries seem to have got lost. Another matter I raised on another occasion related to something that was publicly established by judgment in court, but the inquiry into that apparently got lost between departments. I do not think that that is a satisfactory method of proceeding.

There should be a public inquiry and the facts established. This is not merely a matter for the people concerned. It is not merely a question of establishing their particular rights. It is a question of public interest. If the procedure, which appears from their statutory declarations and from the sworn evidence at the preliminary inquiry, is a procedure that is condoned in the Police Force or in police administration, then it is a matter affecting the general public. It is a procedure which, if it did take place, ought not to have taken place and ought never to take place. We should establish that fact also, if it is a fact to be established. This is a case where we should proceed to a public inquiry. I hope that the Government, in the interests of the persons concerned, in the interests of the public, and in the interests of the police administration and the police officers concerned, will agree to a public inquiry.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): This matter was first raised in the House some time ago by the member for Norwood. A complete inquiry was immediately ordered by the Government in connection with some of the statements the honourable member made in this House. You, Mr. Speaker, are aware that the inquiry proceeded to the stage where I brought a document to you. Because of the serious nature of some of the allegations I desired to know from you, Sir, what action the Government could take to properly deal with this question. I was pleased to get certain advice from you and, in your presence, from the Clerk of the House. Acting upon that advice, Mr. Speaker, I have had certain documents prepared which, in due course, I will lay on the table and move to have printed so that all members will have an opportunity to see them. They will then be able to determine whether the inquiry that the Government ordered as a result of the allegations of the member for Norwood was carried out fully and properly. I had concluded today that the member for Norwood would deal with the statements he obtained and tabled last week, and which were the basis of his request for an inquiry. His motion refers only to those statements. It does not refer to the other matters he mentioned. In his speech during the Address in Reply debate he referred to many matters that would not be covered by this motion. If the inquiry were to be concerned only with the statutory declarations he has obtained, it would be a circumscribed inquiry.

I have undertaken some work in connection with the investigation of matters in respect of which he alleges police misconduct. If the allegations are true, then there are police officers in the Police Force who should not be in the Police Force. The allegations are serious to the police officers concerned. I point out to members that we have the duty not only of protecting the public but of protecting police officers from charges that are not based upon the truth or that are based on partial truths. We have a dual responsibility. We have a responsibility to the people who may be charged before the court, and I am not dismissing that heavy responsibility, but we also have the responsibility of seeing that police officers are not unfairly charged, under the privilege of this House, with something of which, in the final analysis, they have been entirely innocent.

Mr. Lawn: An inquiry would protect the police officers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Police officers are citizens of this country, the same as everyone else, and they have the same legal rights. As I pointed out to you, Mr. Speaker, certain allegations made under the privilege of this House were grossly defamatory to certain police officers. The investigations carried out did not support the charges made. Had the charges been made outside of this House it would have been an open go for everyone, but as the charges were made under the privilege of the House it became necessary for the House to be assured that the charges

were well based and that all the circumstances of the case were fairly and properly before the House. That was the purpose of the investigation the Government was making into this matter. The investigation was somewhat delayed because I required every matter raised in the House to be fully investigated. I wanted members to be assured that the investigation had been fairly made.

I do not want to go into extraneous matters, and I do not intend to do so, but I will deal with the documents that the honourable member brought before the House, one of which you, Mr. Speaker, in your wisdom, correctly withdrew from *Hansard*. I did not know the contents of the documents or I certainly would not have suggested that they be incorporated in *Hansard* holus-bolus. The honourable member read not all of the documents, but only portions of them. I do not wish to take too long over this matter, because honourable members know that at this stage of the session we have much business before us. However, I promised the honourable member that I would give him an opportunity to move his motion and that I would reply on the matter as I saw it.

I have had an opportunity to consider the statutory declarations the honourable member produced, and I have had a thorough investigation made of the matters involved in them. I oppose the appointment of a commission of inquiry. I could advance many grounds, but sufficient time has been spent on the matter without my taking up more time of the House this afternoon. Also, the whole grounds of the allegations the honourable member has made are to be covered by another report that is being prepared. I will deal now only with the statutory declarations. First, the contents of the declarations, in my opinion, do not show the slightest necessity for a commission of inquiry. The declarations of E. R. Ives and Peter McGowan allege violation of civil rights; that is to say, they allege that a police officer assaulted them. If those statements are true, the assault gave rise to a right of immediate private prosecution of the police officer by Ives and McGowan, or an action in the court for damages, including a claim for exemplary damages. Honourable members know that in a recent case exemplary damages were awarded against the police where there had been a violation of civil rights.

Mr. Shannon: That was in another State.

Mr. Dunstan: No, in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That right of action exists today, and has existed since May 1. As the member for Norwood should be well aware, the courts of law of this country exist to protect those who complain of a violation of their rights as citizens.

Mr. Lawn: You don't get before the courts for two bob.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I listened closely to the member for Norwood and made no attempt to interfere with the line of thought he desired to convey to the House. The courts of law are designed to protect all who complain of violation of their rights as citizens. It is only when the remedies provided by the law courts are insufficient or are not available on account of the nature of the wrongdoing, or it is beyond the power of the court to redress that wrong, that the necessity for a commission ever arises. Indeed, the allegations of violence alleged against Detective McEachern are of the very sort which the law courts have been established for centuries to inquire into and to punish. Although Ives and McGowan have had the right to commence proceedings against Detective McEachern at all times since May 25, and Ives at least had the benefit of legal advice from very soon after that date, neither has seen fit to take action in a court or otherwise, but only through the honourable member's complaint in the House.

The Commissioner of Police has not, nor have I or the Attorney-General, received any complaint. Honourable members know that, under our system, if there is any grievance there is a free approach to the authorities to have an investigation made. Members might well ask themselves why such proceedings have not been commenced despite the fact that the honourable member for Norwood has been busying himself on behalf of Ives, his relatives and his friends for at least the last three months. Having studied the documents and the reports, in my opinion the answer is that the honourable member knows only too well that the allegations against Detective McEachern would never stand up to an investigation in the court. The honourable member referred to certain evidence he had read. I remind honourable members that in the Whyalla Police Court on June 5 last Detective McEachern gave evidence on oath and was cross-examined by Mr. Borick, counsel for Ives, as to whether he had offered any violence. Detectice McEachern denied these allegations on oath. It is only now, five months after the event, that Ives refers to them in a statutory declaration read to this House, protected by privilege

and not subject to cross-examination. The time is still available for Ives and McGowan to take legal proceedings against Detective McEachern. I am informed that he invites either of them to do so; he is ready and willing, if given the opportunity, to take civil proceedings for defamation against the member for Norwood or Ives or McGowan or the Ansteys if any one of them is prepared to publish, other than under the cloak of privilege, the contents of their declarations or statements.

I have referred the statutory declarations produced by the member for Norwood to the Commissioner of Police for investigation as to their contents, but I have asked him to defer any action he might consider appropriate in order to give Ives and McGowan an opportunity, if they are prepared to take it, to commence legal proceedings against Detective McEachern, and so establish in a court of law the *bona fides* of their long-deferred grievance. Mr. Speaker, the Government will never condone improper conduct of members of the Police Force, but it does not subscribe to the view that any police officer should be forced to take action in the courts, even if he can, to disprove scurrilous or defamatory attacks on his integrity by those who are not prepared to use the courts of the land to vindicate their rights, but who make their attacks under the protection of Parliamentary privilege.

A full investigation has been made by the Commissioner of Police into the matters raised by the member for Norwood in his statement to this House in August last. I do not intend to go into detail. As I have said, another document is being prepared. However, I wish to refer to one or two matters. The honourable member quotes an English rule relating to two persons being charged with the same offence, but that has no reference to the facts of this case. The honourable member referred to the behaviour of this group of young men who, in company with a girl of 15, had been engaged in a somewhat systematic series of thefts from three or four different sources, as "undesirable skylarking". It seems an unusual description by a lawyer of an offence of larceny involving articles of commercial value which can be easily disposed of. He referred to the girl's being placed in a cell. He was apparently unaware that the girl's father approved of the accommodation at the police station rather than her having to knock up a publican in the early hours of the morning to provide hotel accommodation.

I should like to refer particularly to the declaration made by Joseph Daniel Anstey, the father of the girl concerned. This was one of the declarations tabled by the honourable member. It does not seem to me to amount to anything but, as the honourable member has produced it, I refer the House to what the same Joseph Daniel Anstey had to say when he was interviewed by the investigating officer following the honourable member for Norwood's statement in August last. This copy, which is signed by him and duly witnessed, is here; incidentally, he has not retracted this in the declaration he has made. If members look at his declaration they will see that, although it is a declaration, it contributed nothing to the case the honourable member produced today. Mr. Anstey's statement is as follows:

I am the father of Margaret Anstey, schoolgirl, going to the Whyalla Tech. School, aged 15 years, born on January 29, 1948. I have been interviewed at the Whyalla Police Station by Superintendent Lenton and Detective Sergeant O'Malley on the afternoon of August 26, 1963.

This is in connection with the previous investigation that I said was being made. Members will see from the date at the bottom of this declaration that it was made before the honourable member raised his new declarations in the House. The statement continues:

They asked me certain questions with regard to an incident which occurred in May of this year when my daughter was found in the company of Ross Ives and some other boys at Port Lincoln. They drew my attention to the fact that Ross Ives had been charged with committing an act of indecency on my daughter and told me that certain criticism had been directed towards the police for their conduct in this matter. I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no criticism whatsoever to make about the police in this matter; I feel that they were doing their job and am quite grateful to the police for the action that they took. I realize that what the police did was purely in the interest of my daughter and could have saved her from ruining her life. If such an incident occurred again I would expect the police to act in the same way again and I have nothing but appreciation to offer in respect to their action. Following this incident I have spoken to Mrs. Anstey, my wife, and asked her to warn Margaret against the dangers of this sort of sexual misconduct and Mrs. Anstey has done so. I was concerned to learn that Ross Ives had misbehaved himself with my daughter, and I would not permit him to come to my house again after what happened. My wife has so far as I know forbidden Margaret to go down to Ives' place and associate with him any more. In all this matter I am principally concerned with the welfare of my daughter and I am upset to think that the police have been criticized in any way for looking after her interest. Margaret has never

complained to me about the conduct of the police or has she ever said that she made a false statement to the police at Port Lincoln in respect to any indecency committed by Ross Ives. When Margaret said that a certain act of indecency had taken place between herself and Ives I have no reason to believe that it was other than true.

This was signed by the father of the girl and witnessed by Detective-Sergeant O'Malley, who was there at the time. A supplemental matter is mentioned further on in his statement about placing the girl in the police cell. At 11.20 a.m. on Tuesday, August 27, 1963, Mr. Anstey was again interviewed, and the passage at page 44 of the report relating to the telephone conversation between Mr. Anstey and Detective McEachern was read out. The relevant part of his conversation is as follows (I am quoting from Detective McEachern's statement):

I told him there were two alternatives, one, wake the publican up at this hour of the morning and get her a bed, or we could place her in the police cells. He said, "It would only be a few hours. I don't like the idea of putting people in hotels about, put her in the cells." Mr. Anstey then said, after the above passage being read to him, "Although I was upset at the time I can now recall this conversation taking place."

This also is signed by him and witnessed. I think members will see from the statement of the father that there is a completely different side to the question from that raised by the member for Norwood. The honourable member said that on the doctor's evidence there could not have been any attempt at intercourse on the date mentioned, but the medical evidence at no time said that. I have the doctor's certificate here and any member can read it. It says:

I do not think that there has been any penetration if intercourse has taken place.

That is a totally different thing. Medical opinion and text books make it clear that the rupture of the hymen is not a necessary occurrence in attempts to commit offences of the type charged. I have read the Commissioner's report and the documents on which it has been based, and I have consulted you, Mr. Speaker, in connection with them, as I wanted to clear up one or two supplemental matters. I am satisfied that nothing occurred that would warrant the appointment of the commission of inquiry sought by the member for Norwood. I have also received a report from the Crown Solicitor regarding the comment about his conduct of the prosecution at the Port Augusta Circuit Session, and I am satisfied that there is no foundation for the statements made about this.

The member for Norwood has mentioned a matter that I did not intend to raise as it has certain implications, and I am not sure how far they go. However, as the honourable member has raised it, I think it is proper for me to mention it so that members will be able to appreciate the position. The honourable member said that, acting under instructions, he had prepared certain declarations, which were signed by the people concerned. If I understood him correctly, we have the rather interesting fact that he did not take instructions, in every instance at least, from the people whose declarations were signed; the instructions were given through a third party. I do not know whether there is anything in that or not, but in those circumstances we have persons signing documents that have not been prepared for them. Let me indicate what could happen in these circumstances by reading the following document:

Yesterday Saturday October 19, 1963 while attending the Kimba trotting meeting Mr. Max Sharrad, clerk of the Kimba district council, told me that an attached affidavit had been handed to his son Ross Sharrad at Cleve on Saturday the 12th instant by Mrs. Ives. She had requested him to sign it, informing him that the other youths, who in company with Sharrad and Ives had been arrested at Port Lincoln for larceny, had each signed one. Sharrad took the affidavit but would not sign it until he consulted his father. He later, after a discussion with his father, decided not to sign it as the matters he was required to depose to were untrue. Mr. Sharrad agreed to allow me to take the attached affidavit only after long discussion, as he was particularly anxious to protect his son from further association with this matter. However, I persuaded him that it might well be in his son's interest to bring the matter to the notice of the Police Department. On this basis he agreed to me retaining it so that a copy could be made, but requested that the original be returned to him within a week. I informed him I would take all steps possible to comply with his request. If you feel after perusal of the document that no good purpose will be achieved by retaining the original could you please return it to me to return to Mr. Sharrad. In the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Sharrad I interviewed Ross Sharrad concerning the matters contained in the attached document. His comments are as follows:

This was the statement that was prepared for him to sign. His statement reads:

1. I was present at the Port Lincoln Police Station on the occasion Edwin Ross Ives was charged with carnal knowledge. His reply was, "This statement is untrue." I was not present either in the police station or in the court when Ives was charged with carnal knowledge. I had no knowledge that he had been charged with the offence until a later time.

2. The matter in the affidavit: since this matter was raised in Parliament I have been twice interviewed by the police. I told them the following, which is the truth:

(*a*) I said I was not hit nor was anyone else in my presence.

(*b*) I told them I was not in the room when others were hit; I did not have to be as I could hear what was going on.

These are the words in the affidavit. This is his comment on that. The statement continues:

Comment: It is true that I have been twice interviewed by the police. Firstly, I was interviewed by Superintendent Chamberlain, and secondly by Detective Stanford at Cleve. It is true that I was not hit nor was anyone else in my presence. It is untrue that I told Detective Stanford that I was not in the room when the others were hit, or that I did not have to be as I could hear what was going on. Detective Stanford did not ask me if I was hit or if I heard anyone else being hit. In the conversation with Detective Stanford nothing was said about anyone being hit. I was not hit at the Port Lincoln Police Station. I did not see or hear anyone else being hit. I have no knowledge of anyone being hit at the Port Lincoln Police Station at that time. When Detective Stanford interviewed me he asked me if I had heard any comment from any of the youths charged with me concerning Ives being charged with carnal knowledge; whether Ives had said anything to me concerning this matter; whether I have heard comments from any of the youths concerned or anyone else concerning the proceedings at the police station at Port Lincoln; or whether I had any complaints concerning the police. I told Detective Stanford then that I had heard nothing, and that I had no complaints whatsoever concerning the police. I was convicted of larceny at Port Lincoln Juvenile Court and whilst I did not actually steal any hub caps myself I realize that I was just as guilty as the others because I was an accessory. I have no complaints about being convicted, and realize that I had made a mistake. It is a lesson I have learned and I will not make the same mistake again.

That is the end of his quotation. Detective Stanford's statement continues:

Mr. Sharrad and the youth Ross are very upset concerning this affidavit, as they feel that an attempt has been made by the Ives family to induce him to make a false affidavit which could have serious repercussions. Forwarded for your information, Sir, and should you desire any further information I would be pleased to assist.

(Sgd.) W. H. H. STANFORD
Detective Senior Constable, No. 720.

I point out that the preparation of affidavits on the advice of another person for people who are not actually giving the instructions leads to a perilous position. Here, obviously, an affidavit was prepared on instruction. I do not doubt for one moment that the honourable member received instructions: obviously, he did not make it up. The fact remains that the boy who was going to be asked to sign the declaration does not agree with the important facts stated in it. He does agree with one or two minor facts. I oppose the appointment of a Royal Commission on this matter. If a commission were appointed the impression would be given immediately that the police officers were guilty of an offence.

Mr. Lawn: No, that is not correct.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If we assume that they are not guilty of an offence, then why appoint a commission?

Mr. Lawn: To ascertain the facts.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Recently, in another State a Labor Government sternly refused to take any action until a firm statement was made outside Parliament.

Mr. Shannon: That is the place to make these charges.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Until someone is prepared to stand up and face the consequences of a statement made outside this House, I believe that a Royal Commission is not justified, and I oppose the motion.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): First, I wish to deal with one of the last remarks made by the Premier, while it is fresh in members' minds. It relates to affidavits. Although the Premier has criticized these affidavits, particularly those prepared by the member for Norwood, he should remember that the one he has quoted from was supposed to come from Mr. Anstey and was signed by Detective O'Malley. It would appear (though I may be wrong) that in all probability the wording of that affidavit was put before Mr. Anstey before his signature was placed underneath it.

Mr. Shannon: Is that the usual method of producing these documents?

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Premier read it out. If what the honourable member for Norwood has produced is open to suspicion, then so is the document read by the Premier. In his opening remarks the Premier said that a complete inquiry had been immediately ordered because of the serious allegations made. In other words, at that time it was regarded that this matter contained some serious allegations and that a complete investigation was necessary. It is interesting to note that although this happened in August, it is now November and we have heard nothing of this inquiry although it was immediately proceeded with! Had not the member for Norwood produced these statutory declarations I suggest we would not have heard anything of the inquiry this

year. It would have gone on and on and ultimately we would have been told, "Why raise this? It is so stale!" If these allegations were so serious—seeing that they were investigated the very next day—why did we not get a quick report to clear the atmosphere? Members should be asking themselves this question. The Premier admitted that they were serious allegations. I repeat that had not the statutory declarations been brought to this House we would not have heard anything more about the matter until it could be regarded as stale.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Speaker knows that that is not correct.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The facts speak for themselves. The investigation was ordered in August, and it is now November. The Premier said that a very circumscribed inquiry would be held if it were to relate only to the matters contained in the statutory declarations. It is interesting to note that the Premier completely omitted to deal with one or two of the most salient matters in those statutory declarations. I am concerned with those matters about which the Premier omitted to say much, if he said anything at all. In deference to the House, and because of the nature of the interrogation, the member for Norwood did not read out the material in the statutory declaration by the boy concerned—the material that the Speaker announced this afternoon would be deleted from *Hansard*. I agree that it should be deleted. The member for Norwood did not read it because of its nature. The Premier said nothing about that declaration. If the inquiry is to be held it will be mainly on those points, because in my opinion they are the salient points of this matter. I venture to say that most members, if they read what was in the *Hansard* pull as alleged in the statutory declaration, would be shocked, and that is putting it mildly. Why do I say they would have been shocked? I am not going to repeat what was in the declaration. That is not necessary. It is within the knowledge of some members. According to that statutory declaration this boy was interrogated without legal assistance being given him and without his parents present. So was the girl concerned. They are both teenagers. The boy was interrogated about a serious charge, a charge additional to that which he was originally apprehended on and for which, as far as I know, there does not appear to be any adequate starting point.

If any of our sons and daughters had been subjected to this type of interrogation, as set out in this statutory declaration, we would have taken the strongest action to protest. It is all right for the Premier to say, "Why haven't these two people taken action for alleged infringement of civil rights?" What would their evidence be worth against that of the word of a police officer? They had no-one there to support them. They were teenagers against experienced police officers.

Mr. Shannon: Obviously the parent was not too much help to them.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member need not draw a red herring across the trail. I am talking about the nature of the interrogation and the way in which the so-called confessions were alleged to have been obtained. We have been told that how these confessions were obtained had nothing to do with the law. If that is the case, it is time the law had something to do with confessions, because no confession should be obtained in these circumstances, if they were so obtained, particularly when teenagers are concerned. I was shocked when I read this statutory declaration. This matter ought to be investigated to ascertain the truth of whether this is the sort of thing done in these circumstances. In his reply the Premier said nothing about this interrogation, but to my mind it is the crux of the whole matter. If these two lads were to try to get their case dealt with in the court they would feel that they had little chance of winning. That is why they have not proceeded, quite apart from the question of the heavy expense entailed.

The Premier gave us a challenge from Detective McEachern to all people concerned. That is an easy challenge to make in view of the circumstances I have just mentioned. Let us put ourselves in the position of the parents and of these two teenagers in thinking about making a public challenge on this question. Members know the difficulties associated with making such a public challenge, particularly in view of the way that interrogation was carried out.

Mr. Shannon: Was alleged to have been carried out.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Alleged to have been carried out. I am talking about the real crux of this matter. What the Premier said was of relatively minor importance. The member for Norwood this afternoon said that this girl lived in my district. My wife taught this girl at primary school. She was closely associated with the girl right through her primary education. She speaks of her as an excellent girl, a hard-working student, and

one who caused no trouble at all. Furthermore, in her record at secondary school she has an excellent character, she has maintained her hard-working approach to studies, and she has never associated with students who might engage in doubtful activities. What she is charged with is entirely out of character.

Mr. Dunstan: Further, the charge is impliedly repeated by the Premier this afternoon, even though the Attorney-General filed a certificate. And they talk about stones!

Mr. LOVEDAY: It is most significant, too, that despite what the Premier had to say regarding this medical certificate the Attorney-General was not willing to go further.

Mr. Dunstan: The Premier did not read out the medical evidence in the case.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This sort of interrogation (indeed, the charge itself) is carried out in the name of preserving morality in the community. Well, nobody in this House who has read these extracts in *Hansard* (if those allegations are correct—and they should be examined and inquired into) would maintain that that interrogation was anything but absolutely immoral, yet it is done in the name of morality. If one of my sons or daughters had been treated in the way alleged regarding this interrogation, I would have stopped at nothing to get the matter dealt with publicly. I think, Mr. Acting Speaker, that this House should hold an inquiry to clear the matter up satisfactorily from the point of view not only of the public but of the police themselves. I believe the Police Force wants its name cleared in this sort of matter. I have the highest respect for the Police Force, and I believe that its name should be cleared. If something is wrong, then the person who is guilty should be dealt with, and it is in the best interests of everybody concerned that this matter be cleared up. If it is not cleared up, and if it is left as the Premier has left it this afternoon, it virtually gives *carte blanche* to something similar in the future if the allegations are correct, because if people know that this has been done they will feel that it can be repeated with impunity and there is nothing to stop its repetition. I do not think the Premier touched once on the whole crux of this matter. I hope the House will vote for the inquiry.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I hope the House will not do just that. I listened to the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) with interest, because usually he is very logical. The honourable member said one thing that impressed me: if he had been the parent of a child involved in an investigation along the lines here alleged he would have left no stone unturned to do something about it himself. Does the honourable member suggest that the parents of these two young teenagers are less conscious than he of their duty and their responsibility to their children?

Mr. Loveday: They feel that they have gone to their limits.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member casts a slur if he suggests that those people are less conscious of their duty and responsibility.

Mr. Loveday: I am not suggesting that.

Mr. SHANNON: Obviously, the course the honourable member says he would have taken is open to the parents. I think that if we wanted an inquiry into this matter it would be along the lines of investigating the methods by which statutory declarations are prepared, the compliance with which is secured by the signature of the deponent. I think that might be a rather profitable channel for investigation. The Premier read from the records, signed by the parents, a straight-out denial in one instance of the terms set out in the so-called declaration.

I suggest that if Parliament is to agree to set up Royal Commissions on allegations made by statutory declarations presented in this Chamber, without regard to what action the people concerned in the matters referred to in the declaration have taken outside the House, then we could very easily be having Royal Commissions *ad lib* on any matters of grievance that happen to come within members' knowledge. In every case I have had knowledge of we have had undoubted evidence that something has been done that is not in the interests of the welfare of the people: something has been done of which we do not approve. In this case we have had statutory declarations from one party, in this instance teenage people, denied by their parents in one case. We have a statutory declaration prepared for young Ross Sharrad.

I did not like the comment of the member for Norwood that the father of Ross Sharrad was a justice of the peace; I think that had some meaning in his mind, that, as a justice of the peace charged with a duty of occasionally sitting on the bench and meting out justice, he would not like to be a party to any possible signing of a document that would reflect on the good name of the police. I think that was the suggestion in the honourable member's mind. If I do the honourable member an injustice I regret it, but I could see no other reason for that interpolation: it

was not required, and it did not add anything to the argument. It only pinpointed for me just something which I feel might validly be a matter for investigation: that is, how statutory declarations are prepared, who prepares them and where, what depositions are taken prior to their preparation, whether the veracity of the declarer is examined by the people charged with drawing them, and if they are drawn by a legal man—and in this instance apparently the declaration was—what care is taken to make sure that no injustice is done to any unsuspecting civil servant by virtue of the declarations so made. I do not see that any of these precautions were taken in this case. In fact, on the contrary, we have proof positive that in one instance at least—that of Ross Sharrad—no such precautions were taken, and we were obviously asked to believe that he could have signed the declaration in good faith. Fortunately, he did not, but had he done so we would have been hammered with that as evidence that this police officer did in fact beat these children, about which at the present time I have grave doubt. I think that anybody who has listened to what has been said on both sides in this matter would have serious doubts as to the truth of these allegations.

I hope the House will not support this motion. It is not moved, in my opinion, with any real intention to secure justice for these people. That justice is available to them through the due process of law, and no inquiry will give them that. In fact, they may well be hoist with their own petard if an investigation takes place, if those declarations are proved to be false, for instead of the offenders being treated as they would be on a first offence they might get terms of imprisonment for perjury to teach them a lesson. I hope the House will reject the motion.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I would not have risen to speak in this debate but for some remarks that were made, particularly by the Premier. The Premier said that we were here to protect not only the public but also the police. I wholeheartedly go along with him on that statement. This is a matter where we should draw to the light the whole position so that we can do just that. I do not have the knowledge of this matter that the members for Norwood and Whyalla and the Premier have, and I do not intend to reflect, as another speaker has reflected, on any of the people concerned, as I am not in a position to know the facts. However, there are two versions of this matter, and because of that there will always be doubts in the minds of members as to which version is correct. That is sufficient to induce me to support the motion.

I am not supporting the honourable member's argument, as I know nothing of it, but I support the principle because, if these people have committed a breach, that fact should come into the open. However, what I am worried about is that there was a situation in which an inquiry was asked for and colleagues of the man being questioned were sent to investigate. I cast no reflection on the police or the officers who went to investigate, as they could all be admirable men, but in the eyes of the public it could be construed that there was some favouritism by the officers towards their own mates. Not only must justice be done but it must appear to be done. I think it was wrong in the first instance, when this inquiry was asked for, that colleagues of the officers concerned, who possibly grew up with them, should have been sent to investigate. No matter how fair a person is, this is wrong. In this case the Government should have appointed someone outside the Police Force to make the initial inquiry. Had this been done, I do not think this motion would be before the House—and I am concerned that it is before the House because of the publicity it has been given. I do not like the publicity, which I think is not in the interests of the Police Force, the public or this House.

Sometimes cases against the police have been brought to me and, when the inspector has been in residence in my home town, I have immediately gone to him and have received the utmost courtesy. Many complaints have been ironed out amicably without publicity. However, once when the inspector was out of the town on holidays I went to the Commissioner of Police, as I thought that the correct thing to do. He received me courteously; in fact, he sent one of his officers to talk to me on a matter in which the gaming squad was involved. Members of this squad had burst down a door and had upset the health of the man concerned. I was told by the officer that no charge would be brought against the man because there was no evidence against him. Apparently he had some betting slips, but had only been making a few bets himself. Such people should be compensated for the inconvenience they have suffered. This man was an asthmatic and had to go to hospital; possibly death could have occurred. He hawked oranges for sale and, while he was in hospital, his supply of oranges deteriorated. This caused him financial loss

and I requested compensation not only in respect of hospital expenses but also in respect of the loss of his oranges. The inquiry in this matter was made by the police—and in this case it was even worse than the case we are discussing, as an officer of the licensing squad made the inquiry. A charge was brought against the wife of the man for having bet; she was convicted and a small penalty imposed. This sort of thing does not encourage members of Parliament to do the right thing. I think it is right for us to go to the highest authority, the Chief Secretary, and, if we have any logical complaints, backed up by evidence, a separate inquiry, not an inquiry by members of the Police Force, should be made.

I support the motion because I believe it is in the interests not only of the Police Force but of the public, including all members of this House, that the matter should be investigated to determine who was right and who was wrong. If the people concerned are wrong, action should be taken against them. However, let us have an independent inquiry, not an inquiry by officers associated with the men in question. Sometimes individuals kick over the traces, but in saying that I do not reflect on the Police Force, for which I have the greatest respect. If these people are in the wrong, they should pay the penalty. On the other hand, if the people who have made these charges are wrong, they should be punished for having misled us. However, let justice be meted out so that people can know who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise for the same reasons as did the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters). I say without any hesitation that members of the Police Association of South Australia would not tolerate what has been mentioned in this House, and they should have the right to have the good name of the association, and that would be the general attitude affidavits, they should be subjected to the penalties provided for doing that and for taking up the time of the House. On the other hand, if their statements are true, the public should know. If these allegations are true, I am certain that the action of the officers concerned would not be supported by the association, and that would be the general attitude of its members.

The Premier has challenged the persons concerned to take this matter to the courts rather than have it raised here. He claims that as the Police Department is a public institution it is entitled to the protection of the Government against false accusations, but I point out that members of the public are entitled to see that all Government departments are fair and above board, and above criticism. This is one way of establishing that the officers are not guilty of the charges brought against them. The public should not be forced to pay the costs involved in taking all these complaints to the courts. This matter is in a similar category to the Government's appearing in Arbitration Court cases; it uses money paid by all the community in taxes to brief officers to appear in the court against a section of the community, and that is wrong. It is also wrong for the Government, which receives its revenue from the people who have made this allegation as well as from other people in the community, to brief counsel to appear in the courts on behalf of the police officers while the people who have made the allegations have to pay their own costs.

The people who have made the affidavits and are concerned in police accusations against them in the courts are just as much entitled to have their court costs paid by the Government as are the police officers concerned. The Premier has said more than once that they have had since May to take this action, but I do not know how wealthy these people are. It is all very fine for the rich to say to the poor, "There are the courts; they are available to you." We know these people could go to a court of summary jurisdiction first, but appeals could be made to the Supreme Court and the High Court, even if the matter did not go as far as the Privy Council. How far can these people go with their court action? These matters are not peculiar to the persons concerned, but involve a respectable and reputable Government department, the Police Department. I have every admiration for the Police Force, which is, in the main, the friend of the people. When attacked like this, policemen should have an opportunity to defend themselves at a public inquiry. On the other hand, the people making these allegations should not have to pay for the court action, or to rely on the differences being settled because the money they have does not allow them to take action in a court of law.

The Premier criticized the member for Norwood for producing a statement made by a third person, and immediately following this criticism, he read a statement by Detective Stanford. The person who was involved in a statement made by a third party to the member for Norwood was referred to in Detective Stanford's statement. In fact, although the Premier criticized the member for Norwood for using information from a third party, he did

the same thing. The more one considers this matter the more there appears to be involved. Is this a way of trying to hush it up by asking these people to go to court? The Premier said that he would deal only with the statutory declarations, and that he was having another inquiry made. What is that inquiry? Does the Premier know that these allegations are true? If he knows that they warrant further investigation, why does he not want the House to appoint a Royal Commission? Later, he said that he did not want to go into details because another document was being prepared. At least twice he said that, irrespective of the discussion today, he was having another inquiry conducted and other documents prepared. Has a preliminary inquiry revealed substantial facts concerning the allegation before the House? If so, is that why the Premier is having further inquiries made? The only way we will find out is by carrying this motion, because if it is defeated we shall hear nothing further about the other inquiry or the other documents that are being prepared.

The Premier said that neither he nor the Attorney-General had received complaints. He admitted that the matter had been raised here in August by the member for Norwood and that a police inquiry was being held. I do not know what more complaints he wants. If a member raises it here, isn't that a complaint, or are we just wiped off?

The Premier said that the allegations made would not stand up to a court examination. Both the member for Murray and I have covered that point. If the allegations are ill-founded, then I want to tell the people concerned that they have made false declarations and have wasted the time of the House. On the other hand, there is every justification for a public inquiry to ascertain whether the allegations will stand up to a public examination. There is nothing to fear. The Premier said that the Government would not condone improper acts by members of the Police Force. I agree, but on the other hand, I do not condone false allegations against members of the force. It seems to me the only way to settle the question is to have a public inquiry. If the Premier is genuine, then the only way to prove his statement is for him to vote for an inquiry. The only way I can prove my statement is to support the motion. I did not understand the Premier's remarks about skylarking of boys. I consider that, in the interests of the particular members of the Police Force, the signatories to the affidavits, the boy and girl arrested and charged, the Police Association of South Australia, and the public of South Australia, there should be an inquiry, and I ask the House to carry the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I deeply regret that a matter of this kind has come before Parliament. I believe that this should not have required the consideration of Parliament. Frankly, I believe there should be other ways and methods of solving such problems. I will support the motion for the inquiry, but from my experience of the Police Force, I have nothing but the highest admiration of it, as I have always received the utmost co-operation from it. I am sure that, if no inquiry is held, it will not be the end of the matter. I accept the assurance of the Premier that further reports will be made. No member condones improper actions by policemen and I am sure that the officials of the Police Department and of the Police Association of South Australia do not. In that frame of mind, and in the interests of the Police Force, I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I support the motion. I do not want to cast a silent vote: I wish to explain the vote I intend to cast. I have the greatest admiration and respect for the Police Force and the way that law is enforced in South Australia. The State can be proud of the cleanliness of our Police Force and of its splendid record. My voting for this motion is not to be construed in the way in which the Premier would have it construed: that, because we are convinced of the guilt of the policemen, there should be an inquiry. I do not know sufficient of the facts to judge whether the police are guilty or not.

I am not concerned with the matters that the Premier based his reply on, but I am greatly concerned with the method of interrogation of this young man that allegedly took place—the interrogation referred to in the affidavit deleted from *Hansard*. I urge members to read the declaration that was expunged from *Hansard* and to ask themselves whether they would willingly stand to have one of their sons or daughters interrogated in that manner, and then to reach a decision on this motion. I read it, and like the member for Whyalla I was shocked. I did not realize that such an interrogation could take place. I did not believe—and I still find it difficult to believe—that any young person could be placed in the situation that this young fellow was placed in, if there were any truth at all in the affidavit that has been submitted here.

I know that the Premier referred to the fact that these affidavits were prepared in Adelaide on information that was supplied,

not secondhand but firsthand. However, they were read and signed before a justice of the peace in Whyalla. I do not know how lightly people generally take the signing of affidavits, but I have every reason to believe that this would have been taken seriously, not only by the person signing it but by the witnessing justice before whom it was signed. I think we should emphasize that, and place importance on it. I am not able to argue one side or the other, but from the facts placed before the House—and in particular the interrogation of the young man—I believe that this matter should be thoroughly investigated in the public interest. If it is a figment of imagination—and for the life of me I find it difficult to accept that—then that should be exposed, and the good names of police officers cleared. I want it clearly understood that I have not prejudged the case. If I had I would not need an inquiry. However, I believe that a case has been made out and that in the interests of all concerned—the police, the parents, the young people, and procedure—an inquiry is desirable. I do not think it need be a long or expensive inquiry.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I listened with great attention to what the Premier had to say in his reply. If there were cause for being shocked in this case, I should think that honourable members might well be shocked at what the Premier saw fit to say in this House this afternoon. Some of what he had to say shocked me profoundly; it also angered me greatly. Let me deal with the things he had to say, in sequence. First, he said that some of the matters I had raised this afternoon were not in issue in the statutory declarations mentioned in the motion. That is not true. The statutory declarations before the House specifically call in question the procedure adopted in the questioning of the girl and the boy in this case, and the evidence that was given in the police court in the preliminary inquiry. All those matters were in issue, and the major thing in issue in this case was the way in which obviously false confessions were obtained and the reason why they were obtained.

The Premier, in his first submission, said that we ought not to have an inquiry because the matters in issue could be tested in the court. How can they be tested in the court? Only one matter in issue can be tested in the court, and that is a relatively minor matter—allegations of minor assaults on two youths during questioning. This was not the gravamen of the complaint. This was a minor assault. It was not like the assault committed on the boy Hurley who obtained exemplary damages from police officers in this State. I remind the member for Onkaparinga of that, because he interjected to the contrary. This was not like that case. These were minor matters and, in fact, the boy Ives does not allege that it was any assault on him that produced the confession which was false. It was the representations concerning the nature of the charge and what would happen to the girl. That cannot be mitigated. There is no way of testing that before a court, and the Premier, and those who made the report to him on this occasion to read to the House, know that perfectly well. This is only a means of trying to suggest to this House that there ought not to be a public inquiry. We always get some kind of excuse. When the Hurley case was on it could not be raised here because it was *sub judice*. Then, Mr. Speaker, it was suggested that there was no need to have it dealt with because it had been dealt with in a civil proceeding. When other allegations were raised here the Government could not deal with them because they had to be in statutory declarations. The Government knew, of course, that the statutory declarations in that case had to be got from members of the Police Force, who would render themselves subject to charges under police regulations if they signed declarations. When statutory declarations are produced to the House, it is suggested that it could be mitigated in some other way. How, the Premier cannot tell us. How does one mitigate the obtaining of a false confession?

Mr. Millhouse: It would have been in issue if the boy had been tried.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Obviously, from the evidence in this case the Crown could not go ahead with the case. In fact the Crown withdrew it. The Attorney-General signed a certificate that he was not willing to prosecute this case. The matter was raised by the boy's counsel in open court and the boy was to leave the court with a clear name. Now what is the position of the boy and the girl? The Premier, under the privilege of Parliament, this afternoon revived the allegations against them, even though his Attorney-General was not prepared to prosecute the case in the court.

Mr. Nankivell: He did not do that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes he did. He has alleged this afternoon that although the boy was not tried, and the Attorney-General was not prepared to try him, he was guilty. That is what the Premier said. He proceeded to suggest, from the report he read to the House, that the girl was not telling the truth in the affidavit and that the boy was not telling the truth.

The Premier read something from the medical officer's certificate suggesting that the medical officer concerned, Dr. Liddell, had not shown that the nature of the confessions was impossible on the nature of the physical evidence. The Premier, of course, did not deal with that very fully, and it is no wonder because, in fact, the medical evidence proves conclusively that the confessions obtained were false and could not be true.

Mr. Lawn: We should be given all the information.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have the information.

Mr. Millhouse: Read out the evidence in chief first: it is only a couple of lines.

Mr. Lawn: We always give evidence fully. We do not camouflage.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It will be remembered that the girl had put to her that her confession to the police, which had been obtained from her, was that a completed act of intercourse took place on the night of Sunday the 19th—not just an attempt, a completed act of intercourse. That was her evidence. The Premier does not deny that. It was suggested that that had happened on three or four other occasions. That was in the confession. As a result of this, the boy agreed that a completed act of intercourse had taken place on that night—Sunday the 19th. I shall read the doctor's evidence. I regret that I must do so, Mr. Speaker. I had endeavoured to avoid going into this evidence, in detail, because I thought it inappropriate to have it in *Hansard*. However, the Premier has raised the matter, and as I have been challenged to read this evidence in full I think it must be done. It reads:

James Ralph Liddell, L.Q.M.P., 84 Playford Ave., Whyalla, sworn.

Examined by Detective Stanford. I examined Margaret Joy Anstey at the Whyalla Hospital on Saturday, May 25, this year. The vulva was normal, no sign of bruising or lacerations and the hymen appeared intact. The opinion was that it would be unlikely that intercourse would have taken place.

Cross-examined by Mr. Borick. I made notes of my examination on the police statement. I gave them to the police. I have seen a copy of the notes this afternoon. They were shown to me at half past one approximately. There is no more in the notes than what I have told you now. It is word for word what is in the notes. I examined her for approximately about five to 10 minutes, I cannot say exactly, it was visual and manual examination as well. I made no tests for the presence of spermatozoa. The structural consistency of the girl's hymen appeared fairly tense. I would imagine that if a penis had been inserted it would have broken the hymen. No sign of it having been stretched. The girl could be described as a virgin. If the girl had intercourse on about four or five occasions it would be I think impossible for her hymen to be as I found it. I would agree that where penetration has not taken place the walls of the vagina are vergose and firm. That could apply even after intercourse. I am quite certain there is nothing in my notes—I don't recollect anything else from what I have said today.

In re-examination: If the witness had had partial intercourse or an act whereby the hymen had been stretched six days before the examination, would you expect to find anything? (Answer) One would expect to find some stretching and one would expect to find some bruising.

And, Mr. Speaker, he found none.

Mr. Lawn: That is different from what we were led to believe this afternoon.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. That evidence made it perfectly impossible that these confessions could be true, yet the Premier suggests this afternoon that there is some truth in them, although he is not prepared to go ahead in a court and test them. He is prepared to throw out challenges to other people to go before the court, but he is not prepared to do it himself. Then he turns to the statutory declarations and—as is usual with the Premier—he tries to skirt around the question so that attention may be taken from the matter that is mainly in question. He suggests that there is something strange about the fact that someone comes to a legal practitioner, gives him information as to what somebody will swear, and that practitioner then prepares a draft statutory declaration which has to be sworn before a justice of the peace; and that justice of the peace has to satisfy himself before it is sworn that the person who swears it has read it, has understood it, and is making the declaration.

I am blessed if I know what the Premier is trying to suggest in this case. In fact, the information which was given to me was contained in a draft statutory declaration. What the Premier did not tell the House was that immediately after this matter was dealt with last Thursday I went across the floor of this House and drew the Premier's attention to the fact that that draft statutory declaration had been prepared and that I thought he ought to know about it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The honourable member knew that I did know about it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, I did not.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That was the trouble! You knew I knew.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I did not know that the Premier knew about it at all; I knew nothing of any information that had been given to him. I came to the Premier personally, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House last Thursday and said, "You ought to know about this, and I want to tell you about it now in case you do not know." There was never any attempt upon my part to hide from members of this House what I knew of this matter or what I had done in it. I do not mind going before any inquiry, whoever else does not want to. The Premier suggests that by having an inquiry we are going to regard the police officers as guilty.

Mr. Ryan: What have they got to fear?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Mr. Speaker, the Premier suggests there is nothing to hide in this matter. If that is so—and I hope it is—why hide it? What have the police got to fear from any inquiry if all that the Premier suggests and hints at is true? We have not had the answer of the Premier to the allegations, nor have we had his answer about the evidence in the court. All he could say was that after I raised this matter in the House in August he had an inquiry made and that some documents would be tabled at some unspecified time. Who made the inquiry, how was it made, and what opportunity was there for cross-examination there?

Mr. Lawn: You won't find out any more.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am at a loss to understand why it is that the Premier is not prepared to discuss these matters openly. If the sworn evidence of the Police Force's own witness in the court and the allegations contained in these statutory declarations do not raise some question of public inquiry, I am at a loss to know when we could ever get a public inquiry into a matter concerning the administration of the State. Those things do raise a matter for public inquiry. I think that all the police officers concerned in this matter would welcome a public inquiry. I hope that they would, and I cannot see why they would not, unless some unpleasant inference were to be drawn, and I hope that that inference is not drawn. I hope members of this House will vote for an inquiry so that this matter can be cleared up. If the allegations have nothing in them, let us show that that is the position; as they stand, they have not been answered. All the Premier has tried to do is smooth over the matter with some side issues without once answering the gravamen of the matter before the House. Let us have an inquiry. Let us know the facts.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote to the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Irrigation) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

The Report.

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment Bill on October 22, 1963, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions and took evidence from the following persons:

Mr. T. M. Price, Chairman, Renmark Irrigation Trust.
Mr. F. B. Waltham, Engineer-Manager, Renmark Irrigation Trust.
Mr. R. L. Hender, Secretary, Renmark Irrigation Trust.
Dr. W. A. Wynes, Parliamentary Draftsman.

2. Advertisements inserted in the *Advertiser*, the *News*, and the *Murray Pioneer* inviting persons to give evidence before the committee brought no response.

3. The committee is of the opinion that there is no opposition to the Bill and recommends that it be passed in its present form.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains several amendments, mainly of an administrative nature, to the Local Government Act, most of which have been sought by

local governing authorities and other organizations and bodies. As the amendments are nearly all unconnected, the best course will be to deal with the Bill clause by clause in numerical order.

Clause 3 makes some drafting amendments consequential upon clauses 17 and 34 to 37 respectively. Clause 4 effects two amendments to section 5. The first of these concerns the exception from rating of hospitals where service is given at reduced rates, if not more than one-quarter of the hospital's annual income is derived from patients' fees. The exception is contained in paragraph (2) (d1) (1) (c1) of the definition of "ratable property" in identical terms; it thus applies to lands whether assessed upon land or annual value. The Adelaide City Council has found itself in the position of having to levy rates on the Adelaide Children's Hospital on the basis that its income from fees exceeded the one-quarter stipulated in the definitions, and in fact the hospital eventually paid the council a sum of £7,500 for the year 1961-62. The hospital has pointed out that, as hospitals receiving Government grants increase their daily charges to patients and thus receive more income, they will gradually become ratable under present conditions, and in view of this fact the Government has decided to vary the exception by providing that the hospitals concerned shall be exempted if not more than half of their income is derived from patients' fees. The amendment will apply as from the current financial year.

The second of the amendments effected by clause 4 is to vary the second portion of the definition of "township" in section 5 by decreasing the number of dwellinghouses required to qualify as a township from 40 to 20. The Local Government Association requested this amendment, pointing out that it would be advantageous if councils could create a township without the necessity of taking in adjoining lands of a rural character.

Clause 5 amends section 133 of the principal Act by providing that distribution of how-to-vote cards or the exhibition of any electoral notice not otherwise prohibited shall not be an illegal practice. Section 131 of the Act defines "illegal practice" as including personal solicitation of votes during polling day or within eight hours before voting commences. Section 133 provides that the acts of all authorized agents committed with his knowledge and consent are to be held to be acts of the candidate himself. This could, as I understand it, be read as making the act of an authorized agent in distributing how-to-vote cards an act of the candidate and thus make the distribution into a personal solicitation of votes by the candidate. The amendment is designed to remove existing doubts on this matter.

Clause 6 deals with section 153 of the principal Act, subsection (4) of which provides that no expenditure or payment of more than £20 by a committee of a council is valid unless afterwards ratified by the council. The figure mentioned appears to be unduly restrictive. The subsection was passed many years ago and the sum of £200 is considered to be reasonable under present conditions.

Clause 7 amends section 163ff of the principal Act, which provides that an officer may appeal against a determination of salary by the Local Government Officers Classification Board within 30 days of publication of the determination. The Municipal Association has requested the amendment which increases the time for appeal to 42 days, pointing out that the additional increase in the time would enable councils to have more time in which to decide whether or not to lodge an appeal.

Clauses 8 and 9 may be taken together. They amend sections 173a and 188 respectively of the principal Act which deal with alterations of waterworks assessments (in the case of assessments based on annual value) and land tax assesments (in the case of assessments based on land value). The object of the proposed new sections is to provide that, whenever the waterworks or land tax assessment is altered, the council can adjust any rates paid or payable to accord with the fresh assessment. I should mention that clause 8 introduces a new subsection into section 173a of the principal Act to accord with the corresponding provisions in section 188 that the council may alter its assessment if based on the waterworks assessment whenever the latter is altered, this provision being absent from the present section 173a.

Clause 10 provides that notice of the declaration of any rate is to be given within 21 days instead of 14 as at present. In 1961 the principal Act was amended to enable a council to declare a rate at the same meeting as that at which the assessment was approved. Notice of the making of an assessment must be given within 21 days and it is desirable that the time for notice of the rate should be the same.

Clause 11 raises the total amount of contributions which may be made by councils for the furtherance of local government from £100 to

£250. The amendment was sought by the Local Government Association, which points out that the present provision is inadequate.

Clause 12 inserts, at the request of the Municipal Association, a provision to enable councils to contribute towards the cost of operation of home-help services to assist in the care and wellbeing of children or domestic duties. The service would supplement what is now available from the District and Bush Nursing Society and Meals on Wheels Incorporated.

Clause 13 introduces a new section 290d into the principal Act of considerable importance. It relates to the application of parking meter revenue for car parks. The second and third subsections of the new section will empower municipal councils to expend the whole or any part of what for present purposes I will call "parking meter revenue" in providing a reserve fund for the purpose of constructing, providing and maintaining, car parks, including the acquisition of land for these purposes. What I have referred to as "parking meter revenue" is defined in the first subsection as comprising parking meter fees and penalties imposed for parking meter offences, less any amounts which may be set aside to amortize capital costs, plus interest, salaries and maintenance charges. Subsection (4) makes provision for the appropriation of the moneys standing to the credit of any reserve fund if the council winds it up. The new section does not make it compulsory for councils to establish reserve funds for the purposes mentioned.

Clause 14 provides for an audit of a council's accounts within 14 days of notification by a clerk of his intention to resign or his suspension or removal from office. Such an audit is not compulsory in the circumstances which I have mentioned, although some councils do have one made. It is considered desirable that the auditor should give a clearance before a new appointee assumes office. I may add that the Auditor-General agrees with the new provision.

Clauses 15 and 16 relate to recovery of portion of construction costs of road works and footways with a limit of 10s. per foot of frontage on road works and 1s. 6d. per foot on footways. In both cases there is provision for the addition of 5 per cent interest after six months. One council has been advised that if the addition of interest would result in raising the total amount payable in respect of road works above 10s. per foot no interest can be charged. The amendments in clauses 15 and 16 will make it clear that interest is chargeable in all cases on unpaid amounts.

Clause 17 excises from the Act the whole of Division XII of Part XVII of the principal Act comprising three sections first enacted in the eighties to apply to private streets but now no longer serving any useful purpose. They were appropriate before the enactment of town planning and other modern legislation. The construction of streets in new subdivisions is now the responsibility of subdividers who are required to submit levels for council approval. If other public streets are constructed they are constructed by councils subject to contribution by abutting owners, while private streets in municipalities are in practice constructed nowadays by councils. The chairman of the Local Government Advisory Committee has advised that the provisions are obscure, but, apart from this, the matters covered are already amply provided for by other legislation, such as the Town Planning Act, the Building Act, the Health Act and the Local Government Act itself. In view of these considerations it is desirable that the whole of the Division be repealed. Clause 17 so provides.

Clause 18 amends the existing provisions of the principal Act concerning street name plates. Section 354 empowers a council to affix street name plates upon the walls of houses. The City of Adelaide has had difficulty in relation to buildings other than houses, many owners having refused to allow name plates to be attached to buildings. As the city develops more buildings not being houses will become located on street corners. The Local Government Advisory Committee agrees with the amendments suggested by the council, which will permit street name plates to be affixed to buildings.

Clause 19 is of a drafting nature consequential upon enactment of the Road Traffic Act, 1961. Clause 15 (*b*) is designed to take account of the fact that the signs generally used throughout Australia are now designated as "no parking" or "no standing" areas.

Clause 20 (with which is to be read clause 31) will enable councils to buy houses to be let to their employees by instalments over a period of years. The Housing Trust has sold or erected many such houses and is willing to accept payment by instalments, a method which is extremely convenient for councils since it would enable them to pay for them out of revenue. However, payment by instalments constitutes in effect a borrowing. Clauses 20 and 31 are designed to put these transactions (which involve relatively small amounts of money) outside the ordinary borrowing provisions of the Act.

Clauses 21 and 22 are complementary. Their effect is to amalgamate the existing borrowing powers now set out in sections 423 and 424 of the principal Act, so that all moneys borrowed by a council will be on the security of the general rates and not in part on the security of a special or separate rate. The proposed amendments would simplify council accounting —an analysis of borrowings by councils during the year ended June 30, 1962, shows that only four out of 98 borrowings were made on the security of special rates. Clauses 23, 24 and 25 (*b*) make consequential amendments.

Clause 25 (*a*) amends section 435 of the principal Act, which relates to schemes for undertakings which can be submitted to the Minister for his authorization. By subsection (4) of the section, however, a scheme can be authorized only if the proposed undertaking is to be permanent, of substantial benefit to the area and reproductive or revenue earning. At least one council desires to establish a septic effluent scheme but is unable to proceed under section 435, partly because it may be limited to part of the area and mainly because it cannot be regarded as revenue earning. Such a work has much to commend it and the object of the amendment is to enable the Minister to authorize such a scheme without the need for compliance with the provision that it should be revenue earning.

Clause 26 removes the present requirement that debentures must have interest coupons annexed. It is considered that these requirements are not convenient in all circumstances. Clauses 26, 28, 29 and 30 make consequential amendments. I have already dealt with clause 31 in connection with clause 20. Clause 32 makes a consequential amendment which was overlooked when the power of councils to make by-laws for licensing persons to depasture stock was extended to include sheep. Clause 33 increases the penalty for hawking on foreshores contrary to by-laws from £5 to £20. The general penalty for breach of by-laws was raised from £10 to £20 in 1957, and it is desirable that a similar maximum be fixed in section 477. Clauses 34 to 37 inclusive will have the effect of extending to district councils the powers already enjoyed with respect to sewerage and drainage by municipalities. There seems to be no particular reason why, at the present day, these powers should be limited to municipalities and, while it may well be that district councils might not wish to avail themselves of the powers, nevertheless, it is considered desirable that they should be in the Act for them to use if they so desire.

Clause 38 amends subsection (1) of section 607 dealing with safety precautions during the erection of buildings. The present subsection provides for the covering of a footway when the wall of any building abutting any street has been erected to a height of 12ft. In addition, a board covering is required to slope outwards from the building so that any falling materials will be thrown beyond the footway. The Adelaide City Council considers that the erection of a steel frame of a building does not constitute the erection of a wall, that protection should be given to pedestrians when buildings are erected only a few feet from the building alignment as well as on the alignment, and that the provision requiring board coverings to slope outwards could be dangerous in streets carrying heavy traffic—for example, Rundle Street. The Local Government Advisory Committee agrees with these views, and has recommended the new subsection which covers buildings not only abutting on footpaths but also within six feet thereof: it also relates the safety provisions not only to walls, but also to parts of buildings. Additionally, it refers not only to plastering but also to other building operations and, instead of the requirement for outward sloping boards, provides for coverings to be suitable for retaining falling materials.

Clause 39 adds to the by-law-making powers of councils. Subclause (*a*) empowers the regulation of the height of fences and hedges within 20ft. of junctions as well as intersections as now provided; subclause (*b*) makes a new provision for regulating or controlling the breaking of metal by the dropping of heavy weights within 300ft. of a public place or occupied property; and subclause (*c*) relates to by-laws concerning the loading and unloading of vehicles. The present provision refers specifically to operations in respect of certain types of materials. The amendment removes the specific numeration and widens the power to enable the control of loading and unloading of materials and goods of any kind. Clause 40 confers upon district councils powers to make by-laws with respect to sewerage along lines similar to those of municipal councils. Clause 41 raises the penalty for driving vehicles over closed roads from £20 to £50. Clause 42 widens the extent of section 783 of the principal Act penalizing the depositing or dropping from vehicles of rubbish of specified kinds on streets and roads. In the case of at least one council difficulties have been encountered from the dropping of materials not specifically mentioned. Clause 42 removes the

specific references and substitutes the more general definition.

Many provisions of the principal Act provide for a demand or request for a poll of ratepayers but there is no provision requiring such requests to show addresses and verification of signatures, as in the case of petitions. The Municipal Association has pointed out that councils experience difficulty in checking the rights of persons to sign demands for polls, and the amendment, which will require addresses and verification of signatures, will enable councils to check each signature and qualification more readily. The Local Government Advisory Committee agrees that the amendment is desirable and clause 43 so provides. Clauses 44 and 47 add notaries public and solicitors to the list of authorized witnesses for the purposes of postal votes. Clause 45 is a special provision concerning what is known as the Mayor's Bounty Fund at Kapunda. This fund is, by the principal Act, vested in the "Mayor of the Corporation of Kapunda" and is to be used for assistance and relief of necessitous residents. The Corporation and District Council of Kapunda were united in July, 1962, at which time the fund comprised £119 in a savings bank and £100 invested in a war loan. Since the merger there is no "Mayor of the Corporation of Kapunda", and thus the fund cannot be used. The former Mayor requested the Government to amend the present section to enable the fund to be expended by the District Council of Kapunda for the provision of public conveniences, and clause 48 so provides. Clause 46 makes some amendments to the nomination forms consequential upon amendments to Part VI of the principal Act in 1946 which were apparently overlooked. The 1946 amendment removed the provisions requiring councils to prepare voters' rolls on or before May 1, whether or not nominations subsequently lodged revealed that an election was or was not necessary. References in Forms 2 and 2A in the Fifth Schedule were therefore unnecessary.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act relating to the stabilization of the wheat industry.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I believe that in so moving I cannot do better than quote the opening remarks of the Minister for Primary Industry, the Hon. C. F. Adermann, when he introduced the Wheat Stabilization Bill in the House of Representatives. He said:

The wheat stabilization plan has been an outstanding success and the purpose of this Bill is to carry it on for another five years. There is 15 years' experience behind us when we consider this plan again, for the fourth time. It has operated in five-year periods since 1948, and in that period wheat stabilization has become more permanently established year by year. As a result the present plan is offered with full support of the wheatgrowers and of the State Governments. As far as I can find out there is nowhere any opposition to the principles; and renegotiation is not a matter of argument about the need for the plan, but one of discussion about some of the details.

Wheat is our most important agricultural industry, and it is second only to wool as a source of export income. Over the years it has been a troubled industry, facing the uncertainties of the seasons in production and the vagaries of the world markets in selling. There is no way of avoiding those uncertainties and risks; even today, with the harvest already in progress in the early districts, no-one can tell what the crop will be. Indeed, the weather in the next few weeks could take away, or could add, millions of bushels to the crop, and millions of pounds to its value. Added to this is the erratic course of a world market for wheat, and it defies prediction.

This Bill is the State's contribution to the legislation required for continuing the Australian Wheat Board and the scheme for stabilizing the wheat industry and the price of wheat. The present scheme, which has been in operation for some 15 years and is covered by the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1958, does not apply to any wheat harvested after September 30 last. For some time discussions have been taking place between Commonwealth and State Ministers in the Australian Agricultural Council, and general agreement has been reached that it is most desirable and in the interests of the industry to extend the scheme for a further period of five years with minor modifications.

The Australian Wheat Board, which is established by Commonwealth law, at present undertakes the marketing of the Australian wheat

harvest, both locally and overseas. Commonwealth and State Acts virtually empower the board to take control of substantially the whole of the Australian wheat harvest. It markets the wheat and pays the growers. Under the present scheme price stabilization has been achieved by means of legislative and administrative arrangements under which a price equal at least to the cost of production is guaranteed for about 160,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. The Commonwealth legislation ensured that the guaranteed price would be received on up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat exported, while the legislation of the States ensured that wheat sold for consumption within the Commonwealth (approximately 60,000,000 bushels a year) would realize not less than the guaranteed price. Legislation recently passed by the Commonwealth Parliament will ensure that the guaranteed price for the next five seasons would be received on up to 150,000,000 bushels of wheat exported from Australia.

In order to continue the scheme, which has during the past years operated so successfully, it is necessary that the new Commonwealth legislation be supplemented by uniform State legislation. It is therefore necessary to repeal the expired Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1958, and for each State to enact a new measure on uniform lines. The Bill, when it becomes law, will be administered by the Australian Wheat Board, which is continued in existence by the new Commonwealth legislation. The only alteration proposed in the membership of the board is that Queensland will now be represented by two members instead of one member and one alternate member. The Bill does not alter the duties of growers to deliver wheat to the board through the medium of licensed receivers.

The guaranteed price for wheat for home consumption or stock feed in Australia as fixed by the new Commonwealth legislation for the season 1963-64 is 14s. 5d. a bushel on the basis of fair average quality bulk wheat free on rail at ports of export. The existing provisions relating to the loading on the home consumption price of wheat to subsidize the cost of transporting wheat from the mainland to Tasmania are unaltered by the Bill. This loading at present is 1½d. a bushel.

The guaranteed price for wheat sold overseas is also fixed at 14s. 5d. and, as I have mentioned earlier, the new Commonwealth legislation will ensure that this price would be received on up to 150,000,000 bushels of wheat exported from the 1963-64 season. This price of 14s. 5d. is based on the findings of a recent survey of the economic structure of the wheat industry conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The guaranteed price in future years will be reconsidered from time to time in accordance with movements in the cost of production.

The new Commonwealth legislation provides for the continuance of the Wheat Prices Stabilization Fund from which money for meeting obligations under the guarantee will be met. The Commonwealth legislation, however, raises the ceiling of the fund from £20,000,000 to £30,000,000. If payments into the fund at any time should bring it above that figure the excess will be returned to the growers. Where it is necessary to find money to bring the export returns up to the guaranteed price, the money will be drawn from the fund for this purpose. If there is insufficient money in the fund, the Commonwealth Government will find the difference.

The provisions of the expired Commonwealth and State Acts by which Western Australian growers received a premium of 3d. a bushel on the amount of wheat exported from that State are continued, except that under the new legislation power is conferred on the board to reduce that amount having regard to freight charges payable in respect of such exported wheat and other freight charges payable in respect of wheat exported from other places in Australia.

From what I have said it will be apparent that the provisions of the Bill are substantially the same as those of the expired Act with some additional advantages. Its main object is to extend the stabilization scheme to the next five harvests. The present scheme has operated so successfully that the Government believes that both the marketing arrangements and the provisions for price stabilization have the approval of an overwhelming majority of the growers and has no hesitation in asking Parliament to approve this measure. I have with me a copy of the second reading explanation of the Minister for Primary Industry, from which I quoted, and it is available to any member who wants to read it. As a member of the Australian Agricultural Council I, and other members of the council, appreciate the extremely patient and wise leadership we have had from the Minister for Primary Industry. Mr. Adermann has been a tower of strength.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.49 *to* 8 *p.m.*]

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1379.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. Let it be clearly understood at the outset that it comes within the ambit of social legislation on which all Labor members of Parliament are free to speak and vote in accordance with their conscience. During his second reading explanation, the Premier emphasized that the trade itself had been in close consultation with the Government, that many conferences had been held and that agreement had been reached. He also emphasized that this legislation was closely in line with what was provided in the other States because the Government did not wish to encounter difficulties associated with contravention of the Commonwealth Constitution. The other States had encountered difficulties and the legislation had been challenged, and I believe that legislation in the form of this Bill has been accepted as valid legislation. Therefore, members have only two alternatives: either to accept the legislation in its present form or to reject it altogether. I referred earlier to the fact that the trade and the Government had held numerous conferences and reached agreement and that therefore I should be supporting the second reading; but, if the second reading is carried, I still reserve the right to consider whether I shall support any of the amendments that are already foreshadowed in the Committee stage.

The amendments to the Licensing Act proposed by this Bill fall into three categories —the new method of assessing licence fees, the slight relaxation in trade requirements, and administrative amendments. The first type of amendment is contained in clauses 4, 6 to 14, 19, 21 and 23, which delete the existing basis of licence and permit fees, which are either a fixed fee or related to the annual value of the premises, and substitute in their place a fee which is 3 per cent of the purchase price of the liquor sold. In other words, the fee is being related to turnover instead of to the value of the premises where the liquor is consumed. This is a completely new method in South Australia and it has already been explained by the Premier. I am concerned to know whether this new method of licensing will impose any hardship, particularly in respect of country licences. With all due respect to the desire of the Premier in endeavouring to obtain more revenue by means of taxation, the imposition of additional fees on liquor consumption is certainly another channel of revenue open to it, but it has the disadvantage that it does not fall equally on all people in the community.

The liquor industry contributes heavily to the revenue of both the State and Commonwealth Governments, and there is no getting away from the fact that this form of taxation is a sectional tax, because all people do not support the consumption of alcoholic beverages that are permitted to be consumed on certain premises; not that I expect them to, because I believe in freedom of choice where social habits are concerned. The other class of amendments deals with the slight relaxation of the trading hours. The consumption of liquor with ordinary meals is to be extended from 10 p.m. to 10.45 p.m., plus the existing 30 minutes allowed to consume liquor purchased prior to that time. In addition to this extended time, restaurants with liquor permits are allowed to serve any Australian wines, cider, mead or perry with meals (which is a relaxation of the present restricted conditions), and on Christmas Day these restaurants are permitted to serve these wines with Christmas dinner from 1 p.m. to 3.30 p.m. and 6 p.m. to 10.45 p.m., plus the usual half-hour consumption period after these times.

Liquor with meals for the hotel trade on Christmas Day is during the period 12.30 p.m. to 2.30 p.m. (that is, a two-hour period), whereas the provision relating to restaurants is for 1 p.m. to 3.30 p.m. (that is, two and a half hours). Why the need for any difference in the hours whether one is drinking wine, fruit cup, or anything else?

I notice that it is not intended to alter section 199 of the principal Act dealing with permits to supply liquor on special occasions because there are many occasions when a private individual or club may wish to hold a special dinner or social gathering. One amendment I like is that contained in clause 26, which enacts new section 198b and makes it possible, excepting on Sunday, Good Friday, and Christmas Day, for liquor to be served with a light meal costing at least 7s. 6d. at a hotel or a club between the hours during which liquor normally may be served with meals. I have reason to believe that this section can be used to advantage and I am sure that members of the hotel trade will supply a meal that will be worthy of their standards. Already in many places a counter lunch is provided at the cost of about 3s. 6d. and I have heard that persons who enjoy this type of food have been high in their praise. The meals supplied by the hotel trade are a

credit to the hotelkeepers. These views are already known because I mentioned them some time ago. This new provision will enable those who do not desire a heavy meal at great expense to enjoy both an outing and a lighter meal at a very reasonable charge.

Section 198a of the principal Act permits a resident in a hotel, providing he comes from another State, to entertain up to six guests. This means that any local hotel resident is excluded from entertaining his guests, and clause 25 of the bill removes this exception so that under the new provisions any *bona fide* resident of a hotel may entertain up to six guests at his own expense. The other amendments require very little comment because they provide merely the administrative framework within which this legislation will operate and relate to such matters as the calling of evidence, the powers of inspectors to examine various books and records and the provision for the payment of fees quarterly instead of annually. I consider that proposed new section 198b has great merit. It will, of course be subject to the court's jurisdiction but, at the same time, it will provide that those who desire alcoholic beverages and those who desire fruit cup will get the drink they want. I believe it is considered that hotels mix the best fruit cup. We should try to encourage more of a club spirit. It has been said that we are a long way from providing what many of the newcomers to this country have been accustomed to, and that it is time we attempted to provide for more of this sort of social entertainment. Normally, the extension of facilities would be subject to a local option poll.

I had the pleasure only recently of visiting the German Club in Flinders Street. This club has a very nice entrance. It has provided for bar accommodation, but whether or not it is licensed to sell alcoholic beverages I do not know. I noticed that the club had provided for a ten-pin bowling alley. Two alleyways are available, so at least 12 people might enjoy that bowling and partake of alcoholic refreshment provided they had a light meal costing not less than 7s. 6d. The club also has billiard tables, which could be used by both sexes. This type of club encourages people to take part in these activities. No doubt others would prefer some sort of musical entertainment, but it is difficult to please everybody. It is for the court to determine what accommodation shall be set aside for meals and where liquor shall be served. I believe that more people will come to appreciate the type of entertainment that I have referred to, and that this will result in a better community spirit.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the Bill. I remind the House that it is exactly 100 years since the first licensing legislation was passed in this State. That was the Act of 1863. Bearing in mind that we have 100 years of licensing laws behind us, this year would have been an appropriate occasion to thoroughly review and overhaul the Licensing Act in the same way as this year we reviewed and overhauled the Industrial Code. I believe that the present legislation has a few anomalies and that a number of salutary amendments could have been made in addition to those contained in the present Bill. Indeed, the Licensing Act has been referred to from time to time as a Draconian code, and I think much could be done to ameliorate the rigorous provisions of that code.

The first legislation of 1863 introduced a permit system, and justices of the peace in this State had jurisdiction in that field. The subsequent Act of 1880 made it possible for the Governor to appoint a bench of justices, and these justices had jurisdiction to grant licences to various district council areas. However, they were not enabled to increase the number of licences if objection was raised by two-thirds of the ratepayers in the district council area concerned. The next Act placed on the Statute Book was in 1891, and that introduced for the first time the local option system. However, the areas within which this local option system operated were the areas of the district councils and municipal corporations, and it was a poll of ratepayers which decided whether there should be a decrease or an increase in the number of licences.

It was not until the 1908 Act that the electoral districts of South Australia were made the local option districts in this State, and, as members are aware, it was subsequent legislation—I think the Act of 1954—which made the subdivisions, which were in the State electoral districts, the local option areas in this State. The 1915 Act was a most important one because for the first time six o'clock closing was introduced, and that was by referendum. I personally consider, bearing in mind that it was as a result of the referendum that six o'clock closing was introduced—

Mr. Jennings: The referendum was only an expression of opinion, of course.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: That is so, but I personally consider that only as a result of a referendum being favourable should there be any extension of trading hours beyond six o'clock. Various Acts have been introduced since 1915, most of them making minor amendments to the legislation. The 1932 Act consolidated all the law on licensing up to that time.

The Bill before us has a number of important amendments, one of the most important of which, I consider, is contained in clause 14, which repeals sections 30 to 35 inclusive of Division III of the present Act dealing with the fees payable for publicans' licences. In place of sections 30 to 35 clause 14 inserts new sections 30 and 31 dealing with the fees that will be payable in future for the various types of licence mentioned. At present publicans' and club licence fees are based on the annual value of the premises in question, but under the amending legislation it is proposed that the fees for the various types of licence will be based upon the value of the liquor turnover of the premises during the preceding year. I consider this a more equitable manner of imposing licence fees than has operated in the past, and it is a practice in vogue in all the other States. The fee to be charged for licences is 3 per cent of the gross amount paid for liquor over a year. In most of the other States 6 per cent is charged on the gross turnover. It can therefore be considered that the imposition of a fee equal to 3 per cent of the gross turnover is not excessive.

Mr. Frank Walsh: It won't be long before it is 6 per cent.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I am dealing with the present amendment. It appears from the second reading explanation that the Australian Hotels Association agrees with the amendment. The next important clause in the Bill is clause 23, which amends section 197a (5) of the Act and authorizes the sale and consumption of liquor with meals in restaurants between 6 p.m. and 10.45 p.m. At present the permitted time for the supply of liquor with meals in restaurants is from 6 p.m. until 10 p.m. That is in addition to the normal mid-day time from 12 noon until 2 p.m. Clause 23 also provides that on Christmas Day liquor may be supplied with meals between 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. and between 6 p.m. and 10.45 p.m. I think that is a desirable feature of the Bill and I am certain that most members of the public will welcome the increase in the hours for the supply of liquor in restaurants.

The next important amendment, which is contained in clause 24, permits the sale and consumption of liquor in licensed premises and registered clubs, which ordinarily supply liquor with meals, between 6 p.m. and 10.45 p.m. Under the present legislation the hours are from 6 p.m. until 10 p.m. This clause will also permit the sale and consumption of liquor between 12.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. and between 6 p.m. and 10.45 p.m. on Sundays, Good Friday and Christmas Day. At present the Act permits the supply of liquor with meals on these days only from 1 p.m. until 2 p.m. and from 6 p.m. until 10 p.m. I consider that it has been an anomaly in the past, as was mentioned in the Premier's second reading explanation, that people could, on the days I have mentioned, demand a meal to be served at 12.30 p.m. but could not ask for liquor to be supplied with the meal until 1 p.m. However, this will be rectified by clause 24 of the Bill.

Clause 25 amends section 198a of the Act which, at present, permits only a *bona fide* visitor from a place outside the State to be supplied with liquor after 6 p.m. for up to six guests at licensed premises where he is in residence. This privilege has not been available to any person resident within the State who may be staying at licensed premises but the clause will permit him to enjoy the same privileges as the visitor from outside South Australia when entertaining up to six visitors at licensed premises. I think that this, too, is a commendable provision.

The last clause to which I wish to refer is clause 26, which permits the supply of liquor with light meals in hotels and registered clubs from 6 p.m. until 10.45 p.m. on ordinary days and, of course, as the Premier said in his second reading explanation, an extra half hour will be available for people in these places to consume liquor until 11.15 p.m. In addition, this clause provides that the meal with which the liquor is supplied must cost not less than 7s. 6d., and must be partaken of in a room which has been specified in the permit granted for this purpose and not in a dining room or bar room. This provision merits the favourable consideration of honourable members.

I consider that these amendments will improve the existing legislation and will be a boon to many people who enjoy drinking wines with meals. I am certain that the Bill will find favour not only with those who are

engaged in the hotelkeeping and restaurant business but also with many members of the public. I support the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): In speaking on the second reading of this Bill I thought I would be out on a limb but, nevertheless, I indicate that I do not support the second reading. I will not support any legislation that provides for an extension of liquor hours. I regret that the Premier in amending the Licensing Act has linked revenue with the extension of hours. He said, in giving the second reading explanation, that the most important amendment to the Act was the alteration of the existing basis of licence and permit fees. Had there been a separate Bill dealing with the assessment of liquor licences and permit fees I would then have been able to support the second reading but I cannot do this as the Bill stands in its present form. Apparently the Premier thought that some members would be caught in a moment of weakness because, when he gave the second reading explanation, he digressed from his script to say that the amount of additional revenue for the Treasury under this legislation would offset the concessions that would result from exempting certain people from succession duty. I am at a loss to understand what relationship this Bill has to any matter dealing with succession duties. I think the Premier was trying to draw a red herring across the path, but I will not be side-tracked on this issue of extending hours for drinking liquor.

I am the elected representative of my district and I think it is my duty to sink any Party differences I have and deal with any serious problems confronting us. Problems that will not be solved by extending the hours for drinking liquor are driving motor vehicles under the influence of liquor, broken homes, and alcoholics. Every time the hours for drinking liquor are legally increased the danger to various sections of people is increased. I do not think for one minute that every person who consumes liquor is a menace to human life, but there is always a section that abuses any privileges given to it and, because of this, innocent people can be injured physically and mentally and, in come cases, the outcome is fatal. Many professional men have pointed out at various times that a small percentage of alcohol in the blood can cause a person to become a menace to road safety. Professor G. C. Drew, M.A., of the Department of Psychology at the University of London, in delivering the Ernest Winterton Memorial Lecture, had this to say on road safety and alcohol:

In 1960, 6,970 people were killed and 340,551 injured on the roads in Great Britain. That is to say, approximately 1,000 people were killed or injured every day throughout the year. The magnitude of the problem this sets is, of course, gradually receiving the recognition it deserves, but a significant reduction in these numbers is not likely to be achieved rapidly, or by any one solution. Rather, since any accident is the result of a number, often a large number, of interacting causes, their number will have to be chipped away by simplifying the task, by improving roads, by segregating different types of traffic, by making clearer and more definite sets of rules governing the behaviour of all road users, and so on. It is in this light that I think the problem of alcohol and road safety should be looked at. Even if alcohol ceased to be consumed altogether in this country, and nothing else changed, there would still be a large number of accidents. I believe, however, that there is a convincing body of evidence to show that alcohol is ofen a major, and frequently a contributing, cause of a considerable proportion of traffic accidents. It is some of this evidence that I want to present in this lecture. The first point I should like to make, and I want to make it as forcibly as I can, is that the amount of alcohol in the brain and nervous system which is important in producing changes in behaviour, and not how much the individual has had to drink. The two are obviously related, since it is not possible to have a large amount of alcohol in the brain without having a large amount of drink. The relationship between the two, however, is a complicated one. Alcohol begins to be absorbed into the blood stream within a very short time of drinking, of the order of five minutes or so.

He goes on to say:

The effect of alcohol on muscle response, on reaction times, and on vision, hearing, and touch depends partly on the concentration of alcohol and partly on the complexity of the task. The simpler, more vegetative, aspects of our adjustments to the evironment seem to be made more sensitive and more rapid by small amounts of alcohol. Simple reflexes like the knee jerk, for example, become faster. We become more sensitive to light, to touch and to sounds, so that we can, with small amounts of alcohol, perceive a dimmer light than we can with none.

He then deals with various experimental tests carried out by various authorities, and then says:

Accordingly, my colleague, Dr. Colquhoun, Miss Long and I carried out a fairly complicated experiment, using a traffic simulator. Each driver was tested five times, for two hours on each occasion, and for each test he had a different amount of alcohol, one of them being no alcohol at all, simply flavoured water.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Did he drown?

Mr. HUGHES: If the Minister listens to what the professor has to say, he will see that he did not drown.

Mr. Fred Walsh: He does not suggest that the man did not know what he was drinking, does he?

Mr. HUGHES: No, he does not suggest that the person did not know there was no alcohol, but there are various times when drink has such a low alcohol content that perhaps the gregarious members in this House would think they were drinking water.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They would be pretty far gone!

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt they would. However, this test was carried out, and in the first test coloured water was used. The report continues:

We recorded almost everything he did, where he was on the road all the time, how much he used his steering wheel, brake, accelerator pedal, and so on. We found that errors, in terms of the amount of "wobble" across the road, increased as soon as there was any alcohol in the blood.

I take it that, after they had tried the coloured water and it had produced no results, they then gave the people some water with a little alcohol.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What was wrong with the man—drinking coloured water and alcohol?

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot answer that. The report continues:

The relation between error and blood alcohol was a straight line, proportional increases in blood alcohol producing proportional increases in error. At 80 mgms. per cent the average increase in error was about 16 per cent. The higher the blood alcohol, too, the more inefficient he became in using the steering wheel, working harder and harder to keep a straight course. We found that personality characteristics affected the manner in which behaviour changed, though everybody did change. Extroverts, the social, cheerful people, tended to behave as though they had nothing to drink and made a great deal more error as a result. Introverts tended to drive either extremely quickly or extremely slowly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will connect his remarks with the Bill. This is not a total prohibition Bill; it provides for an extension of hours.

Mr. HUGHES: I think I can tie it up if you will allow me to complete a few more lines. I am trying to tie up the report to one of the clauses that provides for an extension of hours and to impart to the House that, if there are longer hours for drinking, the alcohol content in the blood can increase if people stay drinking in hotels longer.

Mr. Hall: Do you think that past increases in drinking hours have resulted in an increased number of accidents?

Mr. HUGHES: According to statistics, there has been an increase in the number of accidents, but whether it has been due to longer drinking hours would be difficult to answer. The professor continued:

The extreme case here was a woman who without alcohol averaged 30 miles per hour but with 60 mgs. per cent blood alcohol never exceeded eight miles per hour but drove extremely accurately. Those who became accurate but slow panicked when they could not control the speed—in emergencies, etc.—and became very bad indeed. We concluded that there is no threshold for the effects of alcohol but rather that behaviour begins to deteriorate as soon as there is any alcohol at all in the blood.

The professor presented an interesting set of graphs dealing with the relation between the level of alcohol in the blood and time after ingestion; regression of steering wheel movement on blood alcohol level and trend of fatal accident risk to drinking drivers. All the graphs prove that once a person has alcohol in the blood his driving begins to deteriorate. In view of all the tests carried out by the medical profession, and by men and women engaged by the various States to staff our universities, I am led to say that a contributing factor in the number of road accident deaths in South Australia is alcohol.

Mr. Casey: I agree with that.

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad that the honourable member agrees. Let us have a look at the South Australian road casualty figures which were quoted in the recent edition of *Safety News*, the official journal of the National Safety Council (South Australia) Incorporated and Road Safety Division. This may be of interest to the member for Gouger who was seeking information just now whether the extension of drinking hours had a bearing on the number of road accidents. I am not in a position to say that there has been a great bearing, but it will be seen from the figures that there has been a steep increase since 1957, and particularly since 1959. In 1960 the Act was amended to provide that alcohol could be served with meals to 10 p.m., with a half-hour grace. In 1957 the number of persons killed through road accidents was 192, and 5,036 were injured. In 1958 there was a slight drop to 185 in the number killed, but an increase to 5,345 in the number injured. In 1959 the number killed increased to 198, with an increase also in the number injured to 5,621. In 1960, 234 were killed and 7,704 injured. This was a steep increase. In 1961 there was a drop to 178 in the number killed and the number injured was 7,247. Then there was a steep increase in

1962 to 194 killed and 8,322 injured. It can be seen that with the exception of one year there has been a continuing steep increase in the numbers since 1957. At this stage I will not repeat what would be expected of me in speaking in this way, so I leave it to Councillor C. T. H. Koch, Vice-President of the National Safety Council (S.A.) Inc., who said:

While we recognize a growing public awareness of the road accident problem, much has yet to be done to combat the widely held belief that road accidents only happen to other people and their families. The council has endeavoured to educate all road users and to impress upon them the ever greater need for a better standard of road behaviour and courtesy which, together with the observance of existing road laws, provides an answer to the accident problem. Excessive speed continues as the major killer, and while the cause of accidents is often attributed to weather, roads, lighting or motor vehicles, the fact remains that by far the greatest percentage of accidents is caused by human factor—those who walk and drive on our roads with a sometimes reckless disregard to their responsibilities to other road users. The council believes, too, that alcohol is an accident-producing factor which cannot be ignored and continues to urge abstinence whilst driving.

Mr. Casey: I agree.

Mr. HUGHES: I am sure the honourable member agrees, and that Mr. Koch will be pleased to know that the honourable member agrees. It will be noted that Mr. Koch referred to alcohol as being an accident-producing factor and said that the young driver group was disproportionately involved. He said also that greater support should be forthcoming from the Government and other citizens. I presume that when he talks of the Government he means the Parliament. This legislation will not assist in lowering the accident rate amongst our young people. I think it will encourage social drinking of liquor amongst the younger generation. In South Australia we have a large number of young people of whom we can be proud. They have received a very high measure of education and in most cases they can think and act for themselves. However, there are some who will try to "put it over big" and this is not only confined to people in the 21-year age group. I have attended some social functions and have seen young people drive away in cars when they should not have been allowed to do so, yet the Bill will encourage this sort of thing. Once the legislation becomes operative men and women will be able to consume liquor throughout the day and then by paying 7s. 6d. they will be able to continue to drink until 11.15 p.m.

Mr. Casey: Not necessarily.

Mr. HUGHES: It does not matter whether that is so or not. By paying 7s. 6d. they will be able to purchase a light meal and partake of it, or they can purchase the meal without eating it, and still order drinks and consume them until 11.15 p.m.

Mr. Casey: You missed one point.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think I have missed any point at all.

Mr. Hall: Don't you think that drinking in a hotel is better than drinking in a motor car?

Mr. HUGHES: I certainly do. I do not approve of anyone drinking in a motor car while travelling along.

Mr. Hall: I am talking of a stationary motor car. Much drinking is done in stationary cars.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member may know something about drinking in motor cars, but I do not partake of liquor.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Then you cannot judge very well.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not trying to judge at all. I am sorry if I am being misunderstood by the Minister of Lands and other honourable members. It is not for me to judge any person. I am emphasizing the dangers to the people of this State, particularly our young people. I am sorry that certain honourable members think that this is a laughing matter, because to many people in this State it is not. People who attend a theatre at night normally return to their homes and families afterwards, but this legislation will entice many to call at licensed premises. It has already been intimated in this House that that can be made possible. I agree that people on licensed premises should have half an hour's grace in which to drink liquor (and that is reasonable, I do not begrudge anyone having that time to consume liquor in a proper manner) rather than socking it down, to use an everyday term. However, this Bill will encourage people to visit the hotel after the theatre.

Mr. Casey: Theatres come out later than that.

Mr. HUGHES: Most theatres come out at 10.30 p.m., allowing time to visit the hotel.

Mr. Casey: No, theatres usually come out at a quarter to eleven.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps the honourable member is speaking of theatres in Cockburn or other places in the north, but I am referring

now to those in the city. I know the honourable member has many shearers in his district. I have every sympathy for the shearer, and do not begrudge any man who has been shearing sheep (and I have done a few myself)—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Have you been to the opera at Waukaringa?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I have not.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Wallaroo must speak on the Bill. I doubt whether any shearers are mentioned in it.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps there will be an amendment before the House—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot speak of amendments on the second reading, but must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I am sorry that honourable members are trying to make fun, because I reserve the right to speak seriously on this important matter. I listened attentively to the Premier when he gave the second reading explanation; I listened to the honourable member for Angas and did not notice his supporters making fun of him. I represent a large section of people who have asked me to oppose this Bill, and I am carrying out their wishes. It appears to me that honourable members on the other side wish to make fun out of what I am saying, and are enjoying it.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Honourable members are not making fun of you: they are trying to help you.

Mr. HUGHES: Honourable members are not helping me. I do not accept that as help. I do not mind reasonable interjections and a bit of cheek, but not a running commentary. When we are talking about something that can be the means of losing life, then it is a serious subject. Perhaps the honourable member for Frome will agree with me on that point. The Premier is not fooling anyone in not acceding to the request that licensed premises serve liquor until midnight. It was never expected to be increased to midnight by those who made the request. They always ask for more than they hope to get. A compromise is usually reached and of course, as in every year, the liquor interests have come off best. When I spoke in a similar debate in 1960 the Minister of Lands was sitting on this side of the House as the honourable member for Burra, a district that he still represents. In that debate he said that he respected the honourable member for Stuart and me for our strong views on this matter. I hope the Minister is still of the same mind, because I have not changed mine. When the Licensing Act was amended in 1960 to provide for extension of drinking hours with meals to 10 p.m. with half an hour's grace, some members stated in that debate that they had been approached by their constituents to support the Bill. That was not my experience then. Although no-one asked me to support the Bill, several people approached me and asked me to oppose it. I have had a similar experience on this occasion. I have received several letters from churches and individuals asking me to oppose the extension of liquor hours. For the benefit of honourable members, and to let them know that this is not an exaggeration, I quote from a letter I received from the Church of Christ, which is a strong body in Kadina. The letter is addressed to me and states:

> We, the undersigned, members of the Church of Christ, Kadina and electors in the district of Wallaroo, believing and knowing that the consumption of alcoholic beverages is the cause of much trouble and sorrow in the lives of many people and in the life of the community, strongly and definitely oppose any extension of hotel trading hours for the sale of intoxicating liquor, and also any other alterations for increasing the sale of such beverages. We assure you of our full support in opposing any move to have such alterations brought about by an Act of Parliament and beg of you to act on our behalf in this matter,

It carries 60 signatures and is available if any honourable member wishes to peruse it. At a dinner given in Pennington Hall, North Adelaide, to delegates to an Australian fact-finding convention on alcohol last year, the Premier, in welcoming delegates from other States, said (and I do not know whether honourable members opposite will laugh now): "The temperance movement has done a great deal for this country. I welcome the people from other States as people who have come here to undertake work which I believe will be of importance not only to South Australia but to the nation." The Premier was not laughed at then. He realized the importance of what this convention meant to the State and the nation. I believe that he still realizes it, although he has had strong pressure put upon him from people outside this Parliament to have the hours extended.

Mr. Hall: He was talking about temperance, not prohibition.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not talking about prohibition either. I do not want to be misunderstood on that point: I am a moderate man in all things. The Reverend Mr. Westerman, from Victoria, who was guest speaker that night, said that on the basis of readily available well-attested evidence it was a reasonable statement to make that liquor was killing more

people, ruining more careers, causing more accidents, crime and divorce, costing more money and creating more sheer human misery and degradation than any other factor in the life of this country.' That statement was recorded in the next day's *Advertiser*. It has not been refuted. I maintain that his comments must have been near the mark. Sir Philip Messent, who is held in high esteem, was a delegate to this convention. When he was speaking in the Pirie Street hall he referred to young people who grew up in society where the drinking of liquor was made to appear an essential part of daily life. He said, ''They are made to feel that unless they join in, they are not only peculiar young people but they are missing one of the major joys of life.'' He explained that that was not the position, and I agree with him. I have been to various functions attended by young people at which drinks containing alcohol are almost thrust upon them. I am sure other members have had the same experience.

Earlier this year another fact-finding convention was held at the University of Adelaide in connection with the Department of Adult Education in co-operation with the National Committee for the Prevention of Alcoholism. It was Australia's third institute of scientific studies for the prevention of alcoholism. When one examines the list of guest speakers one sits up and takes notice. To read their statements makes one feel that he is doing the right thing in trying to prevent young people from being encouraged to partake of liquor. Dr. Alan Stoller (Chief Clinical Officer of the Victorian Mental Hygiene Authority) was a guest speaker, as well as Dr. E. Cunningham Dax (Director of the Victorian Mental Hygiene Authority), Dr. John McGeorge (New South Wales Government Consulting Psychiatrist), Sir Philip Messent, and Dr. John Birrell (Victorian Police Surgeon).

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to link his remarks to this Bill. I point out that this is not a total prohibition Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I realize that only too well, and I am sorry that I cannot speak on broader principles because this is a serious subject. These men would not be giving their time if they did not realize what a danger alcoholism was to Australia. However, I will not continue with my remarks. As much as I should like to support one part of the Bill I am prevented from doing so because the second part deals with an extension of hours for the drinking of liquor.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I find myself at variance with the member for Wallaroo in the points of view he expressed. I am much in favour of the provisions of this Bill. I think I am equally as responsible as he, if not more so, in my approach to the welfare of my fellow man. I believe that the provisions contained in this Bill are good. It is necessary to leave to the individual a greater freedom in matters that hitherto have been denied to him. We pride ourselves on the levels of education to which we have attained. Academically we have advanced greatly in recent times. The objective of modern education is to ensure that our citizens are so assisted that they may evaluate given situations for themselves.

Mr. Riches: Have you heard of an educated alcoholic?

Mr. LAUCKE: I have, and my sympathy is deep and sincere. However, because of the unfortunate cases to which the honourable member refers, we cannot deny a reasonable extension of facilities to the majority of people. I am mindful of the distress that is occasioned by an excessive consumption of alcohol.

Mr. Riches: Some are not as well educated as others.

Mr. LAUCKE: They are in a small minority. Alcoholism is a disease and it should be treated as such. That aspect must never be lost sight of because it is vital. At the same time, in a modern enlightened community it is wrong that we should deny others those things to which they themselves believe they are entitled. We cannot be too parochial in these matters.

The SPEAKER: I pulled the member for Wallaroo up on the same point. This is a question of hours, not a question of whether alcohol is good or bad. The honourable member must relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am trying to indicate that it is good that some minor extensions of hours are provided. It is necessary, if we are not to find ourselves regarded by citizens from other States and from overseas as being small parochially-minded people. I do not believe in prohibitions on individuals. We should give credence to the innate decencies of most people.

Mr. Riches: Of course you believe in prohibition. There are plenty of things that you would prohibit.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am speaking at the moment of the availability of alcoholic beverages at certain times.

Mr. Riches: There are plenty of people to deal with that.

Mr. LAUCKE: Maybe that is so but it is rather incongruous to me in an era of enlightenment that we should endeavour to impose on educated intelligent people certain laws of conduct. At times I wonder just how far members of Parliament should be their brother's keeper, because each person is responsible for himself and should, with our modern education, be able as a normal citizen to fend and care adequately for himself. I regard the provisions of this Bill as a step in the right direction, albeit a cautious one. However, in my opinion, it is a step in a direction that must be taken and I commend the Government for introducing this legislation. The right time for the consumption of alcoholic beverages is with food. Nothing hurts me more than to see people taking strong drink away in, say, flagons and consuming it away from food.

Mr. Riches: Why do you not favour facilities in the dining room?

Mr. LAUCKE: I feel that beverages should be consumed with food. One is auxiliary to the other and ill effects do not ensue when the balance is there.

Mr. Riches: Why not in the dining room?

Mr. LAUCKE: They are in the dining room.

Mr. McKee: That is past legislation. Why put a prohibition on a navvy or worker going in for the privilege of having a drink by the charging of high prices for meals?

Mr. LAUCKE: As I say, the right time for alcohol to be consumed is with meals. We in South Australia produce the best wines in Australia, wines that compare with the best wines in the world. It is so wrong, in my opinion, to deny access to those excellent beverages at the appropriate place and time to our local population and those who come to us from overseas to enjoy those things that we here produce. In the Barossa Valley, a portion of which I am proud to represent in this House, we have vignerons dedicated to producing wines of the standards to which I have referred. They have brought out techniques from the old world to produce in South Australia wine of world renown. The provisions of this Bill will allow a comprehensive selection of those wines to those who go to cafes and restaurants for evening meals. That is most desirable. In South Australia, we have been rather backward in exploiting our full potential in the tourist trade.

Mr. McKee: I agree with that.

Mr. LAUCKE: And, if we do not think of those who come to us from countries and areas where greater freedoms in this respect are enjoyed, we just shall not have our fair share of tourists coming to South Australia.

Mr. Hughes: Do you know what happened in New South Wales when a study was made of alcoholic beverages?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will not be allowed to go into the question of alcohol. This Bill is concerned with hours.

Mr. LAUCKE: One will not find a more temperate area in this State than the area that produces most of our wines. I say that deliberately and for a purpose, because in recent times times I and many others in my home area have been hurt by reports emanating from Barossa Valley, which did not apply to valley residents. I say that pointedly because we are proud of the tolerance or temperance displayed throughout that area. The part of the Bill dealing with licence fees is a fair and realistic approach to what should be the basis of a licence fee. Hitherto, the position has been, particularly in country areas, that if the local "mine host" improves his hotel in some way or other, very quickly his council rating increases. Simultaneously, the licensing court increases his licence fee, and it is not in relation to the increased business that this "mine host" may be doing.

This legislation ensures that 3 per cent of the hotel keeper's liquor purchases shall determine the amount he pays as a licence fee. That is a good approach, much more equitable than the system hitherto applying. Incidentally, it is just half of the percentage applicable, I understand, in our nearest Eastern State. That removes an anomaly and ensures that the hotel with the largest bar trade shall pay the largest licence fee. After all, our hotels are there not only to provide liquid refreshment but to afford accommodation and house facilities.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They pay sales tax, too.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes; sales tax is applicable to the hotel trade. This new approach is good. So, broadly speaking, I agree with the provisions of this Bill. I am just as responsible in putting my view as is my friend from Wallaroo, who has seen fit to say things that, in my opinion, would indicate that he is not so much desirous of temperance as he is of prohibition. To that attitude I could never subscribe.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): The Premier, in his second reading explanation of the Bill, said that it was essentially in two parts. Some speakers tonight have dealt with the first

part, which refers mainly to licences and the increased fees associated with them. I do not intend to develop an argument on that part tonight because I am not an authority on the matter. Probably it has been gone into quite thoroughly with the Australian Hotels Association and the Licensing Court in an endeavour to see that the charges for licences are equitable, so I have no quarrel on that aspect.

Like the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), I oppose the extension of hours either for drinking in bars or in dining rooms. I consider that adequate allowances are made already in that respect. Unlike the member for Wallaroo, I do not intend to oppose the second reading, but in Committee I will vote against the things in the Bill that I do not like. I consider that that would be the correct approach. We are all agreed on some of the provisions. Having voted and expressed my opinion on the things in the Bill which I do not like, I can either support or oppose the third reading. In Committee I will speak to an amendment that I will have on the files, but I do not intend to discuss that at this stage. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said something with which I think we all agree. Referring to the extension of hours, he said:

> Although they go further than some people would desire, I think they do not go as far as others would desire.

This is evident and is the crux of this Bill in relation to the extension of hours. We will always have differing opinions on the extension of hours; that is natural. Some people will say definitely that six o'clock closing is sufficient and that nine o'clock was sufficient for the serving of liquor with meals. We have seen a gradual extension of hours. Last year we saw an increase to 10 p.m., with a half-hour's grace, and here we see again an extension of three-quarters of an hour with the same half-hour's grace. This is something I must oppose, because I consider that there is no necessity for meals to go on until that hour. If a meal that starts at eight o'clock cannot be completed by 10 o'clock, I think there is something wrong with the meal.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The meal might be started at 10 o'clock.

Mr. BYWATERS: In my opinion, anybody who started his evening meal at 10 o'clock would be rather odd. Some may do so and I do not criticize them for that, but it does not appeal to me. When I go to a hotel, which I do frequently when electioneering and when visiting other States, I am called on persistently by the drink waiter asking me what I am going to have, and even if I say "Nothing" he will persistently come back, and to me that is annoying.

Mr. Jennings: He is looking for a tip.

Mr. BYWATERS: He may be, but he will not get one from me under those circumstances. Every person is entitled to his opinion. I appreciate the attitude of the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), who said that he was just as earnest in his desires as the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). They look at the matter in different lights, and I think that is fair enough, for that is our democratic way of life. If we did not have differences of opinion I think it would be a poor world indeed.

We know that when a Bill for the extension of liquor hours is even talked about in this State—and I guess it applies in other States as well—there is consistent pressure from people who oppose an extension. Every member of Parliament has received correspondence on this subject. The member for Wallaroo referred to a letter and a petition he had received from constituents, and no doubt almost every member here has received similar representations. By the same token, members receive representations from the other side for the extension of liquor hours. Therefore, this is a divided issue. I consider that we are going around this matter in the wrong way in gradually giving a little at a time. This subject causes concern.

You, Mr. Speaker, have been critical of speakers on both sides of the House tonight for going outside of what you term the ambit of the Bill. I consider that what I am about to say now will be within the ambit of the Bill, because I will relate it in some way to what has been said. Some people today oppose any extension of liquor hours because they are conscious of the things that can happen to people who become alcoholics. Each one of us is concerned about this subject: it does not matter whether we are hardened drinkers or teetotallers. I have been referred to in a newspaper as a strait-laced country cousin; we must expect to be criticized for our views, but at least I know what my views are and I do not hesitate to tell people what they are. We will consistently have people who are concerned about this problem of alcoholism, and rightly so, and if members in this House are honest they will agree that a big percentage of hard-up cases that come to our notice are the result of the excessive use of alcohol.

Mr. Fred Walsh: I can't agree with you on that.

Mr. BYWATERS: Perhaps the honourable member cannot agree with me, and I am open to correction on that matter. People have consistently come to me with problems associated with hire-purchase, with accidents, and even with death, where alcohol has been the cause of the trouble.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is going outside the ambit of the Bill now.

Mr. BYWATERS: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not think so. I think my remarks can be linked up with the question of the extension of liquor hours, because it is for the reason I have mentioned that people oppose such extensions. I wish to develop this point by adding something else, Mr. Speaker. This method of extending hours a little at a time is merely a way of watering down the provisions to satisfy two groups of people. I consider that we do not satisfy either group, because it is apparent that those who advocate the extension of hours for drinking with meals are not satisfied with the present Bill, nor are the others I mentioned who are concerned from the other angle. I consider that we are approaching this matter from the wrong angle. As the member for Wallaroo suggested, the contents of this Bill should have been placed in two separate Bills, for in that way each Bill could have been debated on the issues it contained.

I consider that the Victorian Government has introduced the correct method regarding the extension of liquor hours. Only recently when in Victoria I read in the press that Mr. Rylah, who had just returned from overseas, said he believed that the provisions in Victoria were not adequate for these modern times. He offered certain suggestions, but because he had received such a resounding defeat on the earlier Bill he had introduced into Parliament he was not keen to introduce another to bring in what he thought were the correct provisions. He asked the Temperance Alliance in Victoria to meet him and discuss the extension of drinking hours with him. Out of that came the appointment of a commission, with all the powers of a Royal Commission, to inquire into all aspects relating to the extension of liquor hours and the social problems associated with the subject.

Mr. Ryan: Has the commission power to recommend?

Mr. BYWATERS: It has.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Would you be prepared to accept any recommendation such a committee here would make?

Mr. BYWATERS: I think it would be right for us to take notice of someone who had gone into these matters; I believe I would be prepared to accept the decisions of an unbiased commission, but I would not accept a report from a biased commission. All these things are linked up with an extension of drinking hours, whether that extension is of bar hours or the hours for drinking with meals. The terms of reference of the Victorian commission are very wide; they include the causes of the problems and the opposition that could come to such a measure. I think this would be a good suggestion to bring into this House. The Victorian commission is to be conducted by Mr. P. D. Phillips, Q.C., and his secretary is to be Mr. L. T. Dudley, of the Licensing Branch. In the terms of reference the social consequences are set out first. These include the extent to which the consumption of liquor is a significant factor in causing accidents, crime, divorce and broken homes, child delinquency and neglect, and ill-health. These things are spoken about every time an extension of liquor hours comes forward; we should not fool ourselves about that.

Mr. Nankivell: Is that commission totally unbiased?

Mr. BYWATERS: I do not know what type of man Mr. Phillips is, but at least he is acceptable to both side of the question. Surely that shows he is unbiased, or there would have been opposition to his appointment. The terms of reference state that any person who has any cause for concern over an extension of trading hours or any person who wants to extend trading hours can give evidence. The commission has power to call witnesses, and no doubt witnesses will be called.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill contains no reference to a commission of inquiry.

Mr. BYWATERS: But I am linking my remarks to certain clauses in the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to be hard on the honourable member, but I point out that this question is not covered in the four corners of the Bill, which deals with licensing hours and an increase in fees.

Mr. BYWATERS: The Bill deals with an extension of liquor hours, and I cannot see why I should not develop the reasons why people are concerned. These things were referred to tonight by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). He and every member has had representations made by people for and against this Bill, and the problems I have mentioned are the ones they have advanced. These are the reasons why the Victorian commission was set up to study all the causes.

Mr. Freebairn: What reference is the honourable member quoting?

Mr. BYWATERS: The Royal Commission into the Victorian liquor industry, licensing laws and social problems associated with alcohol, which is to be conducted by Mr. P. D. Phillips, Q.C., appointed by Mr. Rylah to deal with this matter because the extension of liquor hours was in question. The document is here for any interested member to see. This would be a good opportunity for people to study it to see if there was justification for an extension. In New South Wales, when liquor hours were extended, one side said that the extension would end all the evils of swill drinking and the other side said it would cause all the troubles in the world. They were both wrong. Things were not changed very much; there was only an extension of time.

Mr. Hughes: This will not alter the swill here.

Mr. BYWATERS: No, it will not.

Mr. Freebairn: What did the Victorian commission say about the taking of food?

The SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable member read the commission's report.

Mr. BYWATERS: This has not reached the report stage yet. It would be interesting if it had, as it would have made good material for this debate. That is why I say a commission would be acceptable to different sides to this question of whether to extend hours, leave them as they are, or even to reduce them if need be. Another provision of this Bill is that it will be permissible to consume alcohol with a light meal. If a meal is provided for a minimum charge of 7s. 6d., by setting aside a separate room the licensee will be able to serve alcoholic drinks to customers who partake of that light meal. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

Subject to the approval of the Licensing Court and the provision of a special room for the purpose, liquor may be served in the evening with a light meal described as a meal costing at least 7s. 6d.

I then interjected:

Is it necessary to sit down or stand up for that meal?

Mr. McKee: Is it necessary to spend 7s. 6d. to get a drink?

Mr. BYWATERS: I don't think. The Premier also said:

It is subject to the provision of what the Licensing Court regards as a fair thing. I have no inhibitions about whether diners stand up or sit down.

The argument advanced by the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) was that it was better to sit down with a meal and have alcoholic drinks than to stand up. I think he is right, but we have no guarantee that this will not be a smorgasbord meal or something like that, which could be devoured in a short time and drinking go on all evening. This is something I do not like, because it could be used purely as an excuse to provide extra drinking hours after 6 p.m., although I realize that it is subject to the Licensing Court's approval. If this is carried, I think it will need careful policing. I appreciate the desire of country people not to be at a disadvantage, and probably this matter can be spoken of later. In Committee I intend to develop this more and promote something else. We will then have a further chance to express further opinions. At this stage I reserve my remarks. Although I do not oppose the second reading, I reserve the right to oppose certain aspects of the measure in Committee and to oppose the third reading if the Bill at that stage does not suit my requirements.

Mr. HEASLIP secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1962, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to impose a charge on the owners of certain motor vehicles as a contribution to the maintenance of public roads, to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1957, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Weeds Act, 1956.

Motion carried.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 6, at 2 p.m.