HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 7, 1963.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 2),
City of Whyalla Commission Act Amendment,
Explosives Act Amendment,
Land Settlement Act Amendment,
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment,
Associations Incorporation Act Amendment,
Offenders Probation Act Amendment,
Police Regulation Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand the Premier intends to introduce prices legislation which may refer to restrictive trade practices. Some companies advertise television sets for rental purposes. My attention has been drawn to the fact that some of these companies bring out to a person's home a type of set which, because of its condition, one would not have in one's lounge room. At the same time the company offers for sale a new set. Can the Premier say whether such trade practice could be classed as restrictive and whether it would be covered by the proposed legislation, or whether such practice would be false representation in respect of the goods hired? Another question concerns the desirability of control in circumstances where people have taken out service contracts on electrical appliances. Many of these people find that when their appliances need attention it is difficult, and in some cases impossible, to get appropriate service under the contract. Will these matters come within the ambit of the proposed legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I doubt whether the legislation would cover the matters referred to by the Leader. I rather fancy that they would come under the heading of unlawful or fraudulent trade practices. For instance, I believe that it is fraudulent for a firm to advertise that it has a brand new electrical appliance for sale at 25 per cent of the proper price, whereas when people go along to purchase the article they find that it has never been for sale or that it is not available. I will have the Leader's question referred to the Prices Commissioner to see whether there is any method of dealing with the problems he has raised.

SUPERPHOSPHATE BOUNTY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On October 29 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the possibility of double and triple superphosphate being manufactured in South Australia. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I took this matter up with Fertilizer Sales Ltd., which represents the three superphosphate companies in South Australia, and the reply I was given states:

At the present time superphosphate being manufactured throughout Australia and New Zealand is of the ordinary type, this being common practice also in most other parts of the world. For some years an enriched form of superphosphate has been made in overseas countries, this being known as double or triple superphosphate. One company in New South Wales (Australian Fertilizers Ltd., Port Kembla) is about to commence manufacture of enriched superphosphate, and another company in Victoria (Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand Limited, Yarraville) has just ordered a plant for the same purpose. The South Australian manufacturers are fully aware of these developments and have been watching the situation for some years, but have come to the conclusion that there would be no economy in manufacture or saving to the user by the manufacture of these enriched superphosphates at the present time in this State. Enriched superphosphates are particularly popular in the United States of America, but in no other country is any substantial quantity manufactured, and in fact the figures for the free world represent less than 10 per cent of enriched compared with ordinary superphosphate.

Under the low rainfall conditions of South Australia it is thought that there would be a very limited market for these fertilizers; they could give rise to problems in spreading owing to the much smaller quantity required, and they could also result in symptoms of sulphur deficiency as they contain none of this element which is present in ordinary superphosphate. The South Australian manufacturers will keep a watch on the situation, with due regard to the reception of the enriched material in the Eastern States, and if a demand should arise will consider manufacture of the enriched material, but for the present this is not intended.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. CLARK: On Tuesday last I asked the Minister of Education whether a statement could be made about the Public Examinations Board, as many people were anxious to know more about this little-known matter. Since

then, I have read a statement in a similar strain made by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. For that reason, I was perturbed to read on the front page of today's issue of the *News* a letter under the heading "Secrecy on Public Exams" written by Professor L. F. Neal, head of the Public Examinations Board. The letter, which has been sent to the heads of all private and State secondary schools, is as follows:

> I am writing to you about the conduct of the public examinations, which this year for the first time are being held in schools. I think you will probably not in the least be surprised when I tell you that, for some weeks past now, the local press have made persistent attempts to get from me and from the secretary details about the arrangements for this year's examinations. These I have resolutely refused to let them have.
>
> I have told them the arrangements are purely private and domestic to the schools and to the board and that to discuss them or to refer to them in any detailed way in public may only cause confusion, trouble, and anxiety. It is my guess, however, that the press, having failed to get anything out of me or the secretary, may make attempts to invade the privacy of schools and the arrangements being made for the examinations. I should not put it beyond the press to make attempts to visit schools at the times of the examinations and attempt to talk to heads of schools, their staff, and pupils about what is going on in the examinations. I do not think it is quite impossible that pressmen may even try to obtain admission to the school in order to photograph or in other ways to make comments in the press on the conditions under which the pupils are being examined.
>
> I know you will be as horrified at the invasion of the schools' private and domestic responsibility as I should be. But I think it worth letting you know that I consider it quite likely that the press, especially if they are thwarted by me and the secretary, may attempt to batter its way into your own local arrangements. This would not only be deplorable in my opinion but also wholly wrong in that no unauthorized persons should have access to any private arrangement in any school for the conduct of private examinations.
>
> I hope you will not mind me writing to you in this way. I do hope you can only benefit from knowing what I think the press may attempt to do. It is my personal view that the examinations should go off in as private and quiet a way as possible and that we should not, year by year, be fodder for the local press.

Will the Minister of Education comment on the situation dealt with in this letter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As I have only just had the opportunity to glance briefly at the statement in the *News,* I do not desire to comment other than to say that it seems to me, with the greatest of respect, to be a most extraordinary document to emanate from the University of Adelaide. Further, I think it equally extraordinary that public proceedings, such as the conduct of public examinations, should be so shrouded in mystery. Over many years, I have enjoyed a constant and close association with the daily and weekly newspapers, with the broadcasting stations, and later with the television stations, and I have never had cause to complain about being misreported on any matter or about any treatment I have received; one accepts praise with criticism. I always think it is very good policy on any matter of public importance to take the press fully into one's confidence, as one ensures the most helpful co-operation if one gives information either on or off the record. I think that would have been the correct policy for the Public Examinations Board to follow when venturing on this entirely new method of public examinations. I am sure that all sections of the press would have been most helpful and co-operative. As I have often said in this House and elsewhere, the Public Examinations Board, which is constituted under a statute of the university, consists of 26 members, comprising the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor of the university, eight professors and lecturers, eight representatives of independent schools and colleges, and eight representatives of departmental schools. Although the departmental school representatives are nominees of the Minister of Education, I am not consulted by the board nor am I informed of its decisions. I do not complain about that: I merely state it as a fact. Therefore, I am just as much surprised as the honourable member is, or any member of the public would be, at the way the board appears to be setting about this new method of conducting public examinations. As the matter has now been raised publicly, I think my best course would be to interview the Vice-Chancellor, who is really the chief administrative officer of the university and whom I find to be a man of very sound judgment who has been most helpful and co-operative towards me in particular and the Government generally. I shall take the earliest opportunity to discuss the matter with him.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Minister say whether an instruction has been sent to all country schools, as well as city schools, that all forthcoming public examinations be held in schools? If this is so, can special consideration be given to varying that instruction in certain places? For several years the Port Augusta council has made available for this purpose the basement of the town hall, which is well lit and many

degrees cooler than any room available at the school. Invariably these examinations are held in hot weather, and the teachers and those who conduct the examinations consider that the children feel less physical distress in these rooms as the atmosphere is congenial and quiet. It is considered that it would be a retrograde step to have the examinations in the school. Can the Minister say whether this is a State-wide direction that the examinations must be held at the school? If so, in the case of Port Augusta at least, could it be varied so that a practice that has proved so successful in the past might continue?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: My understanding is that the Public Examinations Board has arranged that in the metropolitan area the examinations will almost invariably be conducted in schools—not in every individual school; schools may be grouped together—except that some private students who are not attending any schools at all may have their examinations in some other neutral place. So far as the country is concerned, I think that the board has anticipated the honourable member's suggestion and has made, or is intending to make, arrangements for examinations to be held in some appropriate halls in various parts of the country, because it is not always convenient for the examinations to be held in any particular school.

IRISH HARP ROAD.

Mr. COUMBE: The resurfacing and widening of the Irish Harp Road, which has been renamed Regency Road, has been completed except for one section. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, the reason for the delay in completing this section, and will he ask the Minister when the work is likely to be completed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will do that.

USED CAR SALES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: A second-hand car dealer operating in the city of Adelaide is alleged to have sold to a couple living in my district a 1959 Austin A95 motor car and to have claimed that it was a 1960-61 model. After the car had been in the couple's possession for a few days they discovered the following defects: the heater was not working; there was no rear vision mirror; the front windows would not operate effectively; the back seat was loose; the spare wheel carrier was missing; the gear box was worn and the car kept jumping out of gear; the oil sump was leaking; the battery was defective; the radiator hose was perished; and a front wheel tyre had been regrooved. Upon returning the car to the company—in accordance with the company's advertised claim that if a purchaser were not satisfied within a prescribed period the sale would be cancelled—the couple were promised that if they retained the car the defects would all be remedied. This promise was made 13 months ago, and has since been repeated, but up to the present it is claimed that no repairs have been satisfactorily carried out by the company.

The couple have received from the previous owner a written statement concerning the condition of the car when he sold it. This indicates that in some respects it was in poor condition and had not been overhauled. Some time previously he had purchased the car for £695. The company, less than nine months later, sold the car for £745. I wrote to the company and received a reply in which the company denied the allegations and disclaimed responsibility. If I supply the Premier with the relevant correspondence, will he refer the matter to the appropriate authority to determine whether any action is warranted, and, if it is, will he take such action?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: From what the honourable member has said action appears to be warranted. I will refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner to examine the terms of the contract and to see whether anything can be done.

NARACOORTE SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: The new Naracoorte South Primary School is an excellent school built on a sandy range about one mile from the Naracoorte Post Office. Recently, the school committee planted suitable mixed perennial grasses adjacent to the school to establish an oval. The school is built on an elevated range, and, although the water supply is plentiful, the pressure is so low that sprinklers will not operate on a large scale on the proposed oval area. Will the Minister of Works inquire and obtain a report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I regret to hear this information. As the honourable member is aware the Naracoorte water supply has been reorganized from time to time, and I understood that for normal purposes adequate supplies and pressures were available within the area served. Several sprinklers on an oval require a high gallonage an hour, and I

do not know, in the moment I have had to reflect on it, how the problem can be overcome, unless it is by the expensive replacement of existing services. However, I will have the matter examined. It may be possible to adopt another method that will solve the problem, or to water lesser areas at any one time. I will do the best I can to see that the problem is overcome.

COTTAGE FLATS.

Mr. TAPPING: For some time I have received numerous inquiries from elderly folk in my district desiring pensioner houses, as no doubt have other members in their districts. I understand that the Housing Trust has more than 2,000 applications for allotment of this type of house. Will the Premier see whether the Housing Trust can increase the number of these houses constructed in my district?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As soon as possible I will discuss this matter with the Chairman of the Housing Trust. These houses are uneconomic for the Housing Trust as they do not return sufficient rent to cover interest and the cost of maintenance.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 1, I asked the Premier a question about fluoridation and, in particular, whether the Government had been able to make up its mind on this matter, and the Premier undertook to get a decision as soon as possible. Since then, there has been much discussion on this matter. In particular, an announcement was made by Dr. W. D. Refshauge in last Saturday's newspaper that the National Health and Medical Research Council had re-affirmed its decision, taken in 1961, in favour of fluoridation. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet has made a decision?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. Two contrary views have been expressed on this matter, and decisions made by the Queensland and Western Australian Governments were deferred after additional information was received from overseas. We have had conflicting reports whether fluoridation is desirable. No doubt it benefits teeth, but claims have been made by eminent authorities that it is deleterious to people's constitutions. No decision has been made. I doubt whether any extension of fluoridation in Australia will be undertaken, except possibly for the scheme authorized at Canberra, until the argument between the experts has been settled.

SECONDARY TEACHERS.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that periodically in the *Education Gazette* the Education Department calls for applications from retired teachers willing to serve on a primary teachers' reserve list to fill vacancies as required on the staffs of schools. I believe no similar reserve list applies to secondary school teachers, although vacancies occur through sickness and other causes at secondary schools. I understand there are many former teachers—not so because of age retirement—particularly women, who, for one reason or another, would be willing to serve in this way. Can the Minister of Education say whether such a list has been considered for secondary school teachers and whether, in his view, such a list would be desirable?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am sure that such a list has been considered in the past. It is much easier, of course, to have a staff of relieving teachers for infant and primary schools where many married women with previous experience can fill a position rapidly if only for a day, or perhaps a few days, and where they can fit into the particular school and class with comparative ease. It is not so easy in the secondary schools where the students are undergoing a much higher form of education. I should think it would be extremely difficult for a person to fit into the particular progress of the students on any group of subjects at any particular time. The resources of our secondary schools are so strained that I think every suitable qualified teacher or prospective teacher has already been snapped up by the Superintendent of High Schools. I should be delighted to bring before his notice the honourable member's observations that some of these extremely valuable teachers in retirement are available, even if only for short periods. If the honourable member could do even more and give me some names and addresses I am sure that the Superintendent would be in touch with them early next week.

COWIRRA TANK.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about a water supply from the Cowirra tank for the settlements of Cowirra and Ponde?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The following information has been extracted from a report dated October 22, 1963, from the District Officer at Murray Bridge submitted in connection with the Cowirra stock and domestic water supply tank:

On two occasions during the last three years it has been necessary to repair the tank. These repairs comprise the raking out and grouting of the exterior wall where minor areas of dampness had appeared. No disruption in the supply to the Cowirra settlement was involved. The estimated cost of the installation of a larger supply tank which would enable an improved pressure to be available to settlers is £38,250. This work was not considered justified because of the expense involved. However, an alternative proposal to install a second pump of 9,000 gallons an hour capacity to augment the existing pump (3,000 gallons an hour capacity) was approved and has been carried out, the work involved being completed about July this year at a cost of £1,291 10s. The new pump was tested prior to August 30, 1963, but it was not necessary to use that pump other than for testing until after that date because the old unit maintained satisfactory supplies to the settlement during the winter period.

During September the old pump averaged 12½ hours running daily whilst the larger pump averaged only 3.9 hours a day on an average to maintain sufficient supplies to the settlement. The full benefit of the improved pumping facilities in conjunction with the existing tank will not be known until January/February, 1964, when the maximum demand is likely to occur. However, there are approximately 20 cases where an average of 2,000 gallons a day would be consumed to meet the needs of the dairymen at Cowirra and Neeta, that is a daily consumption of 40,000 gallons. It is expected that the peak summer demand will not be more than 108,000 gallons a day for all consumers and that this may possibly be required over a 12-hour period in each day.

The capacity of the tank is 56,000 gallons whilst the capacity of the new pumping plant (9,000 gallons an hour) is sufficient, without the assistance of the old unit, to replenish the supply to the tank to the extent of 108,000 gallons in 12 hours. Whilst it cannot be expected that the two pumps operating together would provide their total full capacity of 12,000 gallons an hour, there is a reasonable reserve of pump capacity over and above anticipated peak demand requirements. Not on any occasions since March 10, 1961, has the tank been emptied for any reason.

Whilst the pressure at consumers' meters has not been good the expenditure of over £38,000 to ensure good pressure could not be justified. In the meantime with the installation of an additional pumping unit which will maintain water at a higher level in the existing tank, some slight improvement in pressure should result. Under the circumstances it is considered that the supply system as it now exists represents a decided improvement over what previously was provided and it should be given a trial period at least throughout next summer before further improvements, if any, and additional expense are considered.

BARLEY DELIVERIES.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week in reply to a question I asked about the delivery of barley to the Port Pirie terminal silo the Minister of Agriculture said that he would try to obtain an answer. Has he an answer?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That question followed a question the honourable member had asked about the delivery of barley to Ardrossan, Port Lincoln, Wallaroo and Port Pirie. The Barley Board has replied:

We wish to advise that at Ardrossan the silo is the board's own property, and at Port Lincoln and Wallaroo the board have leased a specific silo space for the receival of barley in bulk. These arrangements do not apply at Port Pirie where the whole available silo space is required for the receival of wheat.

WOODVILLE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: For some time members of the Woodville High School Council have spent much time and effort in endeavouring to secure a change room for the school. As the Minister of Education is aware, I have led several deputations to him on this matter. A line on the Loan Estimates indicated that this school was allocated money for a change room. I queried the amount at the time, and I received answers from both the Minister and the Premier. Arising from my questions, the council wrote to the Director of Education seeking information about what had taken place regarding plans and specifications for the change room, and the Secretary of the department replied:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of 15th inst. with regard to the inclusion of Woodville High School in the Loan Estimates for 1963-64. You are advised that in the original Loan Estimates, under the heading of change rooms for high schools, an entry appeared for Woodville. This was an error and should have read Salisbury. There are no works included in the Loan Estimates for 1963-64 for Woodville High School.

Well, this Parliament was not in error: it passed the Loan Estimates as they were submitted to it. In the circumstances, can the Minister say whether this school will be deprived of financial assistance for change rooms for which plans have been submitted and, I believe, considered and approved by the department?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I would not think so. I have not had the benefit of reading the correspondence the honourable member has, so he has the advantage of me in that respect. So far as I am concerned, there was no mistake on my part. As the honourable member has said, we had discussions at the deputations to which he referred and at which the Director was present. The Director undertook to visit the school soon after our meeting to discuss two matters, namely, this question and the question of a gymnasium. The

Director took the view—in my opinion rightly so—that as the school had the benefit of the fine St. Clair building close by with all the gymnasium and other recreation facilities, a gymnasium was not necessary and the department in its present state could not afford to construct one; but a change room seemed to be not only desirable but necessary. I shall be only too pleased to take the matter up further in an endeavour to clarify the position.

BERRI TEACHERS' HOSTEL.

Mr. CURREN: On July 30 last I asked the Minister of Education whether the department had any plans to extend the teachers' hostel at Berri. Since asking that question I have supplied the Minister with information regarding the number of teachers who would desire accommodation at the hostel, in addition to those at the present hostel, which is full. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have received an interim report from the Deputy Director of Education which seems to substantiate the information supplied by the honourable member; that is, on a factual basis. However, I did not receive a recommendation as to whether or not any extensions should be made. I think probably the Deputy Director regarded the question of hostels for teachers as one of policy which he would like to discuss with me further, because hostels have proved to be a most unprofitable undertaking in South Australia and we would like to put them on a proper basis if there is to be any extension of them. After the House adjourns, in the next couple of weeks or so I should be pleased to give this (and any other individual matter) my personal attention and see whether I can come to a final and an early decision on it.

FREE BUS PLAN.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the insurance of passengers on buses provided by certain city stores to take passengers from the suburbs to the city?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. I apologize to the honourable member for missing out on some aspects of his question. Actually, three factors were involved. The first was whether these buses were legally operating in terms of the Road and Railway Transport Act and not infringing the Municipal Tramways Trust Act; secondly, whether they needed a permit from the Transport Control Board to operate; and, thirdly, whether or not passengers were adequately insured. I think the first point has been covered adequately in the opinion expressed by the Crown Solicitor, namely, that they are legally operating within the terms of the Road and Railway Transport Act and that they are not infringing the rights of the Municipal Tramways Trust as they stand. Regarding the second point, I have ascertained from the Transport Control Board that these buses do not require a permit, provided they are operating for the carriage of passengers within a radius of 10 miles of the General Post Office. This radius extends almost to the Outer Harbour, so no permit is required for operation within that area. On the third point, I have checked with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and have been assured that these vehicles are adequately insured for third-party cover, which covers accidents to passengers who may be carried.

PORT PIRIE WHARVES.

Mr. McKEE: I have in my possession an extract from the *Advertiser* containing facts revealed in the annual report of the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority. The report discloses that South Australia's busiest export outlet in the past financial year was Port Pirie.

Mr. Ryan: That is only temporary.

Mr. McKEE: Port Pirie is classed as Australia's ninth port, based on export tonnages; it handled 557,000 tons of cargo for the year, which (for the benefit of the member for Port Adelaide) is 4,000 tons more than Port Adelaide. Referring to the cargo handling efficiency, the report says that the construction of a bulk-handling grain terminal with a capacity of 1,000,000 bushels has reduced the non-productive time of a gang of men from 20 per cent to 18 per cent. Regarding the average weekly earnings of waterside workers, the report states that there was a drop of £4 2s. 8d. in the past financial year. These figures prove that Port Pirie is a very important shipping port and that it must be recognized as such. To maintain a high standard and a continuity of employment for waterside workers, will the Government consider further deepening the harbour? Recently 14 ships have come there to load bulk wheat but only two have left the wharf with full loads because the harbour has not been deep enough to accommodate them. Will the Minister of Marine discuss this matter with his colleagues?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: One serious problem that South Australia has before it now is the depth of water in our principal harbours. Several years ago, the Government commenced to deepen harbours (Port Pirie being the first

port) to provide for the type of vessel now being constructed, particularly for the bulk trade, which requires more water than we have at most ports. I am not sure how far we can go and how well we can keep up with the ever-increasing demand for the depths required by modern shipping. Whereas a few years ago it was thought that 30ft. of water was adequate for all purposes, overseas ships now require 34ft. or 35ft. The Government has in hand a large programme of dredging work at our ports; only recently dredging has been completed at Port Pirie, and, speaking from memory, I think it cost about £1,500,000. We are, and have been for two years or more, reorganizing the whole of the wharf frontage along the waterside at Port Pirie, as the Government is aware that it is an extremely busy port through which a great tonnage of valuable cargo is carried. The work is being done there, as is work at other ports. I do not know if the honourable member can arrange with the members for Wallaroo and Port Adelaide, whose ports are currently being dealt with in this way, to have the work at those ports deferred; perhaps he will discuss the matter with them. This year about £166,000 is to be spent at Wallaroo, where the port urgently needs attention. It is a busy grain port and it has not been deepened for some time. The Public Works Committee examined the matter and recommended that the work proceed. We are also preparing for urgent work to be done in the Port River, which concerns the member for Port Adelaide. In addition, urgent demands are being made by the gypsum trade, which is a very large and important trade operating through the port of Thevenard, for deepening and improving the Thevenard harbour. Unless the honourable member can persuade the members for Wallaroo, Port Adelaide and Eyre that work at harbours in their districts should wait so that the Government may have a second look at Port Pirie, I am afraid I cannot offer him any hope of immediate attention there. The Government is aware of the limitations of that port.

ROAD TRANSPORT.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on October 22 about the transport of wool by road from Broken Hill to Adelaide on road transport vehicles owned by the Silverton Tramways Company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Railways Commissioner:

The number of bales of wool carried by rail from the Broken Hill and West Darling areas has steadily increased, as the following figures show:

Year.	No. of bales.
1958	46,720
1959	46,798
1960	58,045
1961	57,478
1962	55,765
1963 (January to October 25)	58,135

This has come about because of the canvasses made of the area by officers of these railways and the Silverton Tramways Company. As far as is possible, we keep a close watch on the movement of wool to Adelaide from the North-East and the Broken Hill area by road. Some months ago we learned that three semi-trailers of the Silverton Tramways Company were *en route* to Adelaide with loads of wool, and we lost no time in taking up with that company concerning them. It was ascertained that the wool concerned had been delayed by heavy rain for four to five days in transit from the West Darling area, and the only way in which it could reach the wool sale for which it was intended was to bring it through by road. As the owners were very anxious to have the wool included in the catalogue, they insisted that it should be brought through by road. The Chairman of the Silverton Tramways Board and the General Manager of the company have frequently assured us that they do not compete with the railways for business between Broken Hill and Adelaide, and I am confident that they consistently maintain this policy.

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE OFFICERS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: There are many drivers employed by the St. John Ambulance Brigade whose terms of employment do not fall under an industrial agreement or award as the drivers are outside the terms of the Industrial Code because of the nature of their employment. They work very long hours, and a request has been received by members on this side of the House that an approach be made to the Government to seek two improvements in their conditions: that some Government assistance be given to providing them with uniforms and that, in view of the public nature of their duties and the times at which they have to travel to work, they be given free transport on public transport while in uniform. Will the Premier say whether the Government will consider bringing about these two improvements to their conditions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government greatly appreciates the work done by officers of the St. John Ambulance Brigade; indeed, for several years it has been making increasingly large grants to the organization to assist it with its ambulance work. I believe

that many officers of the brigade would probably not appreciate the suggestion that they provided this wonderful service with the thought of reward.

Mr. Dunstan: I am talking about full-time officers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many officers do this work without any thought of personal gain. I will examine the request made by the honourable member, discuss it with the Chief Secretary, and advise the honourable member in due course.

FENCING WIRE.

Mr. HARDING: I understand that in America aluminium-coated fencing wire, with a life of 50 years or more, can be obtained at a cost about 10 per cent above that of galvanized wire. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of this, and will he inquire of the manufacturers of the wire what advantages, if any, this wire has over the standard galvanized wire?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will make the necessary inquiries.

OIL COMPANIES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Recently I drew the Premier's attention to a report I had received that certain oil companies were canvassing primary producers in the South-East with a view to getting them to sign contracts. Has the Premier a reply to my question whether this was in the best interests of the primary producers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Prices Commissioner reports:

Early in May of this year oil companies commenced offering to primary producers in the South-East of this State farm storage tanks on loan, in return for a contract to purchase their requirements of petroleum products from the lending company. This method of distribution has been in operation in the Eastern States for some time and the delay in introduction here is due to the limited availability of tanks. There is a total of 1,071 contracts of this type operating in the South-East and they are distributed amongst all companies represented there. In addition there are also 83 contracts where the producers own the tanks. The main petroleum products concerned are power kerosene and distillate. The contracts, in the main, are relatively simple documents providing for the loan of a tank (usually 500 gallons) in return for exclusive supply for a specified period (usually five years) but ranging from one to 10 years. With few exceptions, where the tank is on loan, the primary producer does not enjoy a rebate. What he does achieve, however, is to save himself the cost of purchasing a tank and stand (mainly overhead) varying in cost from about £50 to £70, providing he takes the lending company's products. Where the tank is owned by the producer, some enjoy a rebate (varying from ¾d. to 2d. per gallon—mainly ¾d. to 1d. per gallon) which is designed to offset the cost of the equipment over the period for which the contract is signed. This form of contract is intended to place the producer who has more recently purchased his own equipment on the same footing as the primary producer who has the equipment on loan.

The nature of the agreement tends to confer benefit on the primary producer. Some producers, particularly those starting out or with a restricted amount of capital, readily agree to purchase supplies from one company in return for the loan of equipment. Specimen contracts have been examined and appear to be binding but only in so far that the tank and fittings might be reclaimed by the company if the primary producer decides not to adhere to the contract in which case he is no worse off than before he signed it. I am inclined to the opinion that the so-called contracts entered into in this State do not appear unreasonable and are not inconsistent with many other forms of commercial practices brought about, to some extent, by competition and which do not necessarily react against the public interest or are unfair to competitors such as some forms of trading can be and on which action is contemplated. Some contracts sighted which have been entered into in some other States contain a penalty clause providing for a specified amount of damages for failure to adhere to the terms of the contract. No such type of contract to my knowledge has been signed in this State.

WINCKEL BRIDGE.

Mr. CLARK: The new Gawler by-pass road necessitated the building of a new bridge over the river on the same site as the old one. The old bridge had always been known as Winckel bridge, and for many years a sign was erected near the bridge with that name on it, but spelt incorrectly. Winckel's were old pioneers in the area and their descendants are still living. Indeed, one grand old lady in Gawler, Mrs. Winckel senior, is in her 102nd year. They have been proud that the name of their pioneering family was commemorated by this bridge, and the Minister will no doubt agree with that sentiment. I have been asked to see whether the name of this bridge can be replaced but that it could be spelt correctly. Will the Minister of Works bring this matter to the notice of his colleague, the Minister of Roads?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, certainly.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about

the suggested egg marketing scheme in Australia, and has he information from the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry on details of the suggested legislation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not heard anything further since I last replied to a question on this subject. The latest information I had was that the Bill was being prepared by the Commonwealth Government, but I have not seen it. I understand that it will be forwarded to me for examination and, after I have examined it, this Government will consider what action is to be taken. As yet, I have not received the Bill.

SALT INDUSTRY.

Mr. RICHES: The people in my district appreciate the recent announcement that the contract had been negotiated for the sale of 2,000,000 tons of salt from the saltworks near Port Augusta, and that there is every prospect of the work in establishing the saltworks going ahead soon. Has the Premier any information about the progress on the works at the harbour to handle salt, and can he say whether research is still being conducted into the possible treatment of bitterns?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is correct in saying that I announced that I thought all negotiations had been successfully concluded. However, my statement was not strictly accurate because one or two subsequent queries arose, although I do not think they will cause any problem. Indeed, one query leads me to believe that the industry will become extremely permanent. The honourable member will recall that under the agreement entered into the Government is to provide all of the harbour facilities and the company is to pay for them over a period by means of charges applied on the exported product. From memory, the term of the contract is for 30 years. The company has asked what the position will be at the end of the 30 years: whether the facilities will still be available to it and whether the Government will then consider that the company has paid for the installation over that period. I think the Government's reply will be entirely satisfactory. The query indicates that the Leslie Salt Company is not regarding this as a short-term industry but as an industry of some permanence. As far as I know, no problem is likely to impede the development of the industry; in fact, the reverse seems to be more likely.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TROTTING).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GOVERNOR'S SALARY).

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 Constitution Act, 1934-1961.

Motion carried.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 6. Page 1541.)

Clause 23—"Amendment of principal Act, section 197a."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I move:

Before "mead" in paragraph (*b*) to insert "brandy".

This will have the effect of adding brandy to the list of liquors available to be consumed in restaurants. I ask members to consider the importance of brandy to South Australia's economy. My authority for the following figures is the 35th annual report of the Australian Wine Board for 1962-63. In the year ended June 30, 1963, in the Commonwealth, 1,115,453 proof gallons of brandy was produced, of which 994,420 gallons was produced in South Australia. These figures indicate the extreme importance brandy plays in the economy of our grapegrowing areas. I believe it is my responsibility to indicate my attitude to liquor. I have no real quarrel with members who do not believe in alcohol and who would prefer to see it completely banned. However, I suggest the Committee should appreciate that the consumption of alcohol as a beverage is a fact of life that we must consider. I believe it is our responsibility to encourage members of the public to consume

alcohol properly, by which I mean to take it as a beverage with meals. I am not a teetotaller, nor do I claim to be even a moderate drinker: I am a very sparing drinker, and when I do take liquor as a beverage it is almost invariably with a meal. I ask the Committee to seriously consider the inclusion of brandy amongst the liquors which may be served in restaurants. Originally, brandy was known as brandy wine, and I consider that it is worthy of inclusion in the list. It is rather incongruous that under the legislation any wine will be available in restaurants, whereas brandy will not be.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment. As this legislation affected many interests, it was necessary to consult with various organizations. The matter referred to by the honourable member was considered by the Government when the Bill was being drafted. The main reason honourable members have not been pressurized regarding this Bill is because the various interests have recognized that it is a fair compromise between the various sections of opinion.

Some history is attached to the question of licensing restaurants. I remember that many years ago the wine industry considered that it did not have any legitimate outlet for its wine, as it claimed that many of the hotels were tied to the breweries and therefore wine was being pushed off the market. The industry requested that certain restaurants be permitted to provide wine, and at that time the request was only for what I think is technically termed dry wine. Parliament acceded to that request. I remind the Committee that these restaurants are not subject to local options or any of the other controls to which hotels are subject, and for that reason any suggestion of the inclusion of brandy or spirits or beer in this amendment would be bitterly contested by the people who are subject to the controls that I have mentioned.

The Bill liberalizes this provision, because in future all Australian wines may be provided, therefore I hope the Committee will not extend it any further. The Government has fully considered the matter and it has discussed it with all the parties concerned. I believe that hitherto restaurants have never had to go to the Licensing Court at all, and they will now have to do so merely to have their licences renewed. No other obligation is placed on them except the obligation of satisfying the court that there is a requirement for food to be available. I do not believe that we should set up restaurants to take the place of hotels. As I said, we have liberalized the provision because we did not desire to be too hard on the restaurants in the matter. We now have agreement from all the authorities concerned that all Australian wines should be served, and that has been accepted as a fair compromise. I ask the Committee to accept the provision as introduced. I assure members that this matter has received close attention and has been the subject of much consultation and investigation with the various interests concerned. The Government believes it is a fair compromise between the respective trading interests, and I hope the Committee will adhere to the clause as it stands.

Mr. HEASLIP: I oppose the amendment, which has been introduced because brandy is manufactured here and additional sales will bring increased revenue. I do not think that sort of thing should be introduced into this Bill, which provides for an extension of drinking hours. If brandy is included, why not whisky and ale?

Mr. FRED WALSH: I oppose the amendment mainly because it still limits the types of liquor that can be supplied in cafes. I agree with the Premier that restaurants have advantages over other licensed premises. I know the conditions under which many carry on business, and I suggest that they are not in the interests of the general public; they will not be until properly licensed and controlled by the Licensing Court. I think light ales should be supplied in addition to wines, but I have not moved an amendment to this effect because when I mentioned the matter last night it was the first that I had thought about it. If people who go to cafes want a light drink, they should be able to get it. As I do not intend to vote for the amendment, it would be inconsistent for me to move an amendment to provide that ales may be served. However, I think that soon the Government should consider altering licensing laws, particularly the provisions relating to local option polls, which I think are unfair and not in the interests of the State or of any section of people.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. RICHES: I move:

To strike out paragraph (*k*).

This paragraph, which extends the hours to which liquor can be served from 10 until 10.45 p.m., nullifies the decision of the people expressed in a referendum into trading hours many years ago. This decision should stand until altered by another referendum. I am not

enamoured of restaurants; I think liquor is best served in hotels. Although some restaurants could not be criticized, I think Adelaide would be better off if some were closed. I can remember legislation being introduced to allow liquor to be served until 8. The time was extended until 9, then to 10, and now it is proposed to extend it to 10.45.

Mr. Harding: How does this compare with the position in overseas countries?

Mr. RICHES: I did not trouble to find out, but after going overseas I know that I would prefer to live in Adelaide to living in most of the cities I saw overseas. I do not think we have anything to gain by aping some overseas cities. The tourist angle has been mentioned in this debate. Many things about overseas cities are strange to us, yet I have not heard of people refusing to go overseas because of that. For instance, Australians and Englishmen like to have a good breakfast, whereas on the Continent one has to accept a Continental breakfast; however, I have not heard of anyone refusing to go to the Continent because the habits of people there do not conform to ours. Not as much importance can be attached to this as some people will have us believe. It is not a major factor in attracting or detracting tourists. I am keen to promote the tourist industry because I believe it is an important and a growing industry. This provision is not desirable. I believe that apart from the trade there has been no demand for it. I do not pose as an expert, but I consider that it will not be a good thing for the State; therefore, I cannot support it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is correct when he says that this matter has been before Parliament several times. I remember when people could not obtain liquor with meals after 6 p.m. It was with some misgivings of honourable members that Parliament allowed liquor with meals until 8 p.m. This was the law for a considerable period and it was not abused.

Mr. Riches: That was confined to hotels.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No objections were made to that law and later, when legislation was introduced to extend the hours, no outcry came from the community, as everyone believed that this would be a logical and sensible way of drinking. At the time when this law was last amended to further extend the hours, I had no request for the period to be shortened. The Government first proposed the sale of liquor until 10.45 p.m. with an extra quarter of an hour for its consumption. The licensing authorities recommended that the consumption time be increased by a quarter of an hour. They administer the Act and ensure that it is properly carried out, yet they recommended this increase. The consumption of liquor is better with food than in any other way, because the liquor is drunk more slowly. Last year people from countries where it is a normal thing to be allowed to dine and drink liquor later than the hour provided in this clause visited this State. Honourable members know how much I drink during the year. They know that I have a due sense of responsibility as a member of Parliament as to what should be our attitude towards the temperance question. I believe that everything we can do to encourage temperance is a good thing and I will always stand by that belief. We do not encourage temperance by enforcing people to gulp liquor down when they can sit at a table and drink it in a civilized manner. I know that the motive of the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) in moving this amendment is to encourage temperance. I do not condemn him for that but admire him. However, I do not think he will achieve his object. Amendments providing for fairly substantial increases in licensing fees have been passed. The Government desires to obviate the necessity for people, who want to drink with their dinner, having to obtain a permit which they have had to get if they wish to drink until 11 p.m. It is no trouble to obtain a permit: the applicant appears before the court and pays the fee of 30s. If the licensee has to pay increased fees we should not impose upon him a further charge for a permit for the reasonable consumption of liquor with meals.

Mr. Riches: This clause concerns restaurants.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Stuart and I have different approaches to this question. I do not believe that these amendments will lead to excessive drinking. Of all the amendments, the one that I considered most and had the most difficulty in accepting was that providing for a charge of not less than 7s. 6d. to be made for a meal with which liquor can be consumed. However, that is worth a sincere trial. Many people do not want to sit down to a heavy and expensive dinner when they are going to a theatre or some other function. It is not unreasonable that they should be permitted to have a light meal and, with it, a glass of ale or some other beverage.

The proposed hours for drinking with meals are more realistic than the present hours, and will be more in line with what is regarded as normal practice elsewhere. This provision has been seriously considered by the Government. It is not what was specifically asked for. As a matter of fact, some bodies asked that the hours be extended to 1 a.m. or 2 a.m. The Government could not see the need for that. To permit liquor to be sold until 10.45 p.m. and consumed until 11.15 p.m. will not result in excessive drinking or intemperance. I suggest that the proposed hours be given a fair trial.

Mr. HUGHES: I support the amendment. During my second reading speech I advanced several arguments why this particular provision should be struck out, and I do not intend to repeat them.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I support this extremely reasonable clause. Members who are opposed to it and seek its deletion are not paying regard to the history of liquor trading hours in this State. In 1915 the trading hours were brought back from 11 p.m. to 6 p.m. because at that time there were so many soldiers in the metropolitan area, including young men from the country who were probably in the city for the first time, who were not drinking sensibly and who were unable to control themselves properly, that the general public was asked whether it favoured closing the hotels at 11 p.m., 10 p.m., 9 p.m., 8 p.m., 7 p.m., or 6 p.m. The replies were assessed in such a manner that 6 p.m. closing was instituted and it has remained ever since, and the position has not been reviewed as it has been in every other State except Victoria.

Mr. Bywaters: An attempt was made in Victoria.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, and more than one attempt was necessary in New South Wales. I understand that attempts will be made again in Victoria through the Royal Commission that has been appointed. Originally 6 p.m. closing was regarded as a wartime measure. Some members have suggested that people do not want to drink every time they eat, but that can be argued conversely. If people were obliged to eat every time they had a drink, goodness knows how they would feel by the end of the day. Alcohol is a beverage, and people regard it as such and drink it because they like it. We should not restrict people too much. The Premier has referred to people who have come here from other countries where they have been accustomed to partaking of liquor at almost any time. During the war years, 1 a.m. closing applied in the United States of America. Before then there was no limit. If a man wanted to keep his saloon open, he could do so. However, the 1 a.m. limit applied when I was in America during 1945. Visitors to South Australia and people who come here to live are surprised to discover that they can no longer enjoy conditions that prevailed in the countries from which they came. The proposed extension of hours is extremely reasonable and will be appreciated by the public who want to avail themselves of the facilities offering. Those who oppose any extension of privilege to those people desiring to indulge in this pleasure should regard it from the point of view of the vast majority of people; even those connected with the churches should so regard it. No doubt, they enjoy a glass of ale or wine now and again: their belonging to a particular religion does not mean that they are altogether anti-liquor. Temperance in all things should be our aim.

Mr. RICHES: I make it clear that I am not a spokesman for any church, I am not parading my religion and I am not asking for any support on those grounds at all. I did not mention it and I do not want it inferred that I did. I have been on the receiving end of alcoholism and know what it is to go without; I know what it does in some homes. I speak from my own experience and from knowledge of friends who have been similarly affected. My views were fortified during my recent journey overseas when, although I did not make a thorough investigation of this problem, I did look at not only New York but the Bowery.

Mr. Millhouse: The Bowery makes you think!

Mr. RICHES: We get no benefit from copying America. This provision does not deal with what goes on in the hotels. From what I know of functions in hotels where liquor is served under proper management, there has been little to complain about. This clause deals with the sale of liquor in restaurants. The Premier has said that he has had no complaints. If that is so I am surprised, because I thought he had had many complaints from the police about the conduct of some restaurants in Hindley Street. I have not frequented them but I know that places that were there 12 months ago are not there today.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They are organized as clubs.

Mr. RICHES: The half-hour extension for restaurants will mean that more young people

will be induced to start drinking there than anywhere else in our society. I hope the Committee does not overlook that. I am expressing only my own views. It is not my prerogative to influence anybody else. I shall vote according to my views because I believe that this provision is not in the interests of the State; nor am I convinced that there is any great demand for it.

Mr. CASEY: I support the Bill as it stands. I am afraid I cannot agree with the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) or the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) in this case. The member for Stuart made one vital contribution when he pointed out that more young people would be induced to partake of liquor with their meals in restaurants; but, if we look at the principal Act, we find that that point is amply covered, although it is not always adequately policed. I draw the Committee's attention to section 150b:

> A person under the age of twenty-one years shall not consume any liquor in any public premises while a dance is being held in those premises.

Further on, in section 174, we find:

> Any licensed person, or any person in the employ of a licensed person, who sells or supplies, or permits to be sold or supplied, any liquor to any person under the age of twenty-one years, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of not less than five pounds and not more than twenty pounds.

Mr. Riches: You are talking about licensed premises and licensed persons doing it; I am talking about restaurants.

Mr. CASEY: One thing about which we must be absolutely sure is that people under 21 years of age shall be wholeheartedly discouraged from consuming liquor. I have had some experience in this field because I lived in a hotel until I was 19 years of age, and I was never encouraged to even put a foot inside the front bar until I was 16. Today, many young men under 21 years of age go into public bars in hotels, into saloon bars and even into lounges and consume liquor. This matter should be more strictly policed than it is at present. It is our young people that we have to safeguard. As the honourable member for West Torrens said, moderation in all these things is to be desired at all times. This is one way in which we must educate our young people to be reasonable in their attitude towards intoxicating liquor.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The point about the effect on young people was anxiously looked at by the Government. That is the reason why the time for sale was set down at not later than 10.45 p.m. Honourable members know that cinema programmes and public functions usually end at about 11 p.m., so the Government desired to ensure that there would be no sale of liquor with supper parties taking place after the cinema programmes had finished. That is why 10.45 p.m. was chosen instead of 11 p.m. The honourable member's point has been closely looked at.

Mr. Riches: Is it an offence to serve a young person in a restaurant?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is an offence to serve any young person, even now. As honourable members know, it is difficult for a restaurant owner to know whether a young person is under or just over a certain age. The intention is that no liquor shall be sold after the normal finishing times of the functions to which I have referred.

Mr. BYWATERS: I support the amendment moved by the member for Stuart. The Premier has said that it is an offence to supply young people even in restaurants, but as I see section 174 this point does not appear to be covered.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: In another amendment we make these restaurants licensed premises; we are tightening the legislation, not loosening it, in that respect.

Mr. BYWATERS: I accept the Premier's assurance on that. That is a step in the right direction. Like the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), I am a little concerned about the policing of this provision. I have been to functions at which young ladies have been aspiring to win a contest, and when the drinks have been brought around nothing but wine has been provided. My wife and I have requested soft drinks, and so have the young ladies. This matter concerns me because I think we as members of Parliament are responsible to our young people. I do not think there is any need for an extension beyond 10 o'clock, which already gives a half-hour's grace to 10.30. The present time is adequate.

Mr. HUGHES: I should like to state that in this debate I have been advancing my own viewpoint and not my church's viewpoint. I admit that during my speech on the second reading I read a petition on behalf of members of a church other than my own, as I was requested to do. The arguments I have advanced all along the line have been purely my own and not those of my church.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I express regret if I have offended against the susceptibilities of any honourable members regarding their church

or their religion; that was far from my intention, and it would not be my intention under any circumstances. We have been arguing about the sale of liquor to persons under the age of 21 years, and the member for Stuart has said that we are dealing with only unlicensed premises, but I point out that section 198 (7) states:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the sale or supply of liquor on any licensed or unlicensed premises, or in any registered club to any person to whom it is by this Act unlawful to supply liquor.

I think that that section gets over all the objections and that the position is safeguarded.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 24 and 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Permit to supply liquor with light meals."

Mr. CASEY: I move:

After "be" in new section 198b (8) to insert:

"(*a*) in the case of any premises other than premises outside an area within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1961, for which a publican's licence is in force,"

It would then read:

In this section "light meal" means a meal of any kind for which the charge shall be:

(*a*) in the case of any premises other than premises outside an area within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1961, for which a publican's licence is in force, not less than seven shillings and sixpence.

Mr. RICHES: New section 198b(3)(*b*) provides that no dining room or bar room shall be specified. Can the Premier explain to me why the dining room is excluded?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: All hotels by law must have dining rooms and must serve meals in the dining room if required. It is permissible to have drinks with meals in a dining room at certain hours, and those meals are required, I believe, to consist of certain courses. This provision is intended to apply to rooms set apart separately for light refreshments, and those rooms must not be the dining room or the bar. Personally, I would have no objection to a dining room being set apart for that purpose, if necessary, but probably it would embarrass a hotelkeeper himself if that was done, because it is necessary for the room and for all the conditions relating to this matter to be approved by the Licensing Court. On no account must a bar be used for this purpose, for there must be no attempt to provide counter lunches. The conditions have been agreed to by the Australian Hotels Association, which has readily agreed that they shall be under the control of the Licensing Court. In the dining room liquor can be obtained with a meal. This new provision envisages something different. It provides for a light meal, and not merely a sandwich, which is the reason why a charge of 7s. 6d. has been fixed.

Mr. BYWATERS: In the second reading debate the Premier said the provision would enable people going on to parties and the pictures to get light refreshments. If that is so, why is it provided that they can get liquor until 10.45 p.m.? Perhaps the time should be 8 p.m. A light meal would be consumed quickly by people going on to parties and the pictures, and would not continue from 6 p.m. to 10.45 p.m.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There was a time when everybody went to a function not later than 8 o'clock. The honourable member must know that New Australians go to functions later than that.

Mr. Bywaters: At 10.45 p.m.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Frequently. The honourable member knows that there is a second performance which starts late in the evening in some theatres. I do not think there will be any abuse of the provision. If there should be, it can be amended later.

Mr. LAWN: My attitude towards this clause will be determined by the reply the Premier gives to a question. I am not happy with the clause as it stands and am prepared to vote against it. The Premier told the member for Murray that somewhere in the Bill there is a provision that licenses these premises, but I cannot find it. Will the Premier tell me where it is so that I can read it, and then my vote might be different?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The clause under discussion deals with hotels.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the drafting of the Bill was the position of small country hotels considered? I have a number in my district and I doubt whether some of them could provide a room, other than a dining room, for the purposes of the clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If they do not want to provide a room, there is no obligation on them to do so. They may do it if they want to. Mr. Casey's amendment deals with areas where there is no local government authority, and where widely differing conditions prevail. So far, to some

extent the difficulties have been met administratively. The amendment would apply only in far outback areas where people live under very different conditions from those in the city. A shearer wanting a drink after shearing may not be able to get to a hotel by 6 p.m. and may not want to pay for an expensive dinner. I can see no harm in the amendment, and I accept it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am satisfied that the amendment is reasonable and will support it.

Amendment carried.

Mr. CASEY: I move:

After "sixpence" in subsection (8) to insert:

(*b*) in the case of premises outside an area within the meaning of the said Act for which a publican's licence is in force not less than two shillings and sixpence.

The Premier has summed up the position very well, and I will not go into the matter again. The idea behind the amendment is to provide outback people, such as shearers, with the opportunity to go to places, some of which are isolated, without having to pay 7s. 6d. for a meal.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 27 to 33 passed.

New clause 22a—"Amendment of section 176 of principal Act."

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

22a. Subsection (1) of section 176 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by inserting after the words "licensed premises" therein the words "or in any part of any licensed premises set apart or used as a beer-garden or for the purposes of the sale, supply or consumption of liquor;"

(*b*) by inserting after the word "bar-room" at the end thereof the words "or said part of such licensed premises".

Section 176 (1) provides:

If any person under the age of 16 years other than a child of a licensee is for any purpose in any bar-room of any licensed premises, the licensee of those premises shall forthwith remove that person or cause that person to be removed from the bar-room.

The purpose of the amendment is to have beer-gardens brought under this provision, as they are not recognized in the Act. In 1952, Mr. Christian, who was the member for Eyre, introduced a Bill to amend the Licensing Act; the measure included a provision that children were to be excluded from public lounges of hotels, which places are not mentioned in the interpretation section of the Act. The bar room was apparently the accepted place for the consumption of liquor when the Act was drawn up. In explaining the second reading of his Bill, Mr. Christian referred to the 1896 Act, which allowed children under 15 to be served with liquor in any part of a hotel. He quoted the following report of what the Hon. F. W. Holder, who was the Premier in 1896, said when that Bill was before the House:

This was the first time a Bill of this nature had been submitted to a Parliament in this colony, which had been partly elected by women, and as it was a matter which closely affected the home they should do their best to protect children. Therefore, in clause 41 they provided that "any person holding a licence under this Act, or any Act incorporated herewith, or any person in his employ who shall supply or submit to be supplied any liquor to any child under the age of 15 years, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than £1 nor more than £5." That was a provision, he was sure, they would all gladly assent to, and it was one to which the deputation from the South Australian Brewers' Association raised no objection.

Mr. Christian then said:

That gave rise to an amendment of the same section in 1908 under which the prohibition to serve children was extended to include their complete prohibition from bar rooms.

It was accepted at that time that the bar room was the place where liquor was served. I have moved the amendment to protect children from coming into association with the supply of intoxicating liquor. As I did not want to make the provision so restrictive as to prohibit children from being in an area where any liquor was consumed, I asked leave last night to withdraw the words "sitting room", it having been pointed out to me that this would create a difficulty for guests at hotels who had children with them who wished to watch television. However, I think it is undesirable to have children associated with places where alcoholic drinks are being consumed. I have seen small children of between four and six, or even younger, with their parents, who perhaps have not appreciated something the children have done and have given them drinks from their glasses. On occasions the children have gone to sleep. That may be an easy way out for some parents, but the children might have been intoxicated. This is undesirable.

It has been suggested to me by members sympathetic to my aims that some parents might bring their children to hotels and, if prohibited from taking them into beer-gardens, they might allow them to play in the streets or lock them in their cars, but this sort of thing can

easily be overcome. Some hotels provide playing areas, so my amendment would not affect them, because the playing areas are away from the places where liquor is served. People who leave their children in cars or allow them to play in the streets are negligent, so the Committee should not consider this aspect. When parents go out for a night's entertainment, if they are genuine in wanting to care for their children they leave them with friends or get somebody to look after them. Surely there are better ways to occupy children than to have them in association with hotels. So many provisions are made for sporting facilities on Saturday afternoons that they have many other places to which to go. A beer-garden is no place for a toddler, who gets tired of the environment. If parents want to have a drink they should get somebody to mind their children. Giving children drinks from parents' glasses is bringing them up the wrong way. I feel strongly about this and, if members have any doubts, I hope they will express them so that the matter can be thrashed out.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is not a new matter; it was examined several years ago by the Government after a request had been made by temperance and religious organizations for children to be excluded from beer-gardens when such places were first introduced.

Mr. Shannon: What does the Act define as a beer-garden?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: After going into the matter closely, the Government decided that it was impracticable to accede to the request I referred to. There would be some problems that could lead to undesirable happenings in acceding to the request. I believe that the children concerned would be better under the control of their parents than playing in the street. The parents would enter the hotel for a drink and the children would have to be left outside. I believe nothing would be gained by that. We do not prohibit parents from taking a child into the hotel, only into the bar. I know of no law that prevents the parents from taking a child into the parlour.

Mr. Shannon: Can't a licensee have children?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The law, as I see it, only prohibits a child from entering the bar. I do not believe that the conduct in the beer-garden is any different from that in the lounge.

Mr. Heaslip: Or in many homes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will not go into that question. It is preferable to have the children under the parents' control to their running about in the street, because small toddlers might have accidents.

Mr. Lawn: Your remarks could apply to a bar.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members know that with the type of bar trade in South Australia generally the two parents are not there together, but they are in beer-gardens. Usually only one parent is in the bar while the other looks after the child. In many hotels the atmosphere in the bar is different from that in the parlour, lounge or beer-garden. As far as I know, this amendment is not law in any other State. It was given close consideration several years ago and was supported by strong temperance and religious organizations. I told those organizations that the Government considered that on balance any advantage would be offset because the child would be unattended and possibly playing in traffic in the open street. I hope the Committee does not accept the amendment.

Mr. BYWATERS: I refer to one or two interjections from the member for Onkaparinga. He implied that a beer-garden was not defined. This amendment has been moved because no mention of beer-garden appears in the Act. The amendment provides:

> . . . or in any part of any licensed premises set apart or used as a beer-garden . . .

Mr. Shannon: That does not define the term "beer-garden".

Mr. BYWATERS: According to the Parliamentary Draftsman (and I take his word in preference to that of the member for Onkaparinga) that is sufficient and covers what I require. The honourable member said that this amendment would prohibit the owner or licensee from having children.

Mr. Lawn: Did he say that?

Mr. BYWATERS: That was the suggestion the honourable member made.

Mr. Lawn: I don't think he meant that.

Mr. BYWATERS: The principal Act refers to "other than a child of the licensee", so that should clear up the point for the honourable member. It is obvious that his interjections are irrelevant. When the Premier was speaking he raised similar objections to what I have proposed, and said that small toddlers were better to be with their parents, who would have some control over them. In the cases I referred to the parents had no control over

the children and that is why I moved this amendment. I have seen young mothers out for a good time, neglecting their children, and believing that the sooner the children went to sleep the better. In fact, it seems that something is given to the children to make them sleep. This attitude is deplorable and should not be tolerated. The Premier said that children were allowed in lounges. I wished to include in this amendment a provision to cover that point, but was advised not to do so because of the circumstances. I believe that the Act was originally devised to prohibit children from coming in close association with any place where liquor was consumed. I was trying to overcome this problem by including beer-gardens and lounges, but that was not possible. I ask the Committee to support the new clause.

New clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) 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 Supreme Court Act, 1935-1962.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It increases the remuneration of the judges of the Supreme Court by £750 a year as from July 1, 1963. The last increase in judicial salaries was made in 1960, since when, as honourable members know, there have been adjustments in salaries of other members in the Government service, including adjustments by Bills to be introduced covering certain statutory salaries and salaries and allowances of honourable members. Under this Bill the salary of the Chief Justice will be £7,000 a year and that of the puisne judges £6,250.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, at 2 p.m.