HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 16, 1967.

The House met at 2 p.m.

The CLERK: I have to announce that, because of illness, the Speaker will be unable to attend the House this day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn) took the Chair and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

FISHING.

Mr. HALL: The Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Adermann) has announced that the Commonwealth Government will extend fishing limits on the Australian coast from three miles to 12 miles. A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

The new legislation would help to protect and encourage the fishing industries of Australia and the Territories. "The cray fisheries, which are the basis of a valuable export industry, will be given a very substantial measure of protection," Mr. Adermann said.

Can the Minister of Agriculture, as Minister in charge of fisheries, say what effect this will have on State jurisdiction over fishing conducted off the South Australian coast?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The State has autonomous control of its own fisheries, but the fixing of an Australian fishing limit is a Commonwealth matter. At present anyone from another country can fish off the Australian coast outside of the three-mile limit, but this limit will be extended to 12 miles.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. COUMBE: Last year I asked a question about a Commonwealth proposal to construct a standard gauge rail link between Port Augusta and Whyalla. Has the Premier knowledge of any further negotiations between the Commonwealth and State Governments on this proposal and, if he has not, will he consider taking up the matter with the Commonwealth?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I regret that I have no further information on this important matter. However, I will certainly ask my colleague whether he has any recent information. If he has not and if it is necessary then to correspond with the Prime Minister, I shall do so. I shall inform the honourable member of the outcome.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION.

Mr. LANGLEY: On Tuesday evening last I received a deputation from a body calling itself the South Australian Youth Association, concerning assistance it provides in the physical and mental fitness of youth. The members of the deputation were a young woman named Hargreaves and a Mr. Desmond M. Clark. This association apparently comes within the ambit of the co-ordination of youth facilities that the Attorney-General is hoping will operate in this State. The deputation asked whether it could interview Mr. Pat Hall (Recreation Officer of the Social Welfare Department). Can the Attorney-General comment on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and very strongly, too. Mr. Desmond M. Clark will be known to all members. I strongly advise any parent to ensure that their children have nothing to do with this particular association, as it calls itself. There have been suggestions that the South Australian Youth Clubs Incorporated want the affiliation of this body, but I can only say that I know that the South Australian Youth Clubs Incorporated would not touch this organization with a 40ft. barge pole. I have received complaints about this body and there has been a police investigation about it. The first complaint I received was as a result of the sale of some things purported to be quiz tickets on which was printed:

1967 quiz tickets 10c each; first prize $20, second prize $10, and third prize $5. Drawn on Friday, April 28. Proceeds used to re-establish youth clubs in South Australia.

This appeared under the heading "South Australian Youth Association" which is not a registered business name and does not represent an incorporated association. The complaint I received indicated that tickets were being widely sold and the person who complained pointed out that he questioned the youth who sold him the ticket in a hotel, and the youth produced a pamphlet, a copy of which I have, which stated:

> The South Australian Youth Association.
> 1967 Quiz Book Competition.
> "Save the Youth Clubs Appeal."
> Commission and Prizes.
> (*a*) For every completed book sold, the seller shall receive 50c (or 5s.).
> (*b*) For any person selling 80 books—additional prize, one new portable transistor radio. . . .

Various advertisements have appeared in the newspapers for boys wanted for interesting work during the holidays, but that is to sell these purported quiz tickets. On the back of the tickets are the recommended places at which to sell them—hotels, beer gardens, race and trotting meetings, Rowley Park Speedway, and so on. I inquired of the National Fitness

Council and of the South Australian Youth Clubs Incorporated about this organization, but I shall not tell members what the officials of these organizations said. Perhaps I can tell them privately. I assure members that the responsible youth organizations in South Australia that are involved in the co-ordinating committee (details of which I have given to the House previously) will have nothing to do with this organization, and I strongly advise parents against allowing their children to have anything to do with it.

There has been a police investigation and it seems that the officers of the purported association are Mr. Clark and the young lady by the name of Hargreaves, of the same address, who saw the member for Unley. It seems that Mr. Clark and Miss (or Mrs.) Hargreaves are the sole proprietors of a business run for their own benefit in the name of the South Australian Youth Association. They have had 1,000 books each of 20 tickets printed, which sell to the public for 10c each. Numerous advertisements have been printed in the *Advertiser* calling for lads to make big money. They paid the lads 50c for each book of tickets sold or, virtually, 50c for each $2 collected. This commission would be paid as the boys handed in the ticket butts. A statement from one ticket seller is attached to the police brief. The tickets were allegedly to entitle the purchasers to take part in a quiz to be drawn on April 29, 1967, with a first prize of $20, second prize of $10, and third prize of $5. If all the tickets were sold there would be an income of $2,000. Less $500 for the collectors, and prize money amounting to $35, the couple would have an income of $1,465. There do not appear to be any rules of this association or any proper form of constitution. Investigation of the books of the association has not shown any sort of appropriate accounting. Most people who had purchased tickets for the quiz believed that they were helping youth organizations, whereas it appears very much more likely they provided a money-making business for the two people concerned.

Investigations have been made of the various youth clubs that the people concerned say they are running. None of them has any community backing. Most of them have a very small attendance, yet Mr. Clark has apparently been able to get support from some organs giving publicity in South Australia. There was a broadcast over the air in a programme on community service asking that any donations for the South Australian Youth Association be sent to the Holden Hill Community Centre. Actually, a Saturday morning youth group had been held at that centre for some weeks, but Clark obtained the use of the Holden Hill Community Centre only by convincing Mr. Diamond, a member of the board for the centre, that he was associated with a recognized State youth body and that he was affiliated with South Australian Youth Clubs Incorporated, which he was not. Members will be aware of the record of convictions of the individual concerned. He has served two terms of imprisonment for sending indecent material through the post, and he would not be a fit and proper person to control any youth organization.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether, as a result of the information he has given the House, any complaints will be laid against Mr. Clark and, if they are, whether he considers that the publicity given this matter in the House today will gravely prejudice the hearing of any such complaints?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether any charges will be laid against Mr. Clark. If any charges are laid against him I think he will be able to make his defence. In giving information to the House, I acted on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police. In order to protect the children of this State, publicity about this matter should be given at the earliest possible moment.

WALLAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: Recently, I wrote a letter to the Minister of Education asking that he consider levelling and paving the grounds at the Wallaroo Primary School. The Minister was good enough to call for an immediate report, part of which states:

The Director of the Public Buildings Department, to whom the matter was referred, advises that the drainage, levelling and paving of lands at the school have been investigated and that plans and an estimate of cost have been prepared.

Recently, a shed was removed from the middle of the grounds, leaving concrete in certain places protruding about 6in. above the ground. Further, because of the purchase of certain land some time ago for recreational purposes, a bare metal road was left. The guttering is still there, and this could become very dangerous. I realize that the Minister has called for a report, and it is a very favourable one for the school. Will the Minister discuss the urgency of these matters with the Director of the Public Buildings Department in the interests of the safety of the children at the school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Director of the Public Buildings Department, with a view to having the matters attended to.

FIRE BAN.

Mr. McANANEY: There has been a total fire ban throughout South Australia over the last few days. I appreciate the need for this in most areas, but in the Lower Murray, where there is now insufficient vegetation for a fire and where it would be most difficult for a fire to break out, the total fire ban has prevented farmers from clearing their blocks so that they may be ready for the first rain. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider exempting this area from the current fire ban?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am governed in this matter by an Act of Parliament. It would be necessary for all councils adjoining the area in question to give permission for any exemption to be granted, and this is a very difficult thing. The honourable member referred to the Lower Murray, which I think includes, amongst other council areas, the district councils of Mobilong, Peake and Mount Pleasant. These councils adjoin each other, and each, of course, has quite different types of vegetation in its area. Therefore, it would be expecting much of one council to give permission for another council to be exempt. We can realize the difficulty when we see the types of country in the various areas. In fact, in some council districts there are areas where, as suggested by the honourable member, burning off might be safe, whereas in another part of the same district there would be a very high fire risk indeed.

Since I have been the Minister controlling this matter I have always erred if anything on the side of caution, for I believe this is a matter in which we must take every care. Although I am sympathetic to the people referred to by the honourable member, I am loath to take any action at all that could result in a fire hazard being created. Therefore, I have at all times been extremely cautious about agreeing to anything that could result in damage being caused by fire. I treat with respect every matter sent to me, but at the same time I exercise extreme caution, knowing just what damage can be caused by bush fires. I am sure that all honourable members of this House, knowing of the recent bush fires in Tasmania and what has happened here in the past, would agree with me in this stand.

HOSPITALS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am pleased to see in the newspaper that a new hospital is to be built at Modbury. However, I have often drawn the attention of the House to the dire need for a new training hospital at Flinders University, and I am rather concerned that the priorities in this matter may have been established on political grounds rather than on grounds of necessity. I therefore ask the Premier whether he can say when it is intended to proceed with a new training hospital at Flinders University?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I received information only this week on this matter from Professor Karmel of the Flinders University. Recently a deputation from the Australian Medical Association discussed with me the possibility of a teaching hospital being erected at this university. However, Professor Karmel himself expressed the view that it would be necessary for this matter to be somewhat delayed. In fact, it seems that it could be about 1970 before such a school could be contemplated by the university authorities. This matter has not been finalized in any way, but it seems that it would be three years after a medical school is established at the university before a hospital would be required to train the students there. Whatever occurs in respect of arrangements with the Flinders University and the Medical Association, any obligations to construct the hospital will be fulfilled.

Mr. HALL: The announcement by the Premier last evening concerning a hospital at Tea Tree Gully was rather surprising following his reply to me on Tuesday that at that stage he had no positive information. Apparently someone has put this information into his hands since Tuesday, and we received it last evening. Does the Premier expect that contributions will be made by councils in the area to this hospital when it is built? If he does, will contributions be on a basis comparable with the basis of those levied on (and expected to be paid by) the councils at Tea Tree Gully, Elizabeth and Salisbury in respect of the Lyell McEwin Hospital?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member for Barossa asked a similar question last year, and I could not give her (the member for the district) any information at that time. The report published in the press this morning about this hospital is the result of a telecast that I am privileged to make on ADS7 once a week.

A condition of the contract is that in the time I use in this telecast I must assist the management of the station by ensuring that the station has only information of news value. I make no apology to this House for having to do that. After all, I am privileged to give information over channel 7 in the programme *The Premier Speaks* in the same way as was my predecessor, the member for Gumeracha. The only difference is that whatever I have proposed has been positive. Regarding the latter part of the question, I shall inquire and provide information for the Leader as soon as possible.

WARDENS' COMPENSATION.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on March 14 about wardens, appointed under the Fauna Conservation Act being covered by insurance in the case of injury when carrying out their duties under the Act?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: There is no legal requirement for the insurance of honorary wardens appointed under the Fauna Conservation Act. However, there would be nothing to prevent the honorary wardens' taking civil action for damages in the case of an illegal assault. I am sure the Government would provide legal assistance in such cases, provided that it was satisfied that the honorary warden was acting within the powers prescribed in the instrument of his appointment. Apparently the honourable member's constituent has been appointed an honorary warden. I point out that the appointment would have been made as a result of a specific application by the gentleman himself.

TEACHER'S DEMOTION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the case of Mr. John Murrie, the Darwin schoolteacher. Last Tuesday the Minister of Education said in answer to a question that he was confident that the view expressed by Mr. Woithe (President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers) was not the considered opinion of the majority of teachers in this State. In this morning's paper it is reported that school teachers in South Australia and the Northern Territory almost unanimously supported a statement by the President of the institute that the Minister had been misinformed by senior officers of his department in the Murrie case. That statement was made by Mr. H. W. Clark and Miss E. Curnow. In view of the statement, which has now been published and which, I presume, the Minister has seen and thought about, will he agree that he was mistaken in the view that he expressed on Tuesday and, as a result, will he reconsider his refusal of yesterday to inform the House as to the hearing that has been undertaken by members of his department whether Mr. Murrie was given an opportunity to defend himself; and, if he was, will the Minister say what that opportunity was?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have nothing further to add on this matter. I am waiting for an appeal to be lodged, and that is all I have to say.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have refrained from speaking about Mr. John Murrie's demotion until now. However, many requests have been made to me by people in Crystal Brook (where Mr. Murrie was a school teacher for some years) because of the good job he did there both as a school teacher and as a citizen who participated in many functions. Because of these requests, because I think that the judgment of the Minister has been harsh, and because up to the present there has been no appeal, will he reconsider his decision in this case to see whether some of the harshness, which I consider has been meted out to Mr. Murrie, can be mitigated?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members realize that once a question has been asked it cannot be asked again. I do not have copies of the questions that have been asked about this case, but I strongly believe that the question asked by the member for Rocky River has already been asked by the member for Mitcham. I shall not disallow this question and the Minister may reply if he so desires, but I remind members that they are, to a large extent, placed on their honour to observe Standing Orders and that, before asking a question, they should be sure that the question has not been asked before. I will permit the question now, but I draw honourable members' attention to Standing Orders in relation to questions.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Let me say that I appreciate the tone in which the honourable member phrased his question. I do not think he is trying to make political capital out of it as other people are trying to do.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope you are not suggesting that I am: if you are, I very much resent it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The position has now been reached where I consider that so many conflicting statements have been made that the matter can be properly determined only by an independent inquiry. I welcome that, and I hope that I shall receive an application for an appeal soon.

DEFECTIVE VEHICLES.

Mrs. BYRNE: Under section 154 of the Road Traffic Act, a member of the Police Force has the right to inspect a motor vehicle for roadworthiness and to ascertain whether it is in proper running order. In carrying out those duties, it is customary for a police officer, in the first instance, to stop a vehicle if he considers that its steering, tyres, brakes or headlights are faulty and/or require attention. In addition, if the police officer thinks it necessary, he may check other parts of the motor vehicle against a list which he carries for this purpose. So that the public will be fully aware of what the Police Force requires in respect of defective vehicles, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to ascertain whether the relevant list might be publicized for the benefit of motorists?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Already there is before Parliament an amendment that would permit police officers to inspect in the dealer's yard used cars that are offered for sale. These powers would be in addition to those under the section of the Act to which the honourable member referred. As soon as this legislation is passed by both Houses it will operate. It will provide a facility for the public so that, if a member of the public purchases a used car, he or she will know that the car is roadworthy. It will also protect people in respect of cars being brought into this State that may be stolen. When this legislation is passed the public will be sure of such protection and the police will still inspect the vehicles they suspect of being unroadworthy.

AGRICULTURAL COURSES.

Mrs. STEELE: A comprehensive agricultural course, including such subjects as soil science, plant nutrition, sheep and cattle husbandry, weed control, economic entomology, and other allied subjects was introduced at the Adelaide Technical High School in February, 1966. I understand that the course was motivated by the Society of Agricultural Engineers, and at the commencement of the course it was so popular that more people desired to enrol than could be absorbed into the class. However, the course has been discontinued this year. On inquiry, interested participants in the course last year found that it had been discontinued because lecturers were not available and possibly because insufficient funds were available. It may be considered that a comparable course could be conducted at rural centres where agricultural advisers are stationed. I ask the Minister of Education whether a report could be presented on this matter, because it concerns a great many people who, although they live in the city, are interested in the course.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member. I think she is aware that, as the responsible Minister, I am anxious to promote the study of agriculture and to provide better facilities in our country schools. However, we are frustrated in this regard because of the lack of finance to do what we would like to do.

CLEAR PLASTIC.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The parents of primary schoolchildren in my district have told me that the clear plastic which is used for covering library books in primary schools is unavailable. On checking with the Public Library, I find that the life of children's books can be doubled by the use of this clear plastic. Will the Minister of Education check with the Stores Branch of the Education Department to ascertain whether more clear plastic can be obtained to supply to primary schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

DERAILMENT.

Mr. RODDA: The overnight rail service recently inaugurated to the South-East has been used and appreciated by people in that part of the State. Recently a serious derailment occurred in the Adelaide Hills. As people using the railways are somewhat alarmed by this derailment, can the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, inform the House of the reasons for that derailment or say whether a report is available on the matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Undoubtedly an inquiry is being conducted, and I will ask the Minister of Transport whether a report is available.

PARAFIELD GARDENS STATION.

Mr. HALL: I refer to the building of a railway station at Parafield Gardens, about which I have previously asked questions, the replies indicating that construction would commence this financial year. Although conceding that several months still remain in this financial year, I point out that no apparent move has yet been made to build the station in what is now a reasonably well populated area. As the lack of a station in the area causes great inconvenience to many residents, especially to those without motor cars who have to travel around the roads to get to the old Parafield station,

will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport when the construction of the Parafield Gardens station is expected to commence?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall do everything possible to obtain the information.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier a reply to my question seeking information about the waiting time for Housing Trust rental houses in Upper Murray towns?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The waiting time for ordinary rental applicants at Renmark and Berri is only nine to 12 months, and at Barmera it is about 12 to 15 months. Waiting time varies with the frequency of vacancies.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to my question of last week about progress being made on legislation dealing with the metropolitan drainage authority?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that in August, 1966, a draft of proposals which could be the basis for discussion of a Bill to establish a metropolitan drainage authority was placed before representatives of councils at a meeting held in the Highways building. The Minister points out that, although prepared in Bill form for convenience, it was not a Bill ready for introduction in the House, but comprised draft proposals only for consideration by councils. At the meeting it was resolved that a survey of requirements in the metropolitan area be undertaken as a preliminary to further consideration of the proposals. The resolution passed at the meeting stated that the cost of the survey was to be borne equally between the Government and councils, the latter half of the cost to be borne in such proportion as decided between themselves.

Up to the present my colleague has not received any written advice from councils confirming their acceptance of the resolution particularly in so far as it refers to the bearing of half of the cost of the survey. In the meantime, as many councils already had plans for drainage in their areas, the Minister arranged for a preliminary survey to be undertaken by the Commissioner of Highways at no cost to councils in order to arrive at a rough idea of what would be involved in a comprehensive survey and an estimate of the cost of such a major survey for councils to consider. The Minister advises me that this preliminary work is in hand but the department is still awaiting replies from some of the 30 councils written to on this subject.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am privileged to receive (as I guess the Premier is) a copy of the *Community News*, one of the Messenger group of newspapers, and I see in the issue of Wednesday, March 8, a box article headed "Sturt Creek Widening: Premier Criticized." The article states:

"The Marion council would benefit from the proposed widening of Sturt Creek as part of the south western drainage scheme, but West Torrens would be flooded." This was stated by a West Torrens Councillor at a recent council meeting, when speaking in reply to a statement made on T.V. by the Premier.

Apparently this refers to one of the Premier's television appearances. The articles goes on in the same vein, and it is reported there that the West Torrens council suggested approaching the Premier. Has any approach been made either by deputation or letter? Does the Premier intend to do anything to help the city of West Torrens in the predicament in which it appears it may find itself?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not see the article referred to by the honourable member, so I can only accept that what he has placed before the House is a reasonably correct report. A question has already been asked in this House on this matter, and until information is forwarded to me I cannot say any more on the subject.

UNLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about paving of the yard at the Unley Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that an estimate of cost has been prepared for the reinstatement of the paving referred to by the honourable member. A submission is now being made by that department for approval of funds so that the work may be undertaken soon.

INQUESTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In today's *News* appears a report that no inquest is to be held into a boating accident at Walker Flat, on December 17, in which five people were killed. I understand that this matter is in the discretion of the local coroner, but I am surprised that no inquest will be held in this case. I realize that in these matters coroners are usually advised by the police, although the decision is theirs.

According to the report in the *News* the Attorney-General states that he has no power to do anything about the matter, and I accept that. In view of this decision (which seems strange), does the Attorney-General intend to recommend to the Government a change in the law so as to ensure that inquests are held in such cases?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A comprehensive review of the Coroners Act has been under consideration for some time. I do not expect that we can get early debating time on this matter, but I believe that many amendments need to be made to ensure, amongst other things, that where inquests are necessary they are held and that they are held when there is a public demand for them. However, as the legislation is what we have inherited, I have no power in the instant matter to do anything about it.

BLACKWOOD POLICE STATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Blackwood Progress Association concerning the condition of the Blackwood police station. The letter states:

Recently, the attention of the Blackwood Progress Association was drawn to the inadequate room and facilities at the Blackwood police station. It is obvious that the station has not grown with the rapid growth of the district and that either entirely new premises with separate offices, etc., or an extension of the present building is required. The committee of this association would appreciate it if you could inquire into this matter to see if anything can be done to improve the facilities at the Blackwood police station. We should like to add that the staffing situation has been improved lately with the extra secretarial help and road patrols, and this is very much appreciated by residents.

Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to investigate this matter with a view to complying with the request contained in the letter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: I read with interest this week that the Adelaide City Council had expressed views about zoning within the city and its desire to encourage the building of high-rise buildings in the city of Adelaide, including North Adelaide. Because of these views and the obvious demand for this type of housing will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, reconsider the decision made about two years ago not to proceed with building a high-rise building on East Terrace? Will he now reconsider whether this sort of building, which would be an advantage to people who desire to live in this type of housing, could be erected by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government drafted legislation to give powers to the Adelaide City Council and to other councils to enter the flat-building field, provided that the council retained the ownership of the accommodation and let it under normal conditions. My present information indicates that approval for the accommodation that was to have been erected on East Terrace was refused by the trust because of the expenditure involved. However, because of the changed attitude of the Adelaide City Council in its efforts to increase the population of the city, I believe that there is ample opportunity now for the private sector of the building industry to implement a policy to show the people of this State that it has confidence in the city. It is up to the private sector to accept its obligation to build flats in the city. Because of the planned trip overseas of the General Manager of the Housing Trust (Mr. Ramsay), I do not intend to ask the trust to consider development in the city. He should be free to obtain any information that he considers would be of an advantage in considering future housing accommodation, whether flats or other buildings, to be provided by the trust. Obviously, this State will benefit from the knowledge he gains from his trip. The whole question of trust building in the city will be deferred until Mr. Ramsay returns from overseas.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that residents of Dequetteville Terrace are now prevented from selling their houses unless they are occupied. This is the result of action by the Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood, which contends that the Town Planner wishes to have Dequetteville Terrace preserved for the erection of flats. As the Premier has stated that the Government does not intend to go ahead with flat building in the city until Mr. Ramsay's return, will the Premier inquire of the Town Planner whether my statement about Dequetteville Terrace is correct and, if it is, what power the council has to prevent people from selling their properties in this way? I point out that the action of the council is resulting in the downgrading of properties in Dequetteville Terrace.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I indicated to the House a moment ago that the Government would not erect flats in the city of Adelaide until Mr. Ramsay's return, but that should not be taken to mean that the trust will build them then: it simply means that the trust will not proceed to plan flats for the city

until Mr. Ramsay's return. I will leave the point concerning the Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood and the powers of the Town Planner to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the course of the preparation of material for planning and development in the city, metropolitan councils have been asked to prepare plans, both for zoning and for redevelopment. Under the provisions of the Planning and Development Bill, as it was passed in this House, the new planning and development authority would be able, in conjunction with a scheme put forward by the council concerned, to develop an area in the way recommended by the Town Planner. The councils concerned (and they would include the Corporation of the City of Kensington and Norwood) have appointed consultants to prepare plans. These plans are now being investigated by the Town Planner for the redevelopment of various parts of their areas. Precisely how various Government agencies will fit into this, how the corporation will fit into it, and what regulations will be made can only be decided once the Planning and Development Bill has passed through Parliament. It has been clearly the intention of the Government, however, to provide that redevelopment plans may be adopted in conjunction with local corporations and may proceed. Precisely how quickly they proceed will, of course, depend on the result of the Planning and Development Bill, which received some buccaneer treatment in another place yesterday.

SPRINGCART GULLY.

Mr. CURREN: Concern has been expressed by various organizations and individuals in my district at the desecration of the Springcart Gully cliffs, where quarrying and other operations have defaced the natural beauty of the area. Will the Minister of Lands have this matter investigated to ascertain whether the operations being conducted have been authorized by licence or permit?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter has already been investigated by Mr. Donaldson (Assistant Director of Lands) as a result of letters received and, indeed, the previous inquiries made by the honourable member. I know that the Assistant Director has been in touch with the Mines Department to ascertain the terms of the lease that has been issued in this area, but I do not know whether a breach of the agreement has been made. I will inquire and I hope to have a report for the honourable member next Tuesday.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question relates to a regulation which is at present before the House and which increases the fees payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act: previously, the fees were $4.20, whereas they are now $12.60. Section 35 of the Act states, in part:

. . . the clerk of a local court, on application being made to the court by both parties may, on payment by the applicants of such fee, not exceeding two pounds, as is prescribed by any rule of court, refer the matter to a medical referee.

Section 35 seems to provide that the applicant has to pay the money in accordance with a rule of court. The regulation before the House is a general regulation and has no reference to the rules of court or to the sum payable. If an injured person has to pay a fee of $12.60 in order to get a reference, great hardship could be involved in some cases: not only is the person injured and out of work but he has to pay a fee of that size. Will the Attorney-General have this matter examined by the Crown Law officers to ascertain, first, whether the regulation is in accordance with section 35 of the Act under which it is made and, secondly, whether it is in order, even though the principal Act limits the amount that can be charged and requires it to be fixed according to the rules of court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think there is a simple answer to the member's objection, but rather than reply off the cuff I will have the matter examined and let him have a reply next Tuesday.

FILM ADVERTISEMENTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several weeks ago I had a letter from a valued constituent of mine (Mr. Colin Lawton) who I think is well known to members opposite. In his letter he states:

You have probably noticed, as often as I have, the increasingly lurid and provocative advertisements on the amusements page of our daily newspapers. I wonder if you could make suitable inquiries about the enclosed advertisement for *Sex and the Single Girl*, which on the one hand is labelled "Not suitable for children" yet quotes an admission price for children!

I will let the Premier have the advertisement and the letter if he wishes to see them. Is the Premier prepared to have this instance investigated with a view to letting it be known to those responsible that the tone of the advertisements has slipped again and should be raised?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain a report from the Chief Secretary.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is twofold: (1) to change the name of the "Public Library of South Australia" to the "State Library of South Australia"; and (2) to change the title of office of "Principal Librarian" to "State Librarian". The name "Public Library of South Australia" no longer describes with accuracy the activities performed in this institution. The term "public library" has, in the past 10 years, become associated almost exclusively with the free public lending libraries operated by local government authorities. A change of the name to "State Library of South Australia" would emphasize both the important State-wide reference, research and repository functions of the library, and the fact that it is a State Government rather than a local government library.

Similarly, the title of the chief executive officer should be changed from "Principal Librarian" to "State Librarian". This title is now most commonly used in Australia to designate the chief librarians of the States and it describes his duties more accurately than "Principal Librarian", which designation is increasingly being used for officers of the third rank. Clause 3 amends the long title of the principal Act by substituting "State Library" for "public library". This amendment is consequential on the amendment set out in clause 6. Clause 4 amends subsection (1) of section 18 of the principal Act by providing that the principal librarian appointed by the Governor shall in future be known as the "State Librarian". Clause 5 is merely a consequential amendment substituting "State Librarian" for "principal librarian" in section 19 of the principal Act.

Clause 6 enacts a new section in the principal Act. Paragraph (*a*) of this section provides that in future the library known as the Public Library of South Australia shall be known as the State Library of South Australia. Paragraph (*b*) is a consequential amendment ensuring that references in other Acts, regulations, proclamations and documents to the "public library" and the "principal librarian" shall be read as references to the "State Library of South Australia" and the "State Librarian" respectively. Clauses 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are all consequential amendments substituting "State Library" for "principal library" where this is necessary in the principal Act. This is a simple Bill; it is not controversial, and I should be pleased if members would give it their full support to enable the measure to be passed in good time for the official opening of the new State Library.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (PENOLA UNDERTAKING) BILL.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Order that report be printed.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from February 28. Page 3298.)

Clause 13—"Registration of births and deaths to be in accordance with forms in the Second and Third Schedules."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): During the second reading debate, the member for Burnside raised certain questions in relation to this matter. A report has been received from the Registrar, examining the queries raised by the honourable member, and stating that in relation to illegitimate children he can see no way in which there can be a special form of birth registration. The general form provides not only for the date of marriage but also for the name of the father. In regard to adopting children, no form is laid down in the Bill. That matter is left to regulations under the Adoption of Children Act.

In any case it would be better to know, and to have shown on a certificate, that one was adopted, rather than have a certificate showing apparent illegitimacy, thereby losing the benefits of the legal adoption. In consequence, there is no way effectively of coping with the point raised by the member for Burnside.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 40 passed.

Clause 41—"Definition of 'war service'."

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

In subclause (1) after "engaged" to insert "or any operation in which the police forces of the Commonwealth or the State are engaged as part of a United Nations force".

When I spoke on this matter in the second reading debate I raised the matter of members of State and Commonwealth Police Forces serving in a United Nations force out of the country, and I foreshadowed that I would probably move amendments when the Bill was in Committee. This has become even more important recently with the flare-up of trouble in Cyprus, so I feel this amendment is pertinent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

In subclause (2) to insert the following paragraph:

or

(*e*) if he is engaged on service outside the State in connection with any operation in which the police forces of the Commonwealth or the State are engaged as part of a United Nations force.

This amendment is consequential on the one previously carried by the Committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 42—"Registration of persons dying on War Service."

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

In subclause (2) after "Commonwealth" to insert "or any police force of the Commonwealth or the State".

This amendment, too, is a consequential one.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 43 to 46 passed.

Clause 47—"Registration of deaths of members of armed forces."

Mrs. STEELE moved:

In subclause (1) to insert the following paragraph:

or

(*e*) any person is engaged in connection with any operation in which the police forces of the Commonwealth or the State are engaged as part of a United Nations force.

Amendment carried.

Mrs. STEELE moved:

In subclause (2) (*b*) after "force" first occurring to insert "or police force"; and after "force" second occurring to insert "or police force".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (48 to 80), schedules and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

East Marden Primary School,

Port Pirie Isolated Oil Berth.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIVIDENDS).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DISEASES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 9. Page 3575.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I raise no objection to the Bill and support it.

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

DOG RACING CONTROL BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 5)—After subclause (3) insert new subclause as follows:

"(3a) No licence shall be granted to a Club under subsection (1) of this section unless the granting of such licence is recommended by the Committee of the National Coursing Association of South Australia."

No. 2. Page 3—After clause 7 insert new clauses as follows:

7a. *Certain convicted persons not to take part in dog-racing.*—(1) A person who has been convicted by any court of an offence under this Act or under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1964, shall not, unless exempted from the provisions of this subsection—

(*a*) take part or be concerned in the conduct of dog-racing in the State;

(*b*) train or undertake the training of any dog for dog-racing;

(*c*) accept office, or act, as a member of the governing body of any dog-racing club;

or

(*d*) attend, or be present, as a spectator or otherwise, at any place where dog-racing is conducted or any dog is being trained for dog-racing or at any premises appurtenant thereto.

Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

(2) The Minister may, after considering a report made to him by any person or

committee appointed by him for the purpose of making such report, by writing under his hand exempt from the provisions of subsection (1) of this section any person who has been convicted of an offence under this Act or under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1964.

7b. *Living birds and animals not to be attached to mechanical quarries or used as lures.*—(1) A person shall not, for the purposes of dog-racing or the training of any dog for dog-racing, use, or permit the use of, any mechanical quarry to which is attached any living bird or animal.

Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

(2) A person shall not in the training of any dog for dog-racing use, or permit the use of, any living bird or animal as a lure or quarry.

Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I understand that these amendments are acceptable to all people associated with the sport of dog racing. As honourable members know, the Bill was considered closely by a Select Committee that investigated every matter associated with dog racing. I understand it visited other States and heard evidence from several witnesses. I thank the members of the committee for their efforts and I thank them on behalf of the National Coursing Association. The committee believes the amendments are necessary to enable responsible people to have full control of dog racing. The amendments will assist those responsible to guard the sport against acts of cruelty, and this is the desire of the National Coursing Association.

Amendments agreed to.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Consideration of the Legislative Council's message.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That the House of Assembly reconsider its amendments to the Bill.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Does the honourable member intend that the Acting Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself—

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): On a point of order, Sir, I seek your guidance. When this matter was last before the House, the member for Torrens would not proceed with the Bill. I claim that he has lost all rights, and I wish to know whether he is in order now, having declined his rights when the Bill was last before this House.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have considered the point raised by the Premier and I point out that when this Bill was originally introduced it was introduced by the member for Torrens as a private member's Bill. It is shown on the Orders of the Day under the name of the member for Torrens. Any member may, at any time, move in connection with a Bill that appears on the Notice Paper. I have no hesitation in allowing the motion to be moved by the member for Torrens, as the Bill was shown as a private member's Bill under his name. I cannot uphold the point of order.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

That the Acting Deputy Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the message from the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

That the amendments of the House of Assembly be not insisted on.

When I introduced this Bill as it was when it left another place (where it had been introduced by a private member), I said that it would give to a minority of employees additional benefits that were at present enjoyed by many employees. Because of its majority in this place, the Government successfully amended the Bill, but the amendments made the Bill completely unacceptable to me. By including these amendments the Government risked losing the whole Bill. After the Committee stage, I was called on to move the third reading but, as I intended to vote against what was then the Bill, it would have been futile and hypocritical of me to move the third reading. If the Government persists with its amendments many advantages will be denied to workers in this State.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe (teller), Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Broomhill, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman and Ferguson. Noes—Mrs. Byrne and Mr. Burdon.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Pages 1 and 2 (clause 3)—Leave out all words after "Councils" second occurring in paragraph 1.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That the amendment of the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council has, in its amendment, removed from the proposed new regulation-making power the provision that the powers of superintendents of the board or the Minister may, by regulation, be transferred to Aboriginal reserve councils. Why this regulation-making power was so widely drawn was in order to provide sufficient flexibility in respect of specific powers, particularly regarding entry permits. Simply to have power to define the powers and functions of councils and leave them entirely subject to the existing administration to be over-ridden by all the powers that now exist could put the Government in considerable difficulty. At the moment, the councils are consulted by the superintendents in regard to entry permits. From time to time, the councils are over-ridden by the superintendent, even though all the superintendents some time ago recommended that the permit system be ended on all reserves because it was creating difficulty and trouble. I could not agree to that, because in order to maintain housing and employment and health standards on reserves we have to retain a permit system. We have to encourage Aboriginal councils to be established. The member for Flinders will recall that, when he was the Minister, the Aborigines on some reserves refused to constitute councils. This happened at Point Pearce.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: At other reserves they accepted it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, they accepted it at Koonibba and at Gerard. When I took office there were no councils at Point Pearce, Point McLeay, or Davenport. These councils have all been constituted, and we are seeking the creation of an effective council at Neppabunna and councils are being sought on the North-West Reserve. I have had discussions with the Superintendent at Ernabella as to the creation of a combined council for the North-West Reserve, with representatives from Ernabella, Fregon, and Musgrave Park.

The councils at present constituted have demanded that they be given some specific powers, and they have made it perfectly clear to me that if they are not given those specific powers (and they have specifically petitioned for them) then as far as they are concerned the purpose of reserve councils is utterly defeated. Unless they are given authority in relation to the local governing of the reserves, particularly concerning permits of entry, then they do not consider that they are serving a useful function. They have told me that they consider themselves a sham if they are not given specific authority.

This is a specific demand that they are making. It is a desirable development for Aborigines that these councils do take responsibility. As the member for Flinders will recall, one of the problems on some reserves has been a reluctance on the part of Aboriginal residents to take responsibility. Now they are demanding it, and if we refuse to give it to them the council structure is likely to collapse.

I have in the past few days discussed this matter with the Director and Deputy Director of the department, and they are adamant that the position I am now putting to the Committee is the true position. It is not intended that we be precipitate about making regulations, and at this stage of proceedings it is not intended that the overriding power of the Minister be transferred, or that it be transferred for some considerable time; but at any rate the local power of councils must be effective. The original Bill was drawn sufficiently widely to provide flexibility to deal with a transfer of powers to Aboriginal reserve councils according to the circumstances of the particular reserve and, as honourable members who have visited these reserves will know, very different circumstances obtain between even the detribalized reserves, and therefore we have to provide some area of flexibility in the regulation-making power. I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment from the Legislative Council, because it would completely inhibit the development of the reserve council system which is an essential part of our development for Aborigines in reserves in South Australia.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I followed with close interest the remarks made by the Minister regarding the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council. I assure him that I have a sympathetic interest in his problem. I have always advocated that councils should be established, and when I had the opportunity I did what I could to encourage this. I remind the Minister that when this Bill was before this House I moved certain amendments to this clause (the subject of the Legislative Council's

amendment) which were not accepted. Those amendments were designed to steady the development of the power of councils in a way that I thought desirable.

I am somewhat concerned and a little alarmed that the Minister has felt obliged to inform the Committee today that the councils are now demanding that these powers be provided, because this sort of demanding is the very thing I thought would occur if we placed in untried hands the authority that this legislation would place within their control. The Minister has said that he does not propose to withdraw the overriding power of the Minister at this stage. However, I point out that this clause as it was originally drafted and as it left this Chamber contained the words, "Provided that, notwithstanding anything in this Act. . . . ". That proviso takes away from this clause the right of the Minister to intervene in these decisions. He has handed over all powers irrevocably to the councils.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is, if I make a regulation that way.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister is proposing to operate within the terms of this clause, and it is no good making a regulation that conflicts with the clause.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It does not at this stage have to go to the full length of power contained in the clause.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be arguable. Even if the position is not as I see it, I put it to the Committee that what has already occurred, and what has prompted the Minister to say that councils are demanding certain things at this point of time, leads me to question even more than I did before the wisdom of granting the councils these powers. I am reliably informed that problems have already arisen in that councils not at present legally constituted to permit or refuse admission have been exercising this power taken unto themselves, and as a result certain family feuds of long standing have been perpetuated and have come into the area of this clause, so much so that certain persons who I thought would have qualified for entry to reserves on all normal grounds have been refused it. Aborigines themselves have been refused entry to reserves because of the edict of somebody who believes himself to be legally authorized to refuse entry.

Apart from that, the Minister himself has just said that he feels it necessary that certain persons should have rights of entry in order to carry out certain duties on the reserves, and with that I entirely agree. It is obviously necessary to have some restraint upon the exercise of these powers in the interests of these developments occurring. I think the Minister may be unwise in pressing this matter. I believe that members of the Legislative Council have looked at this not with any idea of being difficult. Those members considered (I understood this to be the tenor of their arguments) it reasonable to allow to remain in this clause the power to make regulations on any and every matter, but they did not wish to leave in the clause the specific permission contained in it and therefore they sought to delete it. I do not think that the Minister's argument about providing powers for the councils is quite valid. He has asked for a general power under the first part of the clause, which it is proposed to retain, but he has asked for a specific power on a specific matter. He can regulate to cover the situation just as well.

Placing any such provision in the Bill would over-ride any regulations on the matter and would leave us with no alternative in respect of this particular phase of the council's authority. If we wish to create certain areas of people and carry segregation and discrimination to its ultimate, this is the way to do it. As has happened in other cases, councils may exercise this new-found authority unwisely. The Minister has already said that he has had to intervene to see that tradesmen, etc., whose services on reserves are required, are permitted to enter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: When have I said that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister may not have referred to tradesmen but he referred to people whose presence on reserves was essential in order to do certain things.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: When did I say that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: About two minutes ago.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'm blessed if I remember saying it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree with the Minister on this point. However, if we are to say to councils, "You can exclude these people," the purposes to which the Minister has referred are not achieved. I do not see that the Legislative Council's amendment greatly harms the purpose of the Bill. The Minister may promulgate regulations to cover the specific matter that he seeks to provide here, the only difference being that they will be subject to the scrutiny of Parliament. I point out that it is not likely that we will obstruct any reasonable regulation. I think the Committee would be wise to accept the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think the honourable member has understood the purport of the provision as it originally stood. All the things that are to be done under this provision must be done by regulation. As it originally stood, the Bill did not transfer any powers to the councils; it simply prescribed a regulation-making power.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The first part of the clause leaves all that power in.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it does not. Although there will still be power to make regulations designating the powers and functions of the councils, that would have to be subject to the rest of the legislation. Therefore, the council's decision would have to be subject to the over-riding power of the superintendent of the board, as well as the Minister. The honourable member may recall that, although the board is basically an advisory board, it has an administrative function concerning permits of entry. In consequence, the councils have sought that the board's powers and the superintendents' powers (and the superintendents agree with this) should be transferred to the councils, subject to the over-riding power of the Minister. If we leave the Act as it stands, we cannot transfer the powers of the board. I cannot prescribe something that is inconsistent with the Act's other provisions. That is why this specific provision is included.

If we are to transfer any of the board's powers, or any of the superintendents' powers, it will have to be effected by regulation, which will lie on the table of this Chamber and be subject to disallowance. However, we need that power if the councils are to carry out functions, which the officers of the department and the councils themselves consider they ought to carry out. I desire these councils to function, and the people concerned to have power in relation to their own future.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In due time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been saying "in due time" now for 130-odd years.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This is the very thing that illustrates the immaturity that exists concerning the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary. These councils have agreed to be constituted and have functioned now for some time in a voluntary fashion, subject to the existing restrictions. We have not been precipitate in this matter; we have urged councils' constitution; they have functioned; we have advised them; and we are satisfied that they are capable and sufficiently mature to exercise these powers. They do not disagree with the Minister's retaining an over-riding power at this stage. Where is the harm in it? There is still power for the Minister to intervene in any necessary case if the councils should act thoroughly unreasonably, although I do not believe that they will. They are certainly prepared to negotiate with us about reasonable conditions for exercising the authorities which it is intended should be transferred to them.

It is urgent that they should be shown that we are "dinkum" about this. That is why I wish to be able to show councils that we are, and to give them authority, which the officers of the department agree should be given to them.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think it would serve the purpose of both Chambers if we considered amending the Legislative Council's amendment. I suggest paragraph va might terminate at the word "Act". That would remove the objection I have raised. This clause makes considerable provision for the right of entry. I make this suggestion for what it is worth and hope that the matter will be resolved in some way.

Mr. CASEY: Without reflecting on the member for Flinders, I cannot understand why, at this point of time, he should say that these people are not ready to look after themselves. I feel that Aborigines have remained in their downward state because we have not given them responsibility. The sooner we class them as people and not something else, the better off we will be.

Amendment disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment would seriously hamper the continued existence and effective working of Aboriginal reserve councils.

LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 9. Page 3582.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): The intervening period since I last spoke has shown that there is a generally accepted idea that some amendments to the Bill are necessary and that they will probably be forthcoming. Because of that, members who are now addressing themselves to the Bill are speaking in the dark. I understand that some amendments are to be made, but I would like to know what the Government intends, although it is unlikely that we will get this information until after the

second reading debate. I dislike urging something that someone has already decided shall be done. The necessity for doing something in relation to two phases of this is so obvious that it must be done.

No restriction should be placed on cellar door sales. The proposal that a fixed price should be placed on these sales is utterly wrong. A fixed price could not be imposed in respect of such sales even if it was desirable to do so: as the Attorney-General knows, there are various grades of wine and various types of grape from which wine is made. Some wines are almost double the price of others, and some wines are made for specific purposes. Fixed prices cannot, in justice, be put on these wines. It has not been necessary for years, and it is not necessary now, to have a licence to sell one's own product. Under the provisions of the old Act a winemaker could sell his wine provided he did not take it away from his premises where it was made, so people had to go to get it. There was also a provision that he could hawk the wine, so long as he did not take it outside a local government area. I presume the reason for that proviso was to prevent people from trafficking with Aborigines. Basically, a winemaker always had the right to sell his product provided it was a product of his own grapes. This right was taken over by co-operative companies. The grape co-operatives along the river and elsewhere have done a magnificent job in handling the wine industry and have contributed substantially towards the enormous increase in grape produce in South Australia. It was always assumed that, as co-operatives were a combination of owners, they would have the right to sell their own product, and this right was never challenged.

At one time I was managing director of a winery which for years sold ex the cellar door without any form of retail licence. Many winemakers thought such selling would place them in jeopardy and they did not like the idea of being at an advantage in this way. The present position is that they operate under licence and pay to the Government exactly the same charges as hotel keepers pay. They pay on the total of wine that passes through the cellar doors in the same way as a hotel keeper pays on the total quantity he sells.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That is 5 per cent.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. Possibly the Minister knows the total paid in this way; it must be considerable. All that most small wineries have is a distiller's wine licence but they sell wine and they sell to a clientele. They do not sell through hotels, most of their product being sold through their properties. People come in and buy the wine or it is bottled and taken away to be sold on the wholesale market to other retailers. This system has worked remarkably well and I have never heard complaints about it.

At one time hotel keepers complained that winemakers sold without a licence. However, winemakers have always had some form of licence. They now have a licence that results in the return from their sales to the Government being on exactly the same basis as the return from hotel keepers. Many people who habitually keep wine in their homes like to go to a winery, irrespective of the price of wine, and take delivery of the product themselves. Many people think that wine drawn from the vat is immeasurably better than wine in the bottle, even if it has been in the bottle for only five minutes.

Mr. Casey: Do you think that is true?

Mr. QUIRKE: No, but that is the way people look at it.

Mr. Clark: There is an added attraction.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, people like to go where the wine is made. A person can test before he buys—and he can test after he buys! Wineries are fairly generous in many ways. A winery will always subscribe to everything going on in a district. Wineries will always donate a dozen or so bottles of wine for any raffle in a district. I once had the distinction of donating a dozen bottles of wine for a raffle and winning in the same raffle a dozen bottles of soft drink! That was a dead loss, although I suppose I did get something back. The quantity of wine sold by the big co-operatives on the river ex the cellar door is great indeed. They sell an enormous quantity of wine to people who supply the grapes and to travellers passing through. These sales are inbuilt in the economies of their selling systems and any restriction could cause an economic collapse.

Mr. Casey: You are trying to create a sort of "free port" of winegrowers.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, husbands and wives come to these wineries because the sales take place in cool cellars that are attractive in the summertime. The cellars are well set out and people like to go there; this atmosphere should not be destroyed.

Mr. Casey: Could you define a small winemaker?

Mr. QUIRKE: Any man who crushed up to 100 tons of grapes or even less would be a small winemaker. I could make good wine out of 1cwt. of grapes.

Mr. Casey: Would you tread them?

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member is being facetious. Nevertheless, some excellent wine has been made with clean feet and, if the feet were not clean when the people started, they were clean when they finished. The people who do this know full well that wine goes through a process of fermentation that will throw out any impurities.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Perhaps that accounts for the dirty sox taste of Hunter River wines.

Mr. QUIRKE: Hunter River wine does have a flavour, but it is not wine that should be taken straight. It is a marvellous ingredient in a blend, provided the blend is extended so that it contains more of the other wine than the Hunter River wine. Hunter River wine is highly prized, particularly for that purpose. However, I much prefer South Australian reislings to Hunter River wine.

I do not agree that the proposals in this legislation will not harm the small wineries. It would be impossible to fix a price for the wine. The best wine, as well as the worst, will make people drunk, but little bad wine is manufactured in South Australia today. Restrictions on cellar door trade would greatly reduce the ability to maintain the present grape intake. If the trade were forced out of these places in the interest of selling it through other avenues, the total consumption would decrease. People who buy wine under a two-gallon licence will not buy two dozen bottles from a hotel. The prices are slightly different, but that difference is justified. These places should not have the mark-up of a hotel because they do not carry the costs carried by a hotel.

Wines are reasonably priced and there should be no interference with price-fixing, because competition exists. Some wines are expensive and, obviously, the price of such wines cannot be fixed. Prestige wines on the market today do not return the winemaker any profit, because many of them are years old and it is not possible to make a profit on their sale. The suggestion of being restricted to a wholesaler's retail licence to fix the minimum price would be detrimental to co-operatives, small wineries, and to small winemakers. They are usually family affairs: they do not make a fortune nor do they aspire to do so. They are specialists in their trade, do an excellent job, and should be left alone so that a tradition can be built up in the wine industry, with each man proud to exhibit his wine, the product of his own growing and making.

It is easy for a Commissioner to take conflicting evidence. Some commercial interests would like to destroy the ability of wineries to sell their product and to force the sales through other avenues. This industry cannot be docketed or tagged, because a ton of grapes from a piece of ground will give a different wine each year. This cannot be made into a mass-producing industry. For a variety of reasons, most winemakers have not marketed their own brands: it is not sold through hotels or other avenues, but other people's labels are used for their wine. These people would be severely penalized if they were unable to sell in this manner. Hotel keepers constantly complain about the multiplicity of brands and will not stock new lines, particularly those not backed with heavy advertising. The little man does not advertise as does the large proprietary companies. A hotel keeper would be unwilling to accept stock from people whose name was not wellknown or, probably, up until then was entirely unknown except to people who purchased the product. The small winemaker would suffer the loss of cellar door trade without any guarantee of increasing bulk sales. Nothing is happening that is detrimental to the interests of the people of this State if people market their own wine. The suggestion put forward that sales should be made at retail prices is ridiculous. All the wine sold ex cellar doors today could not be sold through hotels. To assume that it could be is to assume that one cannot break the wine industry, but this could definitely be done, and disruption could be brought into what is now a well ordered business. I know of no-one, except people who might be commercially interested, who would want to destroy the present situation. The companies that enjoy increased sales would require additional bulk supplies. In most cases, this would result in large quantities of wine manufactured by those companies or supplied from selected bulk producers and would restrict wine sales to certain companies, which would be undesirable.

I have seen that happen in the past, and I have seen what can take place in the wine industry. When my company started to sell wine in Sydney, a circular was issued to all the small retailers and people who wanted their own wine, to the effect that if they bought wine from my company or other companies like it, they would be refused supplies that the other wholesalers in New South Wales would normally supply them, unless they were prepared to pay 25 per cent over list prices at the door.

Mr. Jennings: It's a wonder they didn't issue knuckledusters.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am proud to say that I succeeded when everybody else failed to back me. I smashed the ring, and said, "If you cannot get wine I will supply you with it." I started to deliver wine by semi-trailer, but this arrangement soon broke down when the agents went around later to obtain orders and could not get any. We have not had further trouble since. I sent truckloads of flagons to Sydney, where they could not be obtained. Wine was sent over in bulk, labelled in our own stores, and nothing could be done about it. People in Sydney replied by supplying plastic flagons, but nobody bought them because they could not see the wine in them. The little man has to keep on fighting for his life all the time, and he can only do this by having a really good product. I am aware of the Attorney-General's whimsical fancy of going around and inspecting these places. He likes a dry red wine, and so do I and so do other members. Any move to forestall the sale of wine at cellar doors should be discouraged.

Grapegrowers have to be paid reasonable prices for their grapes. The co-operative winery pays so much by way of first payment by the end of June, and then, upon realization, other payments during the year. In any one year now they get the full price for the grapes, even though some of the money comes from sales made four years ago. This method works very well, but it is on a delicate balance, although it is a true co-operative way of marketing and selling. If the cellar door sales were taken away from co-operatives, it would upset the balance of the whole industry of a particular winery. Co-operative wineries enjoy a higher percentage of cellar door trade than does the proprietary company, excluding the small maker, whose percentage would be higher than that of the co-operative company. Much of the co-operative's sales comes from the shareholders, whose livelihood largely depends on the ability of the co-operative to sell the finished product of their labour. Murray River co-operatives are situated in remote areas and towns where hotel licences are restricted to one for each town. Farmers and other people in outback areas tend to purchase wine in quantity in their own containers. People from the Far North who come to town perhaps once or twice a year call in at the wineries of their choice and pick up their supplies, often in their own containers. I do not like the idea of people using their own containers, which is something my company used to discourage. My company liked people to take wine in glass containers.

We cannot afford (not only for the economy of the State but in the interests of individual wineries) to interfere with a practice which has been built up in the State and which people accept. On the point of club licences, there are various types of club, but the ones that concern me are those that have been established for about 100 years. There are clubs in towns like Eudunda, Tanunda, and towns along the Murray River. There are clubs everywhere in the closely settled parts of central South Australia that have now become part of the social life of the people in those areas. To prohibit such clubs, after three years, from selling to people for taking away is ridiculous nonsense.

Another restraint on trade will be the effect of the provision that liquor supplies are to be purchased from the nearest hotel, at whatever price the hotel will sell them, and then retailed. When Minister of Repatriation, I realized early in the piece that the people on Kangaroo Island, particularly those connected with the soldier settlement, felt isolated. Living on an island that had been cast out of virgin scrub, they enjoyed little or no social life. There were three hotels on the island—two at Kingscote and one at Penneshaw.

A person living in the middle of the island (which is 90 miles long and 50 miles wide) was about 40 miles away from any form of social life. However, halls were built in various localities on the island. I had a hand in urging residents on the island to conduct a local option poll of all residents for a licensed club at Parndana, in the middle of the island. Although we were told that we would never be successful, the poll was carried. I did many unorthodox things, including pleading the people's case in the Licensing Court. A club is now established in the centre of a thriving social community that boasts of a bigger store than previously existed, three or four churches and a magnificent hall, in addition to a hall used by the Returned Servicemen's League.

Under the Bill, however, the club at Parndana would not be allowed to sell a bottle of beer off the premises in three years' time. That would damn the whole set-up. There is no rhyme or reason in that provision. As it would necessitate residents travelling to Kingscote to order their liquor supplies from hotels, I do not think any member would agree that that was reasonable. I sincerely hope the Attorney-General will tell us what amendments he proposes, because if none is proposed by the sponsors of the Bill, we shall have to proceed

to draft amendments ourselves, to try to overcome what are obvious difficulties. If all the Commissioner's recommendations were carried to their full extent, obvious wrongs would result. We do not have to tell the Attorney-General about the difficulties that may result; he is sufficiently wise in his generation, and I hope he will move some amendments to the Bill. Will he let us know what those amendments are, so that the debate may be short-circuited later and so that many people will be relieved of worry? If the present provision concerning clubs is implemented, the whole livelihood of some people will be threatened.

This Bill was badly needed. The Licensing Act was a dreadful thing, whereas the new legislation will be easy to follow. Nothing was more contradictory than the original Act, one section of which permitted one thing and another forbade it. The Act contains relics of the old days: a publican had to allow the corpse of a person, found dead in the street, to be taken into his hotel. Such archaic provisions have been removed only by this measure. I congratulate the Commissioner on what he has undertaken. Although I approve of most of what he has recommended, I do not approve of his recommendations regarding ex cellar door sales, or of the attitude to clubs, to which I have referred.

Mr. Ryan: You had better give some credit to the Government.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Government set up the Commission; is it basking in reflected glory?

Mr. Ryan: If you had been in Government you wouldn't have got this.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know. I am not Nostradamus. I am prepared to give the Government credit for it—

Mr. Ryan: Hear! Hear!

Mr. QUIRKE: —if that is what it craves. However, I had intended to reserve that concession until I saw what amendments were to be moved, for I might have to remove the Government's halo. I support the measure and hope that the final result will be a measure that will make many people happier than they are at present.

Mr. McKee: Many people unhappy, too!

Mr. QUIRKE: That reminds me of the fox and the grapes; the fox, not being able to reach the grapes at the top of the vine, declared them sour and left them. I hope that amendments to the Bill will improve the measure to the satisfaction of the industries with which I am associated.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 21, at 2 p.m.