HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 22, 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

TEACHER'S DEMOTION.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Commission has been issued to Justice Walters in respect of the Royal Commission concerning the Darwin headmaster (Mr. Murrie) and, if it has, what are the terms of reference?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That matter is now being dealt with, and the terms of reference will be made known as soon as possible.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is presumed that the appointment of Mr. Justice Walters as a Royal Commissioner will be made pursuant to the powers contained in the Royal Commissions Act of 1917, which has application within South Australia. In so far as the inquiry concerns action alleged to have been taken by Mr. Murrie at a location outside South Australia (at Darwin), can the Minister of Education say what jurisdiction the Commissioner will have to take evidence and conduct proceedings at Darwin where the effect of the alleged action is primarily centred, and where parents and members of the public whose evidence may be essential to the inquiry are located?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I should like the honourable member to refer that question to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The headmaster of the school is employed subject to the Education Act of South Australia. In consequence, he is subject to the jurisdiction of that Act in this State. It is possible for us to conduct a Royal Commission in South Australia, relating to any matters, for the peace, order or good government of the State, and that includes any contracts the Government of the State makes for the provision of services to another Government. Consequently, there will be no difficulties about the Royal Commissioner's being able to investigate all the matters concerned with the employment of a person under the Education Act of this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General has pointed out that the teachers at the school are servants of the Education Department and, therefore, the department controls their movements and can, no doubt, from a practical point of view ensure their attendance before the Royal Commission. I point out, however, that undoubtedly some of those who will want to give evidence or whom the Royal Commissioner will want to hear are not servants of the Education Department but are private citizens living in Darwin. I have before me the Royal Commissions Act, 1917, which is a Statute of this State and which runs only in this State. It is this Statute that confers certain powers and authorities and creates certain offences in regard to Royal Commissions. Will the Attorney-General, as the chief law officer of the Crown, say whether in his view it is competent for the Commissioner to sit in Darwin, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to exercise, in the Northern Territory, the powers contained in the Royal Commissions Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not considered the question of compelling witnesses: I think that would be for the Royal Commissioner to decide. On the other hand, I have not the slightest doubt that the Minister of Education will ensure that every officer of the department who is involved in this inquiry will be available to the Commissioner. If other witnesses wish to give evidence, I should think there would be no difficulty about their giving it. I point out to the honourable member that there have been many cases of Royal Commissions in one State sitting in another State and taking evidence in that State. Indeed, the Royal Commission on the Licensing Act in South Australia involved the taking of evidence in other States, as the honourable member will see from the report of the Royal Commissioner. This is not new. Indeed, the Royal Commissions on the Licensing Act in other States involved the taking of evidence not only in other States but also overseas. I cannot see that there would be any difficulty in this regard, and I cannot see why members opposite are upset about the full and public inquiry that will take place in this instance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I welcome the fullest possible inquiry into the Murrie case and, when I say that, I think I speak for all members on this side. I must also say, in explanation of my question, that I was surprised at the Minister's *volte face* yesterday when he went from one extreme to the other. He had first refused to give any information on the matter and he then announced that a Royal Commission was to be appointed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot debate a question or express an opinion. I ask him to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. As the Royal Commission involves much cost to those involved in the matter, and as Mr. Murrie will undoubtedly be involved in financial sacrifice (or financial expenditure anyway) as a result of the Minister's announcement yesterday, can the Minister say whether he intends to make certain that Mr. Murrie is not out of pocket, by providing counsel to appear on his behalf before the Commission?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I ask the honourable member to put that question on notice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Attorney expect that Justice Walters, as a Royal Commissioner, will go to Darwin to take evidence? I may say in further explanation that in the time I have had to look at the Licensing Royal Commission's report, it appears that the Commissioner there did not take evidence in another State, but he merely made inquiries and observations. Does the Attorney, as chief law officer of the Crown, express the opinion that the Royal Commissioner will have jurisdiction in the Northern Territory pursuant to the South Australian Royal Commissions Act?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable the Attorney-General does not have to reply to the question if he does not wish to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not bound to express an opinion on this matter. Submissions have been made to the Royal Commissioner which, I have no doubt, he will determine in due course. If the honourable member has submissions to make on this score, I imagine he will be able to make them. I have no doubt that the Royal Commissioner will be able to make the fullest possible public inquiry and obtain the necessary evidence to satisfy both the public and the members of this House. Members opposite can be satisfied in that regard.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have done as the Minister of Education bade me on a previous question. As I cannot and will not assume that the Minister would joke about a matter in which the reputation, circumstances and position of an officer of his department are at stake, will the Premier say whether the Government intends this House to sit next Tuesday so that I may get an answer to the question I have put on notice on a matter of public importance?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The two most important matters the Government desires to have considered before this House prorogues are the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill, which is the first Order of the Day on the Notice Paper, and the Licensing Bill, which is the second Order of the Day. When Orders of the Day, Government Business, are called on, I intend to ask that consideration of Order of the Day No. 1 be suspended until after consideration of Order of the Day No. 2, probably at about 5 p.m. or 5.30 p.m. I assume that the debate will then proceed on Order of the Day No. 1.

Mr. Millhouse: You are an optimist!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At least I am the member for Edwardstown and the Premier of this State. What the honourable member is remains to be seen.

Mr. Jennings: That's a matter of conjecture!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If this is not satisfactory to the honourable member, the House will continue to sit until about midnight, when it will adjourn, and, if the business is not concluded by that time and these two matters have not been dealt with, the House will resume at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier reconsider his allocation of time for debate in the House at the end of this sitting? Copies of the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill were placed on members' files at 12 noon—

Mr. Millhouse: Later than that.

Mr. HALL: Perhaps, but that is sufficient to demonstrate that members have not had time to study the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is something that happened constantly under the previous Government.

Mr. HALL: It is about time the Government stood on its own two feet and forgot the previous Government. It is only using it as an excuse. Members have had time to consider the Licensing Bill, but it will be futile for the Opposition to proceed if we have not read the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill. Will the Premier reconsider his decision?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Since I spoke a short time ago, I have been informed that arrangements were confirmed with another place to proceed until the session is completed today, tomorrow, or the next day without a break. This House will now remain in session in harmony with the other place.

Mr. Jennings: In disharmony!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Earlier this afternoon it was suggested, rather humorously, but taken up seriously, how we could meet the position, so that as much time as possible could be devoted to debate. I assured the Opposition Whip (Mrs. Steele) that I thought the Licensing Bill should be debated until about 5 p.m., then adjourned to allow discussion on the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill. I also suggested that this House would accept the proposed amendments to this Bill adopted in another place without amendment, although a further amendment is to be moved by the Minister of Lands, in charge of the Bill, to provide for inspection of motor cars by police officers in used car sale yards. If the Leader and his colleagues would conclude their remarks on the Licensing Bill at 5 p.m., the House could proceed with the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill some time this afternoon and again this evening, and so dispose of it. I hope that the Licensing Bill will pass the second reading before the House adjourns, but I cannot forecast the time of adjournment.

SAND.

Mr. HURST: On March 14 I asked the Minister of Marine a question about the removal of sand from the dunes in the Semaphore South and Tennyson areas, in reply to which the Minister said that the Australian Glass Manufacturers Company Proprietary Limited leased from the Harbors Board 10 acres of land just north of Estcourt House and that, under the terms of the lease, the company could remove sand to a certain depth. Will the Minister say what that depth is?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question, I have obtained the following information from the Director of Marine and Harbors:

The distance of the seaward boundary from high water mark of the area leased to the Australian Glass Manufacturers Company Proprietary Limited varies from about 238ft. at the southern end to about 284ft. at the northern end. The agreed levels to which sand could be removed were R.L. 125-00 over the area about 80ft. back from the seaward boundary, then reducing to levels along the Military Road boundary generally complying with the level of the crown of that road. These levels varied from R.L. 119-15 in the south-eastern corner to R.L. 122-34 in the north-eastern corner.

WALLAROO SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: Just before the end of last year it was reported in the Wallaroo local press that a prefabricated school building had been approved for the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre at Wallaroo, and it was believed that the building would arrive early in the new year. Provision was to be made in the building for woodwork and dressmaking classes. Will the Minister of Education confer with his departmental officers and ascertain when the building is likely to arrive at Wallaroo and be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

SANCTUARIES.

Mr. CURREN: Much interest is being shown in fauna sanctuaries by people in my district. At present, there is great confusion about just what is the position in what was formerly known as the Cobdogla sanctuary. Can the Minister of Agriculture clarify this position for me and for other residents in my district?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the honourable member said, much interest has been expressed by people in his district, and by other people, interested in conservation and game reserves. Much controversy has arisen over the matter and many letters have been written to the newspapers. Because of the interest expressed, I obtained the following report:

The Cobdogla sanctuary consists of the aggregate area of land and water of 14 different landowners. The total area was previously proclaimed a sanctuary under the Animals and Birds Protection Act which has now been repealed. The entire area is to be re-proclaimed as a sanctuary under the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964, and action to do this will be taken shortly. However, before this action can be taken, it is necessary to obtain the written consent of each of the 14 different landowners. Twelve such consents have already been received and officers of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department will interview shortly the remaining two owners to endeavour to obtain their written consent. Immediately these are received, the whole area will be re-proclaimed as a sanctuary under the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964.

In the meantime, any landowner concerned may prevent shooting on his property by invoking the provisions of section 45 of the Fauna Conservation Act. This section of the Act provides heavy penalties for persons trespassing and shooting on the property of a private landowner without the consent of that landowner. My department is prepared to make available the services of its inspectors to assist any landowner in preventing shooting by any unauthorized person. The Commissioner of Police has also stated that his officers are available to assist likewise. Each police officer has the requisite authority as he is automatically appointed as an inspector under the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964.

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, I noticed in the press that the Field and Game Association had protested about certain provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act, and maintained that the Act had been prepared for landholders by a group of landholders. As the legislation was introduced into Parliament comprising members of the legal profession, trade unionists, and others, and as it had the unanimous support of this House, can the Minister of Agriculture comment on this statement and can he say what his reaction was when he received the petition?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This interesting question arises from a difference of opinion. I can understand the extreme differences of opinion between people interested in conservation and those interested in shooting as a sport. I am a keen conservationist: I do not believe in shooting animals or birds unless there is a special reason for doing so. We have to live with persons who have different views from our own. Co-operation between the two types of person is needed, but it is difficult to get this co-operation when a person has a strong opinion one way or the other. It would be a reflection on the former Minister (which I would not agree with) if I were to take notice of the suggestion that it was drawn up by a group of landholders. This matter was discussed fully in this House and, after all, all sections of the community are represented here. In fact, there could not be a more varied group of people than there is in both Houses of Parliament. It should be realized that this legislation has been carefully prepared and brought down to meet the wishes of most people.

METERS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I asked the Minister of Works whether his department could install water meters below ground level in new subdivisions. I understand the Minister now has a reply to my question.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Requests to have water meters placed underground have been made to the department from time to time, but because of economic difficulties these have not been granted. From the practical viewpoint the present method saves time and money, advantages which heavily outweigh any to be gained by below-ground installation. Investigation in other States has shown that several authorities support this viewpoint, the one exception being Canberra, where meters are placed below ground mainly because of the likelihood of damage from frost. It may be aesthetically more satisfying for the consumer to keep meters out of sight but, in view of the difficulties involved and the cost factor, alteration of the present procedure does not appear to be warranted.

FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. COUMBE: In this morning's press appeared publicity about the construction of the Festival Hall, which we hope will be built at some time in the future. In view of the importance of this project to South Australia, will the Premier use his good offices and consult with the Lord Mayor and, if he is agreeable, approach the Prime Minister to see whether financial assistance, for which a plea has been made, could be forthcoming?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the present or former Lord Mayor of Adelaide desires to approach me on this matter, I will make a time available for discussion. If there is any suggestion worthy of consideration in relation to an approach to the Prime Minister, such action can be determined at that meeting.

BRIGHTON ROAD.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question regarding the programme for reconstructing and widening Brighton Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the work on the Dunrobin Road to Stopford Road section of Brighton Road has been further delayed by acquisition problems. Construction is now expected to be substantially completed in October, 1967. Reconstruction of the rest of Brighton Road is expected to commence in July, 1968, with continuous work to follow until completion. Because of difficulties in relation to widening, this project is planned for progress from south to north.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: On August 12, 1965, I asked the Minister of Education for information on the Education Department's plans to replace wooden classrooms at the Nuriootpa High School with a solid construction building or additions, and the Minister said that plans for new solid construction additions were nearly completed. Will he say whether those plans have been completed and, if they have, whether they can be sighted by the high school council? Will he also say whether it is intended that the construction of the solid construction additions or new building will be proceeded with soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Plans for the new type solid construction high school buildings are virtually completed and, when they are, they can be sighted by the Nuriootpa High School Council. However, it is still not possible to indicate when new solid construction additions will be erected at the Nuriootpa High School because with present resources such high school buildings must be limited to areas that do not have a high school at present, to schools that cannot house expected increased enrolments without consolidation of buildings, and to the completion of schools the erection of which has been planned in two stages.

VETERINARY SURGEONS.

Mr. McKEE: Some of my constituents have asked whether it would be possible to have a veterinary surgeon appointed to practise at Port Pirie. I understand that there is a shortage of veterinary surgeons in rural areas. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether this is so and, if it is, whether the Government has done anything to overcome the shortage?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is usually the task of the people of a district to see whether they can encourage a veterinary surgeon to come there. However, I understand that the veterinary surgeon nearest to Port Pirie is at Clare, but once a month he visits Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta. He advertises in the newspaper the day he is likely to be at these towns. Whether Port Pirie has a veterinary surgeon would depend largely on the quantity of stock in that area. Some veterinary surgeons practise in small animals, but this is not the concern of my department, which is interested in providing service for people with stock. When I came into office two veterinary science cadetships were provided each year by the department to encourage students to take up this important profession, but I considered that two were not sufficient and immediately increased the number to six. In a year or two we should see the benefits of that increase, as there is a distinct need of veterinary surgeons in South Australia. Previously, veterinary surgeons were bonded to the department but this practice no longer applies, and they can go anywhere in South Australia. We realize that the department receives much assistance from them, as they play an important part in tuberculosis testing of dairy herds, and receive from this source some remuneration that encourages them to establish in certain areas. I realized the need to encourage more veterinary science graduates to set up in country areas and, soon after I assumed office, I encouraged a veterinary surgeon who was considering accepting a practice in Western Australia to stay here, and now he is satisfactorily established at Naracoorte.

STREAKY BAY SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning an area school at Streaky Bay?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At no time has the Education Department considered the possibility of establishing an area school at Piednippie. In relation to providing a new school at Streaky Bay, the Public Buildings Department has recently been asked to comment on the suitability of 15 acres of Crown land near the Streaky Bay camping ground as a site for a new school. When this report is received further consideration will be given to the matter.

NORTH MOUNT GAMBIER SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the heating of classrooms at the North Mount Gambier Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of the eight timber classrooms at the school, four have gas heating, two have electric heating and two have no heating as yet. An order has been issued for the installation of gas heating in the two unheated rooms, and the work is expected to be done before the winter.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Works a question about the acquisition and installation of the pumps at Tailem Bend and Coomandook on the Tailem Bend to Keith main. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Tenders for these pumps are still being examined by the department. I have received an assurance from the Engineer for Water Supply, however, that the temporary pumps now in use on the completed portion of the pipeline can adequately meet the demand and will continue to do so as mainlaying progresses.

BREATHALYSER TEST.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of March 9 about the strengths of various alcoholic drinks, both in regard to proof and quantity, and other matters related thereto?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question asked by the honourable member has two main

parts: first, the alcohol content of common alcoholic drinks, and secondly, the quantity of various drinks needed to produce a blood alcohol level of .08 gr. per centum in a given time. A precise statement of the amount of any drink consumed in a given time, which will produce a specified blood alcohol level, is not possible. The actual blood level depends not only on the amount drunk and the time but also on the strength of the drink, the rate of absorption and elimination (which in turn depends on food and other drinks taken) and the rate of energy expenditure. However, experience has shown that a blood alcohol level of .08 gr. per centum indicates that the subject has consumed at least four schooners of beer or at least four ounces of whisky. He may, in fact, have consumed considerably more, but it can be taken that if he has drunk less than four schooners of beer or four ounces of whisky his blood alcohol will not reach the prescribed figure.

The Victorian Royal Commission made extensive and interesting investigations of the effect of various forms of drinking on blood alcohol. Interest centred on producing a level of .05 gr. per centum (five-eighths of the specified South Australian figure). In brief, it was shown that, during an evening dinner with the usual wines and other beverages, very few test subjects reached the level of .05 per cent, but during an evening smoke social, with much less food and very probably more alcohol, many people did so. I ask leave to have a table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

TABLE OF APPROXIMATE ALCOHOL CONTENT OF BEVERAGES

Type of beverage.	Size of drink.	Volume of drink.		Alcohol content.			
		Fluid ounces.	Millilitres.	Percent proof.	Percent by volume.	Percent by weight.	Actual weight in grammes.
Beer—							
West End and Southwark.	Pint	15	426	7.8	4.5	4.15	17.7
	Schooner ...	9	256				10.6
	Butcher.....	6	170				7.1
	Bottle	26	739				30.7
Cooper's	Bottle	26	739	9.6	5.5	5.1	37.7
Scotch whisky	Nip	1	28.4	70.0	40.0	37.0	10.5
Australian whisky	Nip	1	28.4	67.5	38.6	35.6	10.1
Imported brandy	Nip	1	28.4	75.0	43.0	40.0	11.3
Australian brandy	Nip	1	28.4	65.0	37.0	34.0	9.6
Gin and rum	Almost identical with Australian whisky						
Fortified wines (dry sherry and port)	Glass	2	57.0	33.0	19.0	17.5	10.0
Table wines (claret, hock, etc.)	Glass	3½	100	21	12	11	10.9
	Bottle	26	739				81.3

KEPPOCH ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Landholders in the Keppoch area have expressed concern about the slow progress in the supply of electricity to their area (the scheme being an adjunct to the reticulation scheme that has already taken place north of Padthaway) because of other works taking place elsewhere. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Keppoch scheme is progressing as planned?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although, as far as I know, there has been no variation in the programme, I will have the matter investigated, and let the honourable member have a written reply during the recess.

PARA WIRRA RESERVE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Since the official opening of the Para Wirra national park in September, 1963, visiting members of the public have taken much interest in the fauna and flora at the park, and the service received. Regrettably, however, no permanent tourist buses visit the park, visitors mainly comprising casual tourists. I believe one reason for this is that the state of the road leading into the park deters the use of heavier vehicles. I point out that as much encouragement as possible should be given to all types of visitor. In addition, on days when a fire ban has been issued, visitors intending to have

a barbecue meal at the park are prohibited from doing so, because of the type of barbecue provided there. This difficulty may be overcome by providing gas barbecues similar to those in existence at the Healesville sanctuary in Victoria. Further, some patrons have expressed disappointment at the absence of a swimming pool in the park. Will the Premier therefore have my suggestions considered by officers of the Tourist Bureau and/or the National Parks Commission?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will have the matter examined, although I doubt the value of constructing a swimming pool at the park at this stage unless, of course, it is to be used by ducks, which will be added to the sanctuary as the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has suggested. Although the matter concerning the roadway into the park will also be considered, I should not like to become involved with the Agriculture Department concerning fire bans and barbecues. I will let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

AGRICULTURAL COURSES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about agricultural courses at the Adelaide Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The course referred to by the honourable member was really a series of courses in six separate subjects, namely, sheep and cattle husbandry and veterinary hygiene, field crops and pastures, soil science and plant nutrition, irrigation, farm machinery, and economic entomology. The courses were developed after close consultation with the Institute of Agricultural Science and, with the assistance of that body, the Agriculture Department and other organizations, which provided the specialized lecturers needed. The courses as a whole were most successful, although the greatest demand was for the course in sheep and cattle husbandry and veterinary hygiene. All told there were 183 enrolments in the six courses, and 32 lecturers were used. These adult courses were included in the consolidated advertisement published in the *Advertiser* on January 21, 1967, as being available again this year, subject of course to sufficient applications for enrolment being received.

The names of inquirers have been recorded and they have been told that classes will be started subject to sufficient enrolments being received. So far, 30 inquiries have been made for the six subjects. It is likely that instruction in at least some of the classes, the longest of which is of 20 weeks' duration, will start at the beginning of the second term. At the present time, at the request of the Director of Agriculture, these classes are being provided only in the metropolitan area. However, it should be noted that persons who enrolled in 1966 came from a wide range of occupations, and included some people who travelled considerable distances to attend.

CLEAR PLASTIC.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the supply of clear plastic to school libraries for covering books?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Clear plastic has not been supplied to schools during the last few months because the sum already spent on equipment for primary schools has exceeded the quota allocated. For this reason it has been necessary to curtail the supply of less essential items, and clear plastic has been considered one of these items. Heads of schools have been notified to apply again in June when it will again be possible to make supplies available.

GAS.

Mr. HALL: During the debate on the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Bill, the Premier indicated that a further investigation was being made concerning the costing of a possible western alternative pipeline route. Whereas the Premier was somewhat vague about it, I understand that the Minister of Mines has said definitely that the Bechtel Pacific Corporation is investigating this matter. As the Premier said that information on the matter might be available before the House rose, can he now make it available?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No. Although some suggestions have been made concerning this matter, Cabinet has not yet been able to discuss them with the authorities concerned. However, it has been indicated that, whereas the eastern route was originally to cost about $2,000,000 less than the western route, the difference in the estimates has now been reduced by about $250,000. It can be seen, therefore, that the cost of the eastern route is still lower. As further information on this matter is not yet to hand, I am unable at this stage to say what decision wil be made. Apropos what I have said, if the eastern route is still a cheaper proposition it will be adopted. I have every reason to believe that

there will be no alteration to the present proposition. However, when the full report is available these matters will be thoroughly examined.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the repainting of the Port Pirie Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that public tenders were called in July, 1966, for repairs and painting at the Port Pirie Primary and Infants School, but no satisfactory tender was received. It was subsequently decided to carry out the work by departmental labour. The departmental works programme has been such that it has not been possible to date to undertake the work. In view of the priority given to this work and the present funds position, it may be possible to again call tenders late this financial year to commit funds early in 1967-68.

YORKEY CROSSING.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I believe that a restriction has been placed on the total load that can be carried across the Great Western Highway bridge at Port Augusta. The Eyre Peninsula Road Transport Federation, at its annual meeting last Saturday, viewed this matter with concern, and has asked me to inquire about the effect of the restriction. Of course, the operators in that area are greatly concerned with the matter, particularly as the Yorkey crossing (the only alternative to the Great Western Highway bridge) is not particularly good, the roads leading to it from the main highways on the other side of Port Augusta not being all-weather roads. The operators are concerned that, in the event of bad weather, they may not be able to make the round trip. Of course, apart from weather conditions, additional distance and added cost are involved although that is not such a serious matter. Will the Minister of Lands discuss this matter with the Minister of Roads with a view to ensuring that the Highways Department effect such repairs and improvements to the Yorkey crossing and its access roads as are necessary to make it an all-weather route? Also, will he ask his colleague to give an assurance that, in the event of this crossing being unusable by heavy traffic (probably because of bad weather), the load limit on the Great Western Highway bridge will be temporarily waived to ensure that traffic can pass through Port Augusta by one route or the other?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague. I shall write to the honourable member giving him the information.

MURRAY DRAINAGE.

Mr. CURREN: In the *Murray Pioneer* of Thursday, March 16, under the heading "Department Officer Addresses Field and Game Association", appears the following report of a meeting held at Loxton:

Discussion was also made with regard to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's avowed intention to drain all creeks, swamps and billabongs in the Murray system from the border to the barrage at Goolwa. The general feeling of the committee was that, if and when this did take place, it would turn the Murray basin into a "Death Valley". The breeding and feeding of water fowl and native fish in these areas would cease to exist.

Will the Minister of Works have this matter examined to see whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to carry out this drastic proposal?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I, too, saw the article to which the honourable member referred and I was perturbed at the ridiculousness of the statement therein. This morning I have discussed the matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief who tells me that the department does not intend to carry out the proposals referred to. Nevertheless, I have asked for a full report from the department on the proposals, and I shall inform the honourable member when that report is to hand.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the proposed building programme of the new Glengowrie High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: There has been no change in the proposals for the new Glengowrie High School. Students will be accepted for the new school from the beginning of 1968 and will be housed temporarily at the former Sturt Primary School. The building programme for the new school is proceeding as expected.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago I asked a question about the provision of automatic devices to afford protection at several railway crossings at Mount Gambier. At that time I was informed that certain railway crossings

were on a list of priorities. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport when work on railway crossings at Mount Gambier is expected to be carried out?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will ascertain this information from my colleague and forward it to the honourable member.

MATHEMATICS COURSE.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the new mathematics course in schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: All schools are expected to teach the new mathematics courses in grade 1 and grade 2 in 1967. The length of time needed for training varies with individual teachers. In the grades 1 and 2 courses there is obviously little if any new mathematics for teachers to learn. The mathematics in the new courses, with the exception of work on "sets", is essentially the same as in previous courses. The changes in the courses are in method. Most of the training required must be done by the teachers themselves, who need to familiarize themselves with the content and the methods suggested in the handbooks of suggestions, programmes, timetabling and assignments which have been supplied well in advance. Teachers must study the courses thoroughly in order to teach the courses effectively. This applies with equal force to other courses which are from time to time introduced.

Inspectors of schools have organized numerous inservice training courses for teachers to study the content and method of teaching the new courses. Certain schools have also been selected in each district for observation visits by teachers. A recent survey of inspectors' districts indicates that a very considerable number of inservice courses or observation visits have been carried out. Many more have been arranged for this year. In addition, each district inspector has under his supervision a teacher who has been relieved of all class teaching duties for at least the first half of 1967. These teachers are well trained in the new mathematics and visit schools at the district inspector's direction to advise and assist teachers in the classroom. Teachers have received training and assistance in mathematics on a far greater scale than has ever been given to the introduction in primary schools of any new course of any kind. The new courses, for all grades, are being introduced progressively in South Australia, so that teachers at each level can be thoroughly trained. In most other States the new courses have been introduced at all grade levels at the one time.

The outline of the course, handbooks of suggestions, suggested timetabling and programming have been made available to all such teachers. It is not possible to give a precise figure as to how many teachers of grades 1 and 2 have attended inservice courses or made observation visits, but in almost every school at least one teacher has done so and is well equipped to assist the other teachers. In a great number of schools all teachers of grades 1 and 2 have attended inservice courses or made observation visits. These replies apply equally to schools in the Northern Territory as they do to those in South Australia.

BORDERTOWN RAILWAY YARD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some time ago, I asked the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, to obtain a report regarding the completion of phase 3 of the railway yards at Bordertown, more specifically regarding the proposals for improving the roadways in the existing yards. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport states:

Because of priorities, the third stage of the alterations to the Bordertown station yard has not been included in the draft Loan Estimates for 1967-68. Even if the financial provision had been, it is doubtful whether this work, which comprises the lengthening of two tracks on the north side of the southern end of the station yard, could be undertaken physically during the next financial year. The condition of the station roadways is already receiving attention.

MARRYATVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding Marryatville Primary School improvements?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that the heating requirements of classrooms have been investigated. An estimate of cost has been prepared to install new heaters in those areas where improvements are considered necessary. The priority for this work is being considered in relation to other works on hand and the availability of funds. Every consideration will be given to undertaking this work at the earliest opportunity. The condition of the classroom floors has been investigated and an estimate of cost prepared. The actual commencement of this work will depend on the priority allotted in relation to other works on hand. It is proposed to proceed with the provision of new toilet seats and an electric incinerator in the girls' toilet as an urgent matter.

INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier give me the comparative rates for motor vehicle insurance in the various States of the Commonwealth that he promised me recently?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The premiums charged for compulsory third party insurance for private cars are as follows:

	Metropolitan.	Country.
	$	$
South Australia	27.50	25.00
New South Wales	26.95	18.15
Victoria	28.52	21.52
Queensland	20.00	20.00
Western Australia	25.20	25.20
Tasmania	9.80	9.80

For comprehensive insurance, many changes are being made at present and the picture is quite unclear. As soon as it is possible to get information giving a reasonable comparison between States, I will make it available.

FERTILIZER.

Mr. HALL: In today's *Australian* appears the following report:

Imports of crude and manufactured fertilizers are mainly responsible for a $9,000,000 jump in Australia's import bill for the first eight months of this financial year. This is contributing towards Australia's unfavourable trading balance caused by imports exceeding exports. In its last budget, the Government announced that it would pay an $80 a ton subsidy on nitrogenous fertilizer.

Preliminary investigations, it is reported, have been made and land has been purchased for the possible establishment of a nitrogenous fertilizer plant at Wallaroo using natural gas which might become available to that town. Not only is this an important item to the district of Wallaroo, but obviously from the above report it could be important to Australia's agricultural industries and balance of trade. As South Australia is still at this stage in a competitive position *vis-a-vis* other States in relation to the establishment of a nitrogenous fertilizer works, will the Premier take this need fully into account when the route of the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide is considered by Cabinet?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am mindful of the importance of establishing the industry at Wallaroo, and I have communicated directly with the responsible people in the United States of America. I have interviewed certain representatives of their companies in Adelaide, and I have given them the assurance this way: that, if and when they have an economic proposition on the use of gas, they will get a priority for a supply, and there will be no need to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee.

HOPE VALLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 18, in reply to a question, the Minister of Education said that the existing inadequate fencing at the Hope Valley Primary School would be replaced, but that the commencement of the work would depend on the priorities allocated to other works in hand. Has the Minister any further information on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that funds have been allocated to enable work to proceed on the replacement of the boundary fence of the Hope Valley Primary School. Arrangements have been made for the work to be carried out at the earliest possible date.

EGGS.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities charge is to be increased for the remaining three months of the year because of increased production. This will mean that the growers will receive less for their eggs and there will be a greater margin between the increased price the consumer now has to pay and the amount the producer is to receive. I understand also that there are moves afoot to request that poultry farmers be registered so that this increase in production can be controlled. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether an approach has been made to the Agriculture Department on this matter and indicate the Government's attitude towards a restriction on production so that a reasonable price can be paid?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have noticed articles in a newspaper published by the poultry industry suggesting that an approach will be made with regard to registration, but this has not been brought to my notice officially and no approach has been made to me. As the honourable member has referred to an increase in the C.E.M.A. levy, the following report should be of interest:

In 1965-66 the loss was $226,437 at 70c levy, based on a total hen production of 9,458,000 birds. In 1966-67 the budget was based on a 1965-66 egg production, and hens expected were 9,916,000. The levy was fixed at 91c on this estimate, which was a 5 per cent increase expected. It was revised in October to 9,220,000 birds. It now showed an income budget figure from 9,220,000 birds at 91c, which equals $8,390,200. Expenditure by way of reimbursement, etc., was estimated to be $7,428,564, which gave us a safety margin of $961,636, or about 12 per cent.

In 1965-66, from 9,948,000 birds, average production was 14.05 dozen eggs a bird. In 1966-67, from 9,220,000 birds, until the end of October, estimate was 15.26 dozen. (South Australian average was up 2¾ dozen.) This was caused by new methods of farm management. In the January review we find hens up 60,000 to 9,260,000 and eggs up another 1,061,000 dozen following the pattern of above. This meant loss of safety margin, plus a sudden unexpected drop in export prices.

This January, review showed an expected loss of $1,484,000, or 5.21c a dozen on eggs produced to the end of June. On a 15 dozen hen, the levy equals 6.066 at 91c or 6.7 at $1. Rather than collapse prices, it was unanimously voted to increase the levy to make the last 6 periods rise 1½c, equal to about three-fifths of a cent on all eggs produced for the year.

If $1 is persevered with, 1967-68 levy would fall back to equal portions for each period. Up to February 25, 1967, after levy taken out for 1966-67, the net price is 36.49c. Up to the same period in 1965-66, the price is 33.36c.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Will the maximum contribution of $1 a bird per annum be sufficient to meet the future costs of the scheme?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think the answer is bound up in the reply I gave. All egg boards have gone fully into this matter through C.E.M.A. to try to arrive at a suitable amount. As a result, it was felt that $1 would meet the situation. The Eastern States, particularly New South Wales, had added another 1c a dozen eggs for their own pool levy. This applies to New South Wales and Southern Queensland, but we have not had to resort to this. Despite this, the poultry farmer is a little over 3c a dozen better off this year than he was last year, a year in which the price was up on the previous year when C.E.M.A. did not operate.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Last year the Minister of Education obtained a report for me on overcrowding at the Nailsworth school, where there are three schools together. A considerable time has elapsed since then, and I understand that certain properties adjoining the school property have come on to the market. Will the Minister of Education during the recess obtain a further report from his department on whether in the changed circumstances additional properties could be obtained economically with a view to increasing the available area at this school which, as the Minister knows, is grossly overcrowded?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

ORAL SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: A sum of $1,600 appeared on the Estimates for the current financial year as a grant towards the building of two new classrooms at the South Australian Oral School. Can the Treasurer say when that sum is likely to be paid to the organization?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The sum of $1,600 has been provided on the 1966-67 Estimates as a one-third contribution towards a building. This sum is available for payment upon application being made to the Accountant of the Education Department and on adequate evidence being given that the building costs have been incurred.

HARBOURS BAN.

Mr. RYAN: I recently asked the Minister of Marine a question concerning the banning of families, especially wives, of officers who wish to visit tankers at Port Adelaide. The Minister said the Harbors Board was considering the issuing of permits to wives of officers of the tankers. Can he now say whether finality has been reached and whether a system has been devised that is acceptable to the people concerned?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret to say that I have not been informed of any decision, but I shall inquire of the Director and shall inform the honourable member in writing when the information is obtained.

LETTERS TO EDITOR.

Mr. LANGLEY: For some time many letters using a *nom de plume* have appeared in newspapers. Members of this House do not hide their identity under this method: they use their names. Most of the letters are derogatory, and in some cases the facts contained are far from the truth. Some people are not game to come into the open. Recently, I asked a question about free school books, and this was incorrectly quoted in a letter to a newspaper. Furthermore, there was a personal attack on the Attorney-General, concerning his parentage, in an anonymous letter received by a television station. Can the Attorney-General say whether action can be taken to ensure that people sending letters use their names and addresses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a matter that concerns the editorial policy of the newspaper or television or radio station. True, in other parts of the British-speaking world numbers of newspapers refuse to publish letters under a *nom de plume*, and demand that whoever sends a letter to the newspaper expressing views on a matter of public interest should append his name and address. Unfortunately, that does not happen in South Australia, and it has

been my experience that indeed some people who purport to write letters to a newspaper under a *nom de plume* are not people whose names are originally appended for the editorial staff to examine. I have been shown letters purporting to be from my district, but the people purported to have written the letters do not exist. I know there has been a policy of sending around batches of letters to the newspaper, written under a *nom de plume*, from non-existent writers.

Mr. Millhouse: There is a good one circulating at the moment about the Frank Walsh memorial fund.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know about that, but I know that whispering campaigns of the most scurrilous and derogatory nature are engendered by the Party opposite.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to the matter referred to by the honourable member for Unley of an anonymous letter sent to a television station concerning me, I was aware of the letter and was happy for that television station to publicize it, because I knew that canvassers on behalf of the Party opposite had proceeded to spread this particularly scurrilous rumour from door to door. That includes a brother of a Liberal member of Parliament spreading it in my district. Although this kind of scurrilous rumour does not affect me personally—

Mr. Heaslip: Do you remember 1965?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —I bitterly resent the hurt that that kind of thing did to my father, and I will never forgive members of the Party opposite for what they did to him. This kind of thing is engendered by those who cannot fight on a policy in this State. I do not think it is a matter that can be dealt with in law: we can only leave it to the good taste and sense of the citizens of this State that they will not succumb to this kind of thing.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to my question of March 2 concerning the Tea Tree Gully sewerage scheme.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has forwarded the following report from the Engineer for Sewerage:

Work commenced on October 18 with the extension of the 24in. trunk sewer from Montacute Road along the route of the Dry Creek. To date, 4,478ft. of 24in. and 4,248ft. of 15in. mains has been laid to a point approximately at the intersection of Lokan Road and Riverside Drive. Four common effluent drainage schemes have been connected, together with a connection to the Modbury school on Golden Grove Road.

He further states that it has been necessary to temporarily suspend operations in the area for a period of about six weeks, to carry out some other urgent work.

EQUAL PAY.

Mr. McANANEY: I understand it is the Government's policy to grant equal pay to women, and I was rather surprised to read recently a heading in the Public Service Association publication that stated "Ripping off the Equal Pay Mistake: Did Cabinet Know what it was Doing?" Being generous I did not ask the Premier this question earlier, to give him time to honour his promises in this respect. Can the Premier say whether equal pay has been given to any lady members of the Public Service and, if it has not been, when such payments will commence?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is a question of equal pay for work of equal value. This principle has already been implemented and some people have benefited from it since July last.

Mr. McANANEY: It has been disclosed that Cabinet has instructed the Public Service Commissioner to base his findings on the New South Wales Act, which has been described as verbose, restrictive and inadequate. The New Zealand Act, described as short and simple, puts into effect the principle which the Labor Party in this State announced as its policy: to provide equal pay for all women doing equal work or work of equal value. I understand that male and female physiotherapists do the same work but do not receive equal pay. Can the Premier say whether these officers should receive equal pay?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Perhaps I am at fault, because I should have explained that equal pay for work of equal value is to be introduced over five years. In other words, the difference between the basic wage paid to male workers and that paid to female workers will be made up in five increments. The provision of the five-year period is similar to the New South Wales practice.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY.

Mrs. STEELE: Some time ago Dr. Donald Dowie (President of the Occupational Therapists Association) and I (as chairman of the committee working for the establishment of a school of occupational therapy in this State)

waited on the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health and presented a case for the establishment of such a school. We were extremely well received and sympathetic attention was given by both Ministers to the case we submitted. On behalf of his colleagues, the Minister of Education said he would take this matter to Cabinet and have it investigated. As nothing has happened since then, and as my committee is very much interested in the outcome, can the Minister of Education now say what stage this matter has reached, whether an investigation has taken place, and what the outcome is likely to be?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have made preliminary inquiries at the Institute of Technology, but there are no facilities available at present to do this class of work. However, I will inquire further. I have the matter in mind, but the institute, with its present staff and the money available to it, cannot enter this field at present.

NORTHERN FLOODS.

Mr. CASEY: Now that the floodwaters are receding in the Far North of the State and the roads in many of the areas affected by the rains are drying out, will the Minister of Lands suggest to the Minister of Roads that private contracts be tendered for in order to put some of these roads back into their normal state as quickly as possible? I know that the Highways Department, with the plant and equipment available to it in the Far North, would not be able to restore these roads to their original condition for at least 18 months in some cases. This matter should be looked into closely, because there is a tremendous mileage of roads to be repaired. For example, the gang at Oodnadatta maintains the roads from Oodnadatta to the Northern Territory border, and also south to William Creek. Even in this area, where only one grader (and sometimes two graders) is available, it would take a long time to bring the roads back into repair.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I shall be happy to do that.

KALANGADOO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Kalangadoo Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that the design of the school does not provide for gaps to be left in or near the main entrance doors in connection with the ventilating system. The only gap that should occur is between the two leaves of the double entrance doors. The matter will be investigated with a view to remedial action being taken.

STURT RIVER.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on March 7 about the intended widening of the Sturt River and the possible building of a freeway near Anzac Highway?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not yet received that information.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I asked a question about improvements in the lower parts of the Sturt River. Yesterday the Premier laid on the table of the House a report by the Public Works Committee on the Sturt River improvements. I notice that the Government intends to submit to Parliament provision for a special grant of $1,000,000 to assist the councils concerned in the work that must be done. If my memory serves me aright, when this matter was first mooted the previous Government was prepared to bear all the cost, which was then estimated at $1,500,000, thus relieving the councils concerned (of which the Mitcham council is one paying a substantial sum) of the cost with which they are now to be saddled. Can the Premier say whether I am correct in my recollection of the policy of the previous Government and, if I am, whether the present Government has changed that policy? Also, why is the Government offering only $1,000,000 instead of paying the whole sum?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This is another occasion on which I should not be held responsible for what the honourable member thinks. I do not recall the previous Government ever recommending that the Sturt River should be straightened from Anzac Highway to the Patawalonga Basin, or that the basin should be sealed. The Government certainly does not intend to repudiate the previous agreement made with the councils. After long investigation, the Public Works Committee has recommended the expenditure of an extra $1,000,000. The Government, I believe, will provide for this during the next financial year. The previous Government implemented an investigation to ascertain the likely flow of the water. A special investigation was conducted and certain tests were carried out at the University of Adelaide. As a result of these investigations, the Public Works Committee has now

recommended that an additional $1,000,000 be found for this work.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is $1,000,000 in addition to paying half the cost of the original programme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Of course: the Government is not repudiating any previous arrangement. This expenditure is necessary purely as a result of the investigation that took place. The scientific investigation conducted concerned the flow of water in the Patawalonga Basin. It had to be decided whether the boat haven at Glenelg was to have open drainage or was to be sealed. The question of silt in the haven was considered. Taking all these matters into consideration, the Public Works Committee has recommended that the Government make a special grant of $1,000,000. Since this matter had to be investigated, that investigation has delayed the drainage of the south-western suburbs. The people most affected are those living on the eastern side of the Sturt River. They have not had one gallon's worth of relief from the floodwaters: they are getting the lot, and they are getting plenty from the area east of Goodwood Road. Because of the benefits in rating in some of the corporation areas, I do not think it will be a grave hardship for them to find their quotas, and I include Mitcham in that statement.

COMPANY FAILURES.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Attorney-General will recall that an interim committee of creditors concerning the affairs of Greenways and Betro Harrison Construction Proprietary Limited, and associated companies, was formed on October 13 last. A suggested scheme of arrangement was assented to by the court in November last year, the scheme requiring that a meeting of creditors be called. In fact, the meeting was held on January 16 last, at which the creditors assented to the scheme. A report was then submitted to the court on February 20, containing the necessary details, and the court agreed to the scheme. However, an advertisement appears in today's press calling for creditors to lodge proofs of debt by June 30, 1967. As former employees of the companies concerned who have wages owing to them have expressed disappointment, because of the fact that they will have to wait so long for their money, will the Attorney-General have this matter examined?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly have the matter examined. Indeed, there has been much examination of this matter by officers both of the Premier's Department and of my department. The failure of building brokers in South Australia is not new: it is something we inherited from the previous Government, when there was a whole series of failures of people in similar circumstances. Since the present Government has taken office, we have been negotiating for about two years with the Real Estate Institute and the Master Builders Association for amendments to the law to remedy the situation, and to prevent this kind of thing from recurring. It is intended that, next session, measures to cope with all aspects of this matter will be introduced. However, in the meantime, unfortunately, despite warnings that have been issued to the public about contracts with people of this kind, numbers of these have been undertaken, and it has not been possible for the Government, within the framework of the law we inherited, to cope with the claims of people against the failures of companies of this kind.

We have been trying administratively to prevent the complete failure of this operation, because of the depressive effect that would have on the whole building industry generally and on employment in this area. The Government has done everything it can to assist here and to prevent depredations on the State's economy and the complete failure of this operation. If the honourable member will give me the names of the individuals involved, I will have an investigation made to ascertain whether any preference is available to them within the terms of the existing law. I will then inform her of the result of the investigations.

LICENSING BILL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On March 15 last the Attorney-General answered a question asked of him by the member for Gumeracha concerning the Licensing Bill and, after saying that the Commissioner had collaborated with the Draftsman in the preparation of the Bill, he went on to say:

The Commissioner was satisfied that the Bill gave effect to his recommendations.

When I queried him on that, the Attorney-General said:

He was satisfied that the Bill gave effect to his recommendations.

Then, after being pulled up by you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Attorney-General said:

I say without qualification that the Commissioner was satisfied with the Bill.

There are at least two provisions in the Bill that are contrary to the report of the Royal

Commissioner, namely, those concerning barmaids and Sunday trading. The question I desire to ask the Attorney-General is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Questions are not permissible on matters before the House. Regarding Bills or debates at present before the House, questions in connection therewith are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question I intended to ask concerns the recommendations by the Commissioner. Has the Commissioner changed his recommendations on these two topics?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Attorney-General wish to reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already made the position perfectly clear.

WATER LICENCES.

Mr. CURREN: As several announcements have been made recently about proposals to irrigate large areas of deciduous trees and citrus plantings in the Upper Murray districts, can the Minister of Works say whether a water diversion licence has been issued for each of the projects concerned?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The details of this matter are somewhat vague, and I do not know which projects have been announced. However, if the honourable member will let me have the necessary details I will obtain the information required. I should be surprised, though, if licences had been issued in respect of any large areas.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Works has recently returned from a meeting of the Australian Water Resources Council, a powerful body at which are assembled many experts in various fields. I noticed from a brief press statement by the Minister for National Development (Chairman of the council) that it seemed that progress had been made in the more routine aspects of the work of the council, in stream gauging, and so on, and in collecting data as to total water resources. However, there are two outstanding problems that greatly concern Australia, namely, evaporative losses and desalination. At the last meeting of the council that I was privileged to attend, held in Hobart, Mr. Christian, of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, expressed interest in what was purely a layman's proposition of mine, namely, that there might be some possibility of the use of catalysts in desalination, and he promised to examine the matter. Can the Minister say whether the council has made real progress in the matter of evaporative losses, which are of extreme consequence to Australia; and, equally important, in the matter of the beneficiation of brackish water?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Much discussion (not in laymen's language but rather at a very technical level) took place at the last meeting of the council concerning both these matters. I think the honourable member will be pleased to hear that South Australia has undertaken much study concerning evaporation and has been able to supply the council with considerable data on this subject. Indeed, I believe South Australia has done as much as any of the other States of the Commonwealth have done in this matter. When he was Minister, the honourable member took part in this programme and, since I have been Minister, I have done the best I could to see that it was continued. Much progress has been made. Regarding desalination, again I believe a most enlightening investigation has been carried out at Coober Pedy by the Mineral Resources Bureau in conjunction with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. I believe that the most advanced work has been done in this State. It is encouraging that all States are applying themselves to their various tasks. I believe the honourable member would agree that some research work can be carried out to greater advantage in one State than in another. All States, as well as the Northern Territory, are applying themselves to research. The council has been well worth while. It is pleasing to note that the proposed expenditure on assessment programmes drawn up by the six State Governments totals $13,200,000 over the next three financial years, and this will take total expenditure in the States to nearly $24,000,000 by June 30, 1970. I hope that I have provided the honourable member with the type of information he is seeking.

PARAFIELD GARDENS STATION.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my question of March 16 about the building of a new railway station at Parafield Gardens?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no further information as yet.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. COUMBE: Some time ago, the Attorney-General, in reply to my question about progress in overcoming the backlog of appointments of justices of the peace, said he was awaiting the outcome of a review by members of this

House of the list of justices sent them by him. Will the Attorney-General say what progress has been made following this review?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think there are only about three or four electoral districts outstanding in this review. I have asked all members to get in touch with me and make a time to see me. Many members have already done that. In some cases, after considerable notice to members involved, I have simply gone through the applications and dealt with them, in the absence of any appointments by members concerned. I think there are three appointments outstanding in respect of members who wanted to see me about justices in their districts. Since the review was made, applications have been received in relation to various districts. I have them with me at the moment. So far as possible, I get in touch with each member before I make decisions on the applications. If any member has an urgent application he wants dealt with, I should be glad if he would get in touch with me, and I will try to expedite consideration of the application. Generally speaking, the applications for justices are up to date.

Mr. CLARK: From time to time, I have received applications from people in my district who were justices of the peace in another State. If a man is considered to have the ability and the other attributes necessary for a justice in another State, he should be considered for appointment when he comes to this State. Will the Attorney-General see whether it could be made easier for people coming from other States who were formerly justices to continue their justiceship in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter depends on the number of justices already appointed in the district concerned. The mere fact that a person is a suitable appointee does not mean that he should be appointed. Many people in South Australia would be suitable for appointment as justices, but it is important to the institution of justice of the peace that we do not have too many justices in any area, because that writes down the whole purpose of the office. Therefore, the normal procedure is that, if a person is not disqualified by reason of his avocation or background from being an appointee, his application is considered, based on his background and the number of vacancies in the quota in the area. If there is a reason, apart from the local needs of citizens, why he should be appointed, he may be appointed beyond the quota, but these are exceptional cases. The mere fact that a man has been appointed a justice in another State does not mean he automatically gets appointed here: it is a question of whether there is a vacancy or a need locally. If there is a vacancy and a need locally, the fact that he has been appointed a justice in another State is a good reason why he should be considered a suitable applicant here.

CAROLINE WELL.

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to certain drillings in the South-East. The Caroline well has produced carbon monoxide gas, in which certain people are interested. I believe that a trial sale of this gas has already taken place. Further, drilling ceased last weekend on a bore in the hundred of Killanoola, six miles west of the railway siding at Glenroy. Apparently, the results of the recent drilling were encouraging. Has the Premier anything to report on the success of these two most recent drillings in the South-East?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no information on this matter.

SEACLIFF DRAIN.

Mr. HUDSON: My question concerns the completion of Drain No. 10 in my district which runs along Seacombe Road, down Brighton Road, and down Young Street to the sea at Seacliff. In this financial year about one-half of the drain will be completed: that is, the section running from Seawynd Court, near the corner of Brighton Road and Seacombe Road, down Brighton Road and Young Street to the sea.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right! Play out time!

Mr. HUDSON: I realize that this is the last sitting day, and that the information would have to be given to me by letter, but could the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads to ascertain what is proposed in relation to the next financial year on the completion of Drain No. 10; how far the department has progressed with the preparation of plans for the remainder of the drain; and what are the prospective dates for letting the remainder of the contracts for the completion of this drain, and for making the appropriate arrangements with the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the completion of the shifting of the necessary services for the second half of the drain?

Mr. Millhouse: You're doing a good job for your Party.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: Keep it up! You're doing a good job for your side!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to keep to Standing Orders. He knows not only that he should not interject but that he should not be so childish.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Order No. 253 dealing with After Session Papers be suspended for this session.

This motion is moved simply to help the Government Printer, who normally has to delay the closing off of Parliamentary Papers for inclusion in the annual *Blue Book* until two months after prorogation. Papers becoming available after the last day of sitting of this session will be tabled and available in the new session. There will be no change in the availability of Parliamentary Papers to members.

Motion carried.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MARKETABLE SECURITIES TRANSFER BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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:

Engineering and Water Supply Department Depot at Kidman Park,

Whyalla Technical College.

Ordered that reports be printed.

LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 3879.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the general principle of the Bill, and I will support the second reading so that we can eventually go into Committee to give it the detailed attention it warrants. We have heard four speeches on this Bill already. We have heard the Attorney-General, who introduced the Bill, and the Leader of the Opposition, who spoke for the Opposition and generally chided the Government for not including all the recommendations of the Commissioner.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He wants to include them, but he does not support them!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I could not hear the interjection.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Leader was guilty of sour grapes. He wants us to bring in something electorally unpopular and is surprised that we have not done so, but he does not support these things himself.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thank the Minister for his interjection. I shall have something to say about sour grapes later. We heard the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), who is an authority on the wine industry and whose words must be listened to with great respect, and we then heard the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) who spoke about barmaids in 1788 or 1877, or something quite irrelevant to the Bill.

In any Bill to amend the Licensing Act a rural district like mine, which plays a very important part in the liquor industries, must be considered. I mention with quiet pride that the barley industry is a very important industry in the Light District. The liquor industry benefits from the contributions made by barley growers in that district. In the northern Adelaide Plains where I live we are occasionally able to grow malting barley. I know that the member for Wallaroo will join me in supporting the commercial interests of the malting barley growers in his district and in mine because, when speaking last week, he said, "I come from one of the best farming communities in the State."

Mr. Hughes: That is true.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I agree, and it is a district noted for the production of malting barley. I know that when the honourable member speaks on this measure he will join me in supporting the commercial interests of malting barley growers, and I look forward to hearing him say something in support of the district he has boasted about.

I represent also a very important wine grape-growing electoral district. I do not think I need mention that it takes in the famous Watervale district, where the Buring and Sobels establishment is situated. I think it would be undisputed that that firm produced some of the best table wines produced in Australia. In the Watervale district, the wine grape-growing industry is flourishing. The red-brown soil, the high rainfall and the cool summers

produce the beautiful wine grapes, low in sugar and high in acid, which make the table wine that most members of this place enjoy. Although only a few vineyards in the Barossa Valley are in my district, they play a very important part in the wine produced at the Barossa Valley wineries. In my district, too, are wine-grape growers at Cadell who produce popular wines of a very different character from those produced elsewhere in the district. From what I have said, honourable members will appreciate that I have a very real interest in any measure before Parliament that affects the commercial interests of the barleygrowers and wine grape-growers in my district.

I turn now to the Commissioner's recommendations, and in doing so congratulate Mr. Sangster, Q.C., on the excellent report he has presented for our consideration. On page 6, he says:

Generally speaking the several recommendations which I make for amendments to the law are so interlocked and inter-dependent that it would be impossible to treat each recommendation separately, or to amend or reject one without thereby affecting or even reversing another or a whole series of others. Wherever practicable I have endeavoured to indicate at least some of the inter-connection between particular recommendations.

I think it is now common knowledge that the Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, has seen fit to excise two very important recommendations made by the Commissioner. The report continues:

By way of starting point, and for use as a yardstick in examining the various submissions and other material, I have sought the objectives of the licensing laws of South Australia.

I have concluded that those objectives are, or should be, the regulation and control of the sale, supply and consumption of alcoholic liquor so far as (but no further than) needed in the public interest:

(*a*) in the availability of adequate and proper premises, goods and services to meet the reasonable needs and convenience of those who seek them; and

(*b*) in the prevention of excessive or other undesirable consumption of alcoholic liquor and of the adverse consequences thereof.

The Commissioner has considered all phases of the liquor industry, and has made recommendations that he believes would be in the interests of South Australians. One recommendation was against the continuance of cellar-door sales at wineries. These sales have become an important feature of the economy of wineries, particularly of the small ones, and there are many immediately adjacent to my district. The Commissioner has recommended that the familiar two-gallon wholesale licence be taken away from wineries.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He made specific reference to cellar-door sales and their continuance.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister did not explain the Bill clearly and, apparently, he has many amendments that have not yet been placed on files.

Mr. Quirke: The Commissioner did not recommend against it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A letter from Mr. Maitland (President of the Wine and Spirit Merchants Association of South Australia) states:

The introduction of a wholesale licence that restricts trade to licensed retailers only would be the only kind of such licence in Australia and probably in the world. Our reasons for fearing this kind of licence are (*a*) Interstate merchants at present sell direct to the South Australian public. If this right is taken away from South Australian merchants, the door would be wide open for this type of trade to be completely taken over and exploited by interstate merchants to the loss of everyone in South Australia, including the State Government by the loss of licence fees. (*b*) Licensed retailers could individually or collectively, with or without good reason, boycott one, two, or more merchants at the same time, or at different times, to force merchants to sell at retailers' terms, as merchants would have no other outlet. (*c*) The Merchants' Association would lose all say in fixing retail prices, which would be against public interest.

I am presenting the case as Mr. Maitland has written it to me, because it is the duty of all members to acquaint the House of all relevant information. Mr. Maitland's letter continues:

Repeal of the requirement of merchants to sell existing minimum quantities of one gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine, or two gallons of other fermented liquor and the substitution of single bottle supply would increase merchants' delivery and administrative costs, and inevitably retail prices would have to be increased, which would not be good for the economy, the industry, or the public. Merchants sell the prescribed minimum quantities which are substantial enough to maintain the generally wholesale nature of their activities. Hence, if the existing prescribed minimum quantities are maintained for merchants, then merchants are to that extent restricted from competition with all retail outlets: yet at the same time, merchants would preserve the business they have built up over many years of lawful trading.

The Minister has assured the House that he will not proceed in the Committee stage, so he will have time to consider the implications of that letter. When the member for Burra supported existing cellar-door sales, he did not

say that they were an important tourist attraction. Visitors from other States can buy wine at the cellar door in the wine districts of the State.

To me, and to those living in my district, one of the most important features of the Bill is the provision for the removal of the sealed container or bottle sales from registered clubs. The Government does not appreciate the role these clubs play in the lives of South Australians. A circular letter, from the President of the Executive of the Registered Clubs Association, states:

The association is comprised of 40 clubs registered under the Licensing Act, the total membership of which is in excess of 60,000 members. Of the member clubs, 33 clubs are restricted under the present Licensing Act to the same hours of trading as hotels, and seven clubs, with a membership of 37,000 are not subject to hours control. The executive of the association and its members are most concerned at reports that the Bill for amendment of the Licensing Act will follow closely the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and, in doing so, will curtail the privileges of the existing clubs to a marked degree.

The letter concludes:

Members of existing registered clubs will strongly resent any limitation of the rights which (without any abuse or offence to the public in general) have been enjoyed in the past and the executive of the association on their behalf would appreciate the opportunity to make specific submissions to you as a member of Parliament when it has had an opportunity to peruse and examine the Bill.

As the association has not since contacted me, I presume it has made its submissions and recommendations direct to the Attorney-General. There are two licensed clubs in my district: at Eudunda and at Cadell. The Eudunda club is an old one and it is not wealthy. It is able to maintain the services of a full-time barman-manager and a second man on, I think, a part-time basis. If that club were to lose its bottle sales it would not be in a financial position to carry on. There are two other licensed premises in Eudunda and, in addition, there is a licensed wine shop. The Eudunda club has been in the town for a long time and its closure would be regretted by the local people.

There is a different type of club at Cadell. When I was first a member of this House I had the privilege of officially opening that club. It serves a community that is farther than 10 miles away from the nearest licensed premises at Morgan. If a person at Cadell wanted to go to a hotel at Morgan he would have to cross the river by the punt and return the same way, making a round trip of 20 miles. The Cadell club has now served the people of that town well during the last four or five years. The profits made have been sunk back into the business, and the club is a valuable addition to the social life of Cadell people. Recently (I think it was last year), this club borrowed more money from the State Bank to build a large ladies' lounge, and the facilities provided there are a great credit to it. If it were to lose bottle sales, this club would be placed in an embarrassing financial position. There are various other licensed clubs along the Murray River.

Last weekend I visited Loxton for a Murray Citrus Growers' Organization meeting, and I took the opportunity to call at the Cobdogla club, which is in the Chaffey District. I should like to indicate the financial position of that club to show members the reliance that it places on bottle sales. For the financial year ended June 30, the bottle sales of the Cobdogla club amounted to $13,480 and bar sales $12,366. Members will therefore see that the gross return from bottle trading and bottles bought by members and taken away amounted to more than the returns from bar trading. Despite the large turnover the net profit was $2,007. This is all returned to the club in capital and benefits the club.

I am told that the two other clubs at Moorook and Monash are in a similar position financially. Each club has about 250 members, who feel that their financial positions, as members of viable clubs, would be placed in great jeopardy. I heard that the member for the district had promised to place an amendment on the file to permit the licensed clubs in this State to carry on their present system of trading, but I notice from my file that he has not yet seen fit to carry out the promise he made to a certain committee member of the Cobdogla club. It would be interesting to find out which way the loyalty of that member lies when he weighs the goodwill of 250 financial members of each of these clubs against the ruling of the Trades Hall junta.

Mr. Clark: These are the only things that matter!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall be interested to see what support the Murray River clubs and all licensed clubs in this State will get from members opposite.

Mr. Clark: Principle means nothing! These are the only things that matter!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I support the second reading, so that Opposition members can see

what amendments the Government will bring down. We can discuss the Bill in detail in Committee.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): It was rather amazing to hear the remarks of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. Clark: It always is.

Mr. HUGHES: What the honourable member for Gawler said is true: it does not matter to what depth Opposition members sink, as long as it gains them votes.

Mr. Clark: I doubt whether it does.

Mr. HUGHES: I doubt very much whether any remarks that the member for Light has made this afternoon will gain him votes in his district. He made certain remarks about my attitude to the Bill and insinuated that I would be up before (almost) a court of farmers in my district if I opposed this measure in any form. He even intimated that I would support him in his remarks, but that thought is farthest from my mind.

The member for Burra spoke on a subject he knows something about and on an industry in which he is interested. I know his constituents would be satisfied to read such a speech, although I disagree with most of the things he said. Nevertheless, I do not hold that against him: he made a good speech in relation to a subject he knows something about, which is entirely different from what the member for Light has just done. For the honourable member's benefit, my constituents know me well enough to realize that principles mean more to me than anything contained in the Bill that could be of benefit to them. They would not want me to sacrifice my principles. That is something about which I doubt the honourable member could boast.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you at variance with your Party?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly not! I assure the honourable member of that. Indeed, I will prove to him presently that members on this side enjoy a privilege, in that we may oppose measures introduced by our Ministers, without any fear of a reprimand subsequently.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you saying that seriously?

Mr. HUGHES: I am serious, and I defy anybody to prove me incorrect on that score. Not once has a member of the Opposition been able to prove that statement to be incorrect.

Mr. Millhouse: Look at the second reading explanation!

Mr. HUGHES: I am not worried about that. Indeed, I will say quite a few things this afternoon, with which the Attorney-General may not agree, without fear of reprimand from him. The member for Light referred to "pubs up the river districts". What nice language to which he should stoop in the House! For his benefit, I point out that two licensees of hotels in Wallaroo have told me that they do not desire 10 o'clock closing.

Mr. Coumbe: There's nothing new about that.

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to hear that. I hope that members who follow me will instance similar approaches. The member for Light tried to belittle me this afternoon.

Mr. Quirke: I think he said "clubs", not "pubs".

Mr. HUGHES: No fear! He said "pubs".

Mr. Freebairn: Don't be ridiculous!

Mr. HUGHES: I know what the honourable member said. Now, I am ridiculous! When a measure effecting the extension of trading hours was introduced by the previous Premier, I called for a division, although I suppose I could have counted our numbers on one hand. The next evening, when I attended a Returned Servicemen's League dinner at Wallaroo, one of the R.S.L. leaders (who was not a teetotaller by any means) said, "We would have been disappointed in you if you had not done that." The member for Light sets himself up as an authority concerning every member's district; he apparently knows how the constituents feel about their respective members. I should like him to visit my district some time for, if he did, I would have no fears for my political future.

I disagree with some of the Bill's provisions. Nevertheless, I intend to vote for the second reading, because I entirely agree with some of the provisions. If in the Committee stages certain provisions are either voted out or amended I may even vote for the third reading. However, if that does not happen, I will vote against the third reading, and I will have no fear of reprimand from the Attorney-General for doing so. A member of the Government who disagrees with something introduced by one of the Ministers may voice his disapproval at any time. That was not the case with members of the previous Government.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not true.

Mr. HUGHES: It is true. If the member for Stirling had been with the previous Government long enough, he would know it was true. Actually, I admire the previous Premier for this; the previous Government was led by a man with an iron hand, who could rule his

Party in the way that he did. Not one Opposition member can deny that.

Mr. McAnaney: I deny it!

Mr. HUGHES: What I am saying is true.

Mr. McAnaney: You're not speaking the truth.

Mr. Nankivell: Just twisting it!

Mr. HUGHES: I would not for a moment call the member for Albert a liar, because he has graciously given me a ride home. The member for Burra who has been in the House for a long time will know that what I have said about the previous Premier is correct.

Mr. Quirke: Well, I don't. It's not true.

Mr. HUGHES: By way of illustration, I point out that whilst the Government was in Opposition it wished to amend a Bill affecting the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act, to the effect that a 10 per cent deposit should be paid on articles bought on hire-purchase. The previous Premier did not desire the amendment, although he has since altered his previous decision. However, a certain member of the Government at the time wished to support the Opposition's amendment, and it is a well-known fact that the then Premier took that member to task in the corridors of the House. In fact, the member concerned came into the House, resumed his seat and was audibly told by the then Premier that if he was not prepared to vote with the Government at the time, he would not receive the next pre-selection. The member for Gumeracha is not denying this because he knows it is true. I admire such a man: he was a statesman, and that is more than I can say for some members opposite.

The only time I heard any member take the then Premier or any Minister of that Cabinet to task was when the then Premier was in another State. The member for Mitcham attacked the then Premier on that occasion, and I criticized him for his lowliness. I received much support from Ministers of the then Cabinet because I said that it was not an appropriate time to criticize the then Premier and that, had the honourable member wanted to criticize him, he should have done so when the then Premier was present in the House. In any case the member for Mitcham was on the mat the next morning; the previous Premier soon put him in his place, because there was no further criticism. This could never happen with the present Leader. At that time, I said there was only one Sir Thomas Playford, and that is true. His worth has become evident because of the back door methods being used by the present Leader as he runs all around the State saying things about this Government.

Mr. Rodda: Such as what?

Mr. HUGHES: He was in the honourable member's area the other day making ridiculous statements. My opinion of the previous Premier has never changed, and while he is a member of the Opposition he will keep a ruling hand on it.

Mr. Nankivell: You have become intoxicated.

Mr. HUGHES: I have not—I am telling the truth. It hurts those Opposition members who have not been here long to hear the truth, but perhaps it does them some good because it makes them realize in what a predicament the Opposition will be after the next election when the member for Gumeracha retires from Parliament. The member for Gumeracha knows as well as I do that the Opposition will be in a real mess.

Last evening the member for Enfield spoke about this matter, commenting in his speech about me and previous members for Wallaroo. Although I did not hear his speech, I have no doubt his remarks were made in a kindly manner. When the Bill was first introduced, I thought I would have to take the Attorney-General to task for bringing in such a measure. However, since its introduction, another person has claimed that the Government displayed an attitude of disinterest in the matter until that person indicated he would move to extend liquor sale hours. In the *Advertiser* of March 10, under the heading "Liquor Reform Bill Gives 'Satisfaction'", the following article appears:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall) said in the Assembly that he took "satisfaction at last in seeing provision to bring South Australia's liquor trading hours into line with other States." He accused the Government of setting out to get "quite a bit of mileage" out of its liquor legislation. Speaking on the Government's Bill to amend the State's liquor licensing laws, he said the Government had shown an attitude of disinterest in the matter until he had indicated that he would move to extend liquor sale hours.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He reckons it is all his own work.

Mr. HUGHES: The article continues:

The Government then chose to refer the issue to a Royal Commission and the State was deprived for a further year of trading extensions. "Since then the Government and the Attorney-General have played this up politically," he said.

The *Advertiser*, as usual, reported the Leader fully and, although I know the reason for this, I will not say what it is as I do not want to become political. Because of those statements, I should have thought the Leader would

be the last in this House to accuse the Attorney-General of having played up this Bill politically.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He wanted to get on the band waggon.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, he has done everything to claim some credit for it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Even though he said originally that the Royal Commission was a waste of time and money.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and he said many more things about the Royal Commission about which I may speak if time allows. At two afternoon functions I have attended in my district, several people have told me that, although they previously supported the Liberal Party, since reading the report I have quoted they could not continue to support a Party led by a man who wanted to gain kudos from a social reform already introduced by another Party. I have already quoted from the article that displeased them. After reading the article these same people stated that, despite repeated pressures brought to bear against Sir Thomas Playford when he was Premier of the State, he could not be badgered into doing something that was not, in his opinion, in the best interests of the State. That is why the people in my district intimated to me voluntarily that after the statement had appeared in the *Advertiser* they could no longer support the Liberal Party. It seems that the Labor Party has a few converts, because of the Leader's wanting to jump on the band waggon after the introduction of the Bill.

Mr. Broomhill: He did not fool anyone.

Mr. HUGHES: No, he did not fool anybody, and he is not going to fool anybody in the future, because people are beginning to wake up to some of the statements he is making about the Government. Future press articles attributed to the Leader of the Opposition will not wipe out the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* last Friday week. I will come back to the Bill now.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

Mrs. Steele: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: It would appear, after the applause, that members opposite have not been enjoying what I have had to say: that they are very anxious for me to go back to the Bill and to get away from them. The member for Burnside is nodding assent, so I take it that, as she is the Whip, she wants me to depart from a few of the truths I have stated this afternoon, which were brought about by the remarks of the member for Light. Members opposite want me to depart from that line of thought. I am addressing the House not with the idea of influencing other people on the Bill but merely to explain my own convictions and attitude toward the extension of trading hours. I am sorry that I appear to be out of step with a number of people. I was out of step with a Victorian who visited South Australia some time ago as the guest speaker to delegates to an Australian fact-finding convention on alcohol. I do not find it easy to address myself to the Bill, because it is easy for people to say that members who are not happy about the extension of hotel trading hours are adopting a superior air and a "holier than thou" attitude. I assure the honourable member for Albert that that is not so in my case.

Any measure that will tend to increase the consumption of liquor is not for the benefit of the State. It is because I hold that conviction firmly that I cannot support an extension of trading hours. I am not asking anyone to agree with me, and I do not adopt the attitude that I am right and others are wrong. It is because of my firm conviction that I cannot support a measure that will inevitably encourage the consumption of liquor. I remind honourable members that it is over 100 years since the first licensing legislation was passed in this State. In 1908 the electoral districts of South Australia were made the local option districts for the State. The 1915 Act was a most important one, because for the first time 6 o'clock closing was introduced. I understand that that was done by means of a referendum. Bearing in mind that that was the result of a referendum, there should be an extension of trading hours beyond 6 p.m. only as a result of a referendum in favour of such a move.

People in South Australia were staggered, upon opening their papers one Monday in 1964, to have staring at them in large block letters:

Views on hotel hours change. The first crack in the wall of early closing in Victoria appeared last week when five church groups said they no longer supported it.

The article went on to explain that the policy-making bodies of the churches, all Protestant, had not been committed to the change. That was absolutely true on that occasion. I made inquiries and I was left in no doubt that, despite the article in the press at that time, as far as the whole of the people of the five churches mentioned were concerned it was not true. That is true in South Australia today of certain churches. I cannot speak with authority on the attitude of other churches:

for example, the Churches of Christ, the Salvation Army and the Seventh Day Adventist Church.

I wish to make it plain that I am not speaking on behalf of the church to which I belong. However, I assume that every honourable member has received a copy of a statement prepared by the Department of Christian Education of the South Australian Methodist Conference. The article makes clear the Methodist Church's attitude.

The statement refers to certain aspects of the Commissioner's report, and then gives its opinions on them. While the conference opposed a number of factors and comments in the Commissioner's report, it agreed with some of them. I am a member of the Methodist Church, which considered the Commissioner's report, and the representatives of which were helpful while the evidence was being taken. This church disapproves strongly of certain things in the report, but accepts other recommendations, and it and other churches are adopting a sensible attitude towards this measure. The Methodist Church of South Australia helped to introduce 6 p.m. closing, and has fought since then for its retention. Many people consider that this church is changing its attitude, but it has not changed its attitude toward the extension of trading hours.

A Methodist may advocate free beer 24 hours a day and no-one can shut him up. We are privileged to live in a free country: he can say this and anything else he likes, but he does not represent the Methodist Church. I refer now to an unwarranted inference that the Methodist Church no longer supports 6 p.m. closing: this is entirely without foundation. The Methodist Church definitely opposes any extension of trading hours, as do the Churches of Christ, the Salvation Army and the Church of the Seventh Day Adventists. This attitude is not narrow-minded or an attempt to limit the enjoyment of drinking. The churches are concerned with the great problem of the Australian homes, and with the forgotten members of Australian society—the mothers of the homes. If the husband were induced to stay longer at hotels and other places that dispensed liquor, he would be late home for the evening meal, thus causing domestic arguments. Many people advocating extended trading hours for hotels employ servants, but I am speaking of the ordinary family, where the mother bears the whole burden.

Mr. McAnaney: That would be 99.9 per cent of the population. There are very few servants now.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well; I will not mention servants. When measures such as this are before the House, the most important member of the Australian society, the mother, is forgotten. Surely the honourable member would not want to imply otherwise. I hope he would not, because I would be disappointed if he did.

Mr. McAnaney: I was merely correcting a mis-statement.

Mr. HUGHES: I have not made any mis-statement. I concede to the honourable member that there may be 99.9 per cent of the mothers who are servants of the home, but the honourable member would know that many families in South Australia employ servants.

Mr. McAnaney: Very few.

Mr. HUGHES: These people advocate this legislation.

Mr. McAnaney: That is a very irresponsible statement not based on facts.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know what additional facts the honourable member wants, but I am speaking of the mothers of this land. He wanted me to say that 99.9 per cent of the servants of the homes were mothers. I am trying to convince the member for Stirling how wrong he is, and I am disappointed that he does not have the respect for Australian mothers that I thought he would have. The honourable member may receive letters from the mothers of this State if what he said is printed in *Hansard*.

Mr. McAnaney: What did I say detrimental to mothers?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member knows what he was trying to insinuate, and he can read it in *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. Bockelberg: You would not want to read *Hansard* after what you have been saying.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Stirling has another convert. And now, the Leader of the Opposition is laughing about the mothers of this State. Apparently, Opposition members are making fun of the mothers of this State, but I suggest to the Leader that he should have more respect for mothers. He has done a bad enough job in the country now but, once mothers realize that he has been laughing at them, they will not be pleased. Honourable members opposite may laugh today, but in a few weeks' time they will pin a white flower on their coat lapels in honour

of their mothers. If honourable members opposite are sincere in what they do on mother's day, I hope they will adopt an attitude different from their present one of not caring less, because that is the attitude they are adopting towards the mothers of this State. I hope they will not adopt this attitude towards the important issue that is now before the House.

When an article about a change in trading hours in Victoria appeared in the *Advertiser* in 1964, I was invited to be the guest speaker at Maughan Church Pleasant Sunday Afternoon. On the Sunday immediately after my address, I was asked why there was all this talk about a vital issue that was not with us in this State. I said, in reply, that the statements given in evidence at the Royal Commission in Victoria would be the greatest single factor in support of longer trading hours in that State and that it would be quoted up and down the length and breadth of South Australia. That is exactly what has happened, and that is why this Bill for the extension of trading hours for the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquor is before this House this afternoon. It is essential for the preservation of their individual needs of security, independence and peace of mind that the women of this State take steps to retain well-knit homes, which are the birthright of every child. No service is performed by failing to make clear our disagreement. One woman had this to say:

Let us all have the courage to stand for what we know is good for all people. The evidence is all in favour of giving the liquor interests more freedom to make and sell their poisonous product regardless of the harmful effects it has on the community—crime, accidents, broken homes, etc.

I do not think the lady who wrote the article meant that liquor would poison anybody: she was referring to crimes, accidents and broken homes. Let us stand firm against any alteration to trading hours, and help the unfortunate mothers of this State, of whom there are plenty. All honourable members must come up against women in their districts with families that are the victims of the effects of alcohol consumption. Nobody in this House, including the honourable member for Frome, can deny that longer trading hours will mean more sales of intoxicating liquor. The extension of trading hours will mean increased consumption. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 3859.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): There is, in my view, no more important topic with which Parliament can deal than that of road safety. This is intimately bound up with the provisions of the Road Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicles Act. I have said that in this House not once but on many occasions. No matter that comes before us is of greater importance (and I do not want anybody to misunderstand me when I say that or to think I mean otherwise). Having said that, I want to make the strongest possible protest I can against the way in which the Minister is forcing this Bill through the House. This Bill was introduced originally, I understand, in another place before Christmas; it stayed there for about two or three months while it was debated on and off. It was introduced in this House at 5.30 p.m. yesterday; the Minister took about half and hour to give us his second reading explanation (which runs to 12½ foolscap pages of typescript) and now we are asked by the honourable gentleman, less than 24 hours later, to get on with the debate on a Bill that has 29 clauses, all of a technical nature. And that is not all, Mr. Acting Speaker (and I ask the honourable Minister in charge of this matter to take note of this): this Bill was not on members' files before 2 p.m. today. I know that because I was checking all the morning to see whether it was available to read and I, for one, am not satisfied now—

Mr. Langley: There's no doubt about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —to accept a second reading explanatory speech without checking the Bill word for word. This Bill was not available until 2 p.m., which was only three-and-a-quarter hours ago. The *Hansard* pull of the Minister's explanation has only just come into this Chamber, yet he has the gall to ask us to get on with the debate. All the Opposition has had to refer to in this matter is the second reading explanation—one typed copy of it to share amongst 15 of us here today. This is an absolute disgrace, and I am surprised that the Minister of Lands (who is apparently in charge of this Bill) would be so unfair as to try to force the debate to continue at this stage. The Whip informs me that it took a fortnight to go through Committee in another place. We know a number of controversial matters are contained in the Bill, yet we were told by the Premier (no doubt on behalf of

the Minister) that we were to continue the debate on this matter at 5 p.m. today, the last day of sitting. This is a disgraceful state of affairs. The only excuse that the Premier gave at Question Time, when the Leader of the Opposition asked him to make sure that we had some opportunity to look at the Bill, was that this had been done by the previous Government. I say it was never done by the previous Government, but what if it were? What excuse is that for this Government to go on in the way it has? If this is the way in which the present Premier is conducting the business of the House on this last day of sitting, and the last day on which he will be in office, I say good riddance to him. If this is the way in which the Minister wants to conduct the business of this House, then good riddance to him, too.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The feeling is mutual.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If this is the sort of thing we are going to be in for if he is to be the Premier of this State—

Mr. Burdon: It won't be long before it is good riddance to you, too!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If that is so, then good luck to every member of this House. I don't care what happens to me in the future: I am protesting now about the high-handed way in which the Government of this State wants to conduct the business of Parliament.

Mr. Broomhill: You protest too much.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for West Torrens, who is the Government Whip in this House, seldom participates in a debate, so he would not know what work was required to prepare a decent speech, or even a speech at all. I do not think he has made one speech this session (not one that I can remember, anyway). That is the background to this debate. I think it is the worst example we have ever had of the high-handedness of the Government—to ask members on three hours' notice, when we have been busy on other things (Question Time and the debate on the Licensing Bill) to go on with the debate on a topic that is both of the utmost importance and also extremely technical. Yet this is what the Minister is asking the House to do. It is quite impossible to do justice to the Bill before us. All one can do is to pick out what seem to be on a cursory glance the most important things.

It seems extraordinary to me that the Government, which pretends to think that this is the popular House (the important House, where decisions should be made), can be so foolish as to rely on what is done in another place and to deny the members of the House the opportunity to give proper attention to this matter. We can only hope that the same thing will not happen in this Bill, which has been introduced by the Minister of Lands, as has happened in other Road Traffic Act amendments that have come before the House and in many other pieces of legislation; that is, that next session we will have to correct some of the mistakes left in the legislation. I will bet my bottom dollar that that happens again.

Mr. Hall: It won't happen in 1968.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it will not happen under the new Government in 1968. This is a very good reason for the people of South Australia to get rid of the present Government (if they wanted any further reason)—that it treats Parliament, and this House in particular, with the contempt with which it is now treating it.

Mr. Hudson: Get on with the Bill!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder whether the member for Glenelg has had a chance to look at the Bill; he was pretty vocal in Question Time. I wonder if he will make a characteristic contribution to this debate. It will be interesting to see whether the honourable gentleman, after his interjection, bothers to take any part in this debate at all. Let me now do what the honourable gentleman asked me to do a moment ago, and look at some of the provisions in the Bill. The first thing that strikes me is that we are considerably and significantly increasing the powers given to the Road Traffic Board. If we look at clause 6, we find that in the future speed zones are not to be made as they are at present made by regulation, which must be laid on the tables of both Houses.

Speed zones are to be made by the board, and the board is given the job of hearing the submissions of aggrieved persons and reporting them to the Minister. It is for the Minister to affirm, vary, or reverse the board's decision. That means that in this matter the Government is by-passing Parliament. Instead of this House and the other place having the last say in the fixing of speed zones, this matter in future will not come to Parliament at all but will go first to the administrative tribunal (the Road Traffic Board), the final say being with the Minister but not, as at present, with this House. We find a similar thing concerning clause 20. There is a curious new provision, which will be section 74 (1b), regarding the requirement to signal a turn or a slowing down. New subsection (1b) provides:

If the board is satisfied that, by reason of the historical character of a vehicle—

and what on earth the definition of historical is, I cannot imagine; of course, no definition is attempted in the Bill—

or class of vehicle or for any other reason, it is impracticable or unnecessary for a signal to be given by the driver of such a vehicle as required by subsection (1*a*) of this section, it may, by writing signed by the Secretary of the board or by notice published in the *Gazette*, exempt the driver of that vehicle or of any vehicle of that class from compliance with the provisions of subsection (1*a*) of this section.

Again, that is giving authority and jurisdiction to the board rather than to Parliament. Hovercraft are brought under control for the first time (typical, of course, of the Government that it must control everything, and that everything new must be brought under control as soon as possible). The Minister has inserted a definition of "hovercraft" in an early clause, and then in clause 27 inserts a new section 161a in the Act. The Minister of Marine is being nudged out of this matter; he has been nudged out of so many things, as we have noticed, by another Minister. The new section to be inserted provides:

A person shall not drive an air-cushioned vehicle—

an air-cushioned vehicle being a hovercraft, according to the definition clause—

on or over a road without the approval of the board.

As I say, everything is to go to the board. The Road Traffic Board was set up about seven or eight years ago during the time of the Playford Government. The terms of reference given to it, in fact, were similar to the functions that had been carried out for over 20 years by the State Traffic Committee. At the time, members in this House asked (and I was one of them) whether it was the previous Government's intention to dispense with the State Traffic Committee, a body comprising a dozen or so men who represented different interests connected with road traffic. The answer was that it was not the intention of the Government to do that.

The previous Government did not dispense with the State Traffic Committee, of which I was the Chairman: it remained in being. However, the present Government, after it had been in office for some time, decided otherwise. I was written a letter stating that the State Traffic Committee was at an end and thanking me, incidentally, for the work I had done as the committee's Chairman. That decision of the Government to do away with the State Traffic Committee has never been made public, for some reason. I replied to the Premier (who wrote me the letter, ending up, I think, with "Kindest regards, yours sincerely", as he always ends his letters to me, but I do not know about letters to other members—

Mr Clark: He has a special regard for you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think he has. I have a special regard for him, too, but I will not say whether it is high or low.

Mr. Clark: I think he would tell you whether his was high or low. I think he would be frank, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not doubt that he would be frank, but I do not think I would understand what he was saying.

Mr. Clark: That would be your fault.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think so, and the member for Gawler, an "ex-schoolie", knows that.

Mr. Clark: I'd sooner be an "ex-schoolie" than a B-grade solicitor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not practising as a solicitor any more.

Mr. Clark: At least I was an A-grade teacher.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot dispute that. I am charitable enough to accept the honourable member's assertion on his own behalf. Never let it be said that I would denigrate the member for Gawler in any way.

Mr. Clark: It would be impossible to do it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It would not be.

Mr. Clark: It would be difficult, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think we ought to pursue this line of cross-fire.

Mr. Clark: In other words, you don't want to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not.

Mr. Clark: Nor do I.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going on to say that I wrote to the Premier, when he informed me that the State Traffic Committee was disbanded, and asked him, I think, whether Cabinet would reconsider the decision. The reply I received was that he saw no reason to refer the matter back to Cabinet again, and the State Traffic Committee therefore went out of existence, unsung. The Premier has always been careful not to make any public reference to this fact, which is apparently not known to this day. I am still receiving letters from the Police Department and others addressed to me as Chairman of the State Traffic Committee. Even more ironically, those members who have read through the Royal Commissioner's report on liquor will see that

the Commissioner suggested that the .08 per cent blood-alcohol level provision should be reviewed after 18 months by the State Traffic Committee, the body which the Government had quietly presumed to put out of existence some time before. The Road Traffic Board, which has taken the place of the State Traffic Committee in many ways (although its functions are far greater), is given much power and authority which should, in my view, be with Parliament.

A quick look at the Bill shows that some provisions merely excise provisions included in the Act 12 months ago. Last year the Government inserted at the end of section 141(4)(*b*)(ii) the words "and that mirror or device is five feet or more above the level of the ground". Yesterday, about 12 months later, the Minister said how unnecessary it was to have these words in the Act at all. I will see whether I can find his actual words in the only copy of his explanation I have had to look at in the short time the Minister has given me. The Minister said:

> The actual height of the mirror is of minor consequence, because at 5ft. it could strike a pedestrian or other vehicle which is 5ft. or more in height and, irrespective of the height, the vehicle to which it is attached would require the additional width of roadway or parking space depending on whether it is travelling or parked.

Why does the Government have to fiddle about like this with the legislation? I did not think that the Minister was adopting an irresponsible attitude although his facial expressions now indicate that he might have been. This provision was inserted in 1966 and we are going to take it out in 1967.

I wish to deal now with two matters of greater consequence. First, I shall deal with angle parking. In his second reading explanation, the Minister was pleased to draw some comparison between Norwood Parade and Unley Road, both at the moment in districts held by the Labor Party, a situation I am confident will be put right within 12 months. Control of parking is a vexed matter which the Minister, directed perhaps by his expiring leader, insists that we should decide on a few short hours after the Bill has been introduced into the House. I do not know whether the Minister realizes what a hornets' nest is likely to be stirred up by this matter. In the city of Adelaide special bays have been cut out from the footpath to allow for angle and right-angle parking.

New section 82a (1) states that "a council shall not by by-law, resolution, or otherwise, authorize a vehicle to stand at any angle on any road unless the council obtains the prior approval of the board therefor". This is a sweeping power we will be taking away from local government and giving to the board. New section 82a (2) states "where the board is of the opinion" and so on. Again, another sweeping power has been given to the board on a matter of controversy, which is regarded by local government as important.

Mrs. Steele: Has local government made a protest?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There has not been time for protest to be made to members of this House. The ink was hardly dry on the Bill before we were asked to pass it. Another controversial matter is the question of the use by motor cyclists of safety helmets. On this matter representations have been made to Parliament. Before this fag-end of the session began about four weeks ago, I was approached by representatives in my district of a motor cycle club. At that time I new nothing about the Bill and told them that nothing was before Parliament on this subject. Members in this House are not always aware of what is going on in another place. However, the motor cycling fraternity in South Australia is very exercised about this matter and I believe every member has received a letter, as I have, from the Auto Cycle Union (of which Sir Keith Wilson is the patron) protesting about it. Although I do not know and have not had time to check, I gather that an amendment to this provision was inserted in the Upper House, because it now reads that "a person shall not, after December 31, 1967, drive or ride on a motor bicycle, with or without a sidecar attached, at a speed exceeding 15 miles an hour, unless that person is wearing a safety helmet of a type approved by the board". I suspect that this is an amendment because the Minister's typescript speech had this provision written in manuscript, so it was a pretty late change.

This is a matter of controversy. I believe every person should wear a crash helmet when riding a motor cycle. This is a sensible provision in line with the provision for the compulsory installation of seat belts, which is coming about in South Australia. Of course, there are significant differences between obliging the installation of seat belts in motor cars and the obligation placed on motor cyclists to wear safety helmets.

Mrs. Steele: They are compelled to wear them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that is one point. The second point urged to me against this provision is that sometimes one does not have a helmet with one and, as the provision was originally, it would mean that one could not ride a motor cycle at all. An amendment has now been inserted allowing a limit of up to 15 miles an hour. An amendment along these lines is a good thing, but my query is whether 15 m.p.h. is a safe upper limit. A person going at much less than 15 m.p.h. could go head over heels, land on his head and do considerable injury to himself. A rider does not have to travel at 15 m.p.h. to get into that trouble. A slow-moving vehicle or a motor cyclist not wearing a helmet and travelling no more than 15 m.p.h. would be a menace on the road. I do not know whether the Minister has considered this matter in the short time since he read his explanation to the House. I hope that he will have the courtesy to reply at the end of the second reading debate. I do not know whether it is physically possible for most motor cycles to go in top gear (or at what gear) at 15 m.p.h., nor do I know whether it is possible to ride a motor cycle for any distance at that speed. I have never been a rider of motor cycles, but the member for Torrens may be able to enlighten me on that point.

These are matters that should be considered over a period of time when we talk to people outside and make up our minds, instead of rushing the Bill through in the dying hours of the session. I have not had a chance to pull my remarks together as I like to do. The speed limit in future for motor bikes, with or without sidecars, is to be 45 m.p.h., whereas at present the limit is 25 m.p.h. Under the Bill, there is to be a blanket limit, with or without a sidecar attached, of 45 m.p.h. I have amended my copy of the Act. I only had an hour, while the member for Wallaroo was talking, to be entirely polite, on whatever the Bill was he was talking about. It seems to me that this is a blanket cover now.

Mr. Hudson: Read all of section 51(*d*) and emphasize the word "outside".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know what the honourable member has in mind. He is thinking of the definition of "built-up areas", where the maximum speed is 35 m.p.h. The 25 m.p.h. maximum is taken out of the Act altogether. I think I may have an ally here. I thank the honourable member. He will bring to bear his considerable influence on the front bench while he sorts himself out, because he needs to clarify this matter in his own mind. This is a matter of controversy, whatever the final conclusion of the member for Glenelg may be on this matter. Whether motor cycles should be restricted on the open road to 45 m.p.h., and whether, because this is a lower speed than the general stream of traffic, this does not, in itself, create a danger to traffic, I do not know. The honourable member for Glenelg has apparently taken sufficient interest to get a mention from the Minister, and also has some views on the matter. Another matter of some controversy is the play on the words "the right of", which is done time and time again so that drivers on the road will not give right of way in South Australia but will simply give way. This is another way in which we fool with the law in this State, thereby causing confusion in the minds of most motorists who say, "Why should I follow closely the wording of an Act?"

There are changes in the definitions of "cross-over" and "carriageway". These are matters that have caused much difficulty of interpretation in the State in years gone by. I do not know why these changes in definitions are supposed to be better than the ones they are replacing; they are certainly longer, thus giving more chance for a mistake, more scope for argument, and I certainly do not mind this, although I think it is tough on the normal litigant. The concept of a carriageway is that part of a roadway used by vehicular traffic, but the Minister did not give an adequate explanation of it when introducing the Bill. The same stricture can be cast on the definition of cross-over, because it is the substitution of one definition for another. If I had had more time to prepare my remarks I would have spoken for a considerably shorter time. This is the penalty which the Premier, on his last day in office—his swan song one may call it—must pay for arrogantly insisting that we proceed with this Bill at such short notice. The word "mo-ped" does not appear in the Bill, but was used by the Minister in his second reading explanation. I do not know what it means. New clause 53a provides for a speed limit of 50 m.p.h. for buses carrying more than eight passengers, and in his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The Government considers that the new limits proposed by this provision are desirable for safety reasons particularly as a number of human lives could be at stake in an accident involving a bus. Sudden braking of a bus travelling at a high speed could cause serious injuries to passengers by throwing them from their seats. If this occurred on a bend the vehicle could overturn because of the passengers being thrown to one side of the vehicle.

When one considers new clause 53a one finds these are not the only circumstances in which this rotten clause will apply, as it includes "or has seating accommodation". The onus will be on the driver to show that it was safe to travel at a speed greater than 50 m.p.h. Again I strongly protest at the Minister's haste in putting the Bill through, and the action of his expiring leader for obliging him to do so. We know that it is the Premier who insisted on this being done. This is not the way to treat this House nor is it the way in which a matter of such great importance should be treated.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I was interested in the speech of the member for Mitcham which he said was in this fag-end of the session: his speech could have been described in the same way. Although he made great play that the Bill had to be debated on the last day of the session, he also spent much of his time in phoney indignation at the undue and unseemly haste in this procedure. He ignored the fact that the Bill was originally introduced in the Legislative Council on November 15, 1966, and much publicity has been given to it. He demonstrated clearly why the State Traffic Committee is now defunct, and a good thing, too. The amendment, raising the speed limit to 35 m.p.h. for the carrying of pillion passengers on motor bicycles within the metropolitan area or a built-up area, and to 45 m.p.h. outside those areas, is a sensible change. The suggestion was put to me by members of the Auto Cycle Union of South Australia and by members of various clubs that, when a pillion passenger was carried, the rider of a motor bicycle was forced to keep to the speed limit of 25 m.p.h., and considerable danger was involved, particularly on a busy road where there were stationary vehicles. The motor bicycle, travelling at 25 m.p.h., was forced to keep to the left of the road to avoid the main stream of traffic, and when it passed a stationary vehicle it had to be pulled out to the middle of the road again. The change from the use of "right of way" to "give way" is important.

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

Mr. HUDSON: It has been said to me by a number of people that the existing right-of-way rule is not satisfactory on main roads, as drivers of cars coming into the main road from a side street are not prepared to take their right of way because the flow of traffic on the main road is too fast. In most oversea countries the old right-of-way rule has given way to the establishment of "give way" signs at nearly all intersections, so that at any given intersection a driver on a major road is given right of way over the driver on a minor road.

Members may well have noticed the introduction of these "give way" signs along West Terrace; by and large they have improved the flow of traffic there, because traffic proceeding north now has the right of way over traffic coming into West Terrace from the city. As a consequence, instead of the doubt that existed in the mind of the driver previously whether he should stop for somebody coming in on the right, slow down or not take any notice at all, the driver now proceeds normally and the traffic on the right must give way. Because of the density of traffic flow this will, when it is properly established, prove to be a much more satisfactory arrangement than the old give-way-to-the-right rule. Consequently, the remarks of the member for Mitcham, that all that was involved in these amendments was a play on words, are just ridiculous.

I refer now to the introduction of compulsory safety helmets for all riders of motor bicycles. This, in the way it came before the Road Traffic Board, was associated with the increase in the speed limit for motor bicycles carrying pillion passengers. I think the responsible element among motor bike riders recognized the need for safety helmets. Those to whom I spoke, without exception, all wore safety helmets and regarded any motor cyclist who did not wear one as a bit of an idiot.

On the other hand, I think motor riders had some source of complaint against the form of legislation as introduced in another place, and the amendment of the other place to which the Government has agreed providing that people may ride motor cycles without wearing a safety helmet if they drive at less than 15 m.p.h. ensures that the inconvenience that could be caused to motor bike riders from not having a safety helmet through some misadventure or for some other reason will not be too great. I believe the law on this matter should be such that some inconvenience is created for the motor bike rider who forgets to wear a safety helmet. The law should not allow a speed limit of, say, 25 m.p.h. without requiring a safety helmet to be worn. It may well be that there is no injury from accidents that occur at that speed when no helmet is worn, although I doubt that. I believe the majority of motor cyclists are responsible in their attitude, not only to the machines they ride but to the rest of the community. The

ordinary careful motor bike rider would recognize that if he forgot his safety helmet he should be subject to the considerable inconvenience of having to ride his bike at less than 15 m.p.h. I consider this provision is satisfactory, and I think it is a necessary safety measure. It is all very well to say that the motor bike rider who is just riding a motor bicycle alone is risking only his own life and he should be at liberty to do that. However, any motor bike rider may, at times, want to carry a pillion passenger and, when he does, he is responsible for that passenger. A provision that requires him to provide a safety helmet for such passenger as well as for himself is a wise precaution, as it almost certainly means that, if he is required to provide a safety helmet for himself, the chance of his being able to provide one for his pillion passenger and avoid breaking the law will be much greater. I have no quarrel with the way in which the provision for safety helmets is set out in the Bill.

I refer now to two matters raised by the member for Mitcham. He tried to make a great song and dance about the powers of local government authorities in relation to angle parking being vested instead in the Road Traffic Board. I think most honourable members realize that this is a necessary change and that the overall problems of road traffic and parking are becoming too wide and general to allow a continuous variation to occur from place to place.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you discussed it with your local council? You don't want to answer that.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member also made a great play about the proposed change in the legislation with respect to speed zones. He pointed out that the Minister would have the ultimate power to approve, or otherwise, the introduction of speed zones, and said it would no longer be necessary for regulations to be placed before the House. The question of speed zones and their variation, and the necessity for trial and error to establish satisfactory speed zones round a particular bend or in a particular area, make the whole process of laying regulations on the table of this House far too cumbersome. If we believe in the good sense of the Road Traffic Board and of the Minister (and in our more honest moments I am sure all members will agree with that), I think we will agree that this is a more satisfactory arrangement. The provisions in clause 20, which amends section 74 of the principal Act, give additional power to the board. The requirements relating to the use of discretion in relation to the signals (which may or may not be made by vehicles that do not have blinking lights, so that the driver can readily indicate to traffic coming behind him, or to oncoming traffic, whether he is turning right or left) are a matter of minor administration, and not likely to be a matter of direct concern to Parliament in individual cases. If certain rules are established that are not satisfactory to the community at large, Parliament can amend them further. However, as far as detailed administration is concerned, it would be folly to provide that regulations must be laid on the table of the House, or for the board not to be given the kind of discretion envisaged in clause 20.

Finally, I refer again to the speed limits concerning motor cycle riders with pillion passengers, so that all members may be quite clear on just what the Bill seeks to do. First, the Bill provides that in built-up areas, the limit for motor cycles or motor scooters carrying pillion passengers will be raised from 25 to 35 miles an hour. I have already explained why that is a sensible arrangement. It is not correct, as the member for Mitcham has tried to suggest, that there is a blanket increase in speed limit to 45 miles an hour. This particular increase applies outside built-up areas, whereas previously the speed limit for motor cycles and motor scooters carrying pillion passengers outside built-up areas was 35 miles an hour. That speed in respect of, say, a long trip to Melbourne was a silly restriction. It meant almost certainly that excessive fatigue was likely to occur to any motor cycle or motor scooter rider making a long trip with a pillion passenger.

I am glad to see that the provision has been amended. I hope that that particular change will be looked at administratively to test its success or failure. A further amendment may have to be made later to section 51, especially concerning the speed limit for motor cycle riders with pillion passengers outside built-up areas. It may well be that, if the normal practice for motor cycle riders with a pillion passenger is to go to the limit, and a little beyond the limit, as many motor car drivers do, the provision for 45 miles an hour in the Bill is more than sufficient. However, it may well prove advisable later to alter the 45 miles an hour to 50 miles an hour.

I repeat that the strictures of the member for Mitcham about not having had sufficient notice of this Bill were put over with much phoney indignation. The Bill was originally explained

in the Legislative Council on November 15 last and, consequently, members (if they were interested in this subject) had four months to check on what was taking place. Indeed, one would have thought that if the member for Mitcham, as Chairman of some traffic committee or other (which, fortunately, has been disbanded), had been really interested in the Bill, he would not have waited for four months to find out what it contained. Everyone knows that amendments to the Road Traffic Act are always thrashed out in great detail in another place. One of the first things I heard when I came into this Parliament was that it was an annual joy of members of another place to discuss among themselves the various amendments to the Road Traffic Act. This was almost regarded, I was told, as the prerogative of another place. Indeed, I was once informed by a member of that place that members of the Lower House really need not bother themselves about Road Traffic Act Amendment Bills; this was all looked after in another place.

The member for Mitcham said that the Bill should not have been introduced in the Legislative Council in the first place, but the Minister of Roads (the man who administers the Road Traffic Act) is a Minister in another place. Early in the session another place is not very busy and does not have the amount of legislation before it that this House has.

Where administrative matters can be introduced into another place early in the session, it is obviously a sensible arrangement that this be done. That is what happened in this case. If I may be so bold as to say it, the Bill came out of another place in a more satisfactory state. The amendments to the Act contained in the Bill are not as have been enunciated by the member for Mitcham; they are more important than he has seen them to be; and they deserve the attention of members of this place. I support the Bill unreservedly. I think that by and large, particularly in the changes with respect to speed zones, the introduction of compulsory safety helmets, and the changes that have been made in relation to giving way and the introduction of "give way" signs, the safety and the flow of traffic on our roads will be improved. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): It is interesting to be told that we should follow debates that occur in another place. This measure was introduced in the other place on November 15 last but, as we all know and as has been pointed out by the member for Glenelg, this type of Bill is apt to be amended fairly substantially in another place. Therefore, there is little point in members of this House seriously considering such measures until we see in what form they come from another place.

Mr. Hudson: Aren't you able to read the debates and follow what happens?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I followed them, but they did not indicate what would happen to the Bill, because I understood there were one or two amendments that several members wished to include that are not in the Bill at present. Indeed, those members have discussed the matter with me. It was not until about half an hour before the member for Mitcham commenced to speak that I was able to obtain a *Hansard* pull of the second reading explanation. I must admit that the Bill was on file, but do not think we can be expected to analyse this Bill fully at such short notice. It is taken for granted by members opposite that we on this side are working in conjunction with members of another place, but I say emphatically that that is not so.

Mr. Hudson: You have nothing to do with them!

Mr. NANKIVELL: These matters are not discussed between us. What members of another place do is entirely independent of what we do. I support the member for Mitcham in saying that what we do in this House is our business and that how we treat this Bill is quite independent of what may happen in another place.

Mr. McKee: Now put your tongue in the other cheek!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not wish to be accused of delaying the Bill, as we are instructed that it is to be disposed of tonight. First, I agree that the "give way" provision is necessary, and I am pleased that it is included. However, I was rather surprised to hear the Minister in his second reading explanation refer to major and minor roads. Although I understand that major and minor roads exist in Victoria, there is no such thing in this State as a major or a minor road. This has been a point of much contention at Moorlands. Members have heard me ask questions about accidents that have occurred at this corner, which is the junction of two highways. At present I am receiving protests from the Pinnaroo council that Highway No. 12 is categorized as a minor road in comparison with Highway No. 8. The last accident that occurred at this corner resulted in a fatality.

It happened because of an argument about which was the major and which was the minor road. The Victorian driver involved obviously thought he was on a major road and that the driver on the other road should give way to him. The South Australian driver believed he had right of way over a vehicle turning right across his course, so he did not give way, the result being a fatal accident. A "stop" sign has been erected at this corner, and I presume it will be changed to a "give way" sign. An examination of the question of who has the right of way on certain roads is long overdue, as is the provision of "give way" signs. Therefore, I appreciate seeing these provisions introduced.

I also have knowledge about interstate buses, which are dealt with in the Bill. On the other hand, school buses have a speed restriction on them, and people who suggest that they travel at excessive speeds must realize that they are supposed to travel at no more than 35 miles an hour under the regulations. The large buses operating between Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne travel at speeds of 60 miles an hour, and even more. I do not know whether the provision of 50 miles an hour is really necessary, except to bring this State into line with other States. If we are to have uniformity, then this is possibly a case where we should accept it. In the past I have always considered that legislation affecting these buses has been liberal. Axle weight loadings are placed on semi-trailers travelling to other States, and these restrict their speed. Some buses have a nine-ton axle loading on the back axle and travel at 60 miles an hour, which has been permitted. I have always believed that no justification existed for restrictions on the movement of transport, except that drivers are subject to fatigue and, because of the excessive weight of their vehicles and the momentum they reach at speed, considerable damage could be caused. My experience is that enforcing these speed limits where the vehicles are within certain patrolled areas can create an impediment by causing traffic to slow down, and consequently accidents can be caused. Be that as it may, I believe that 50 miles an hour speed limit cannot be quibbled about. In the circumstances, I am pleased that some justice is being brought about in that the rate at which vehicles of relative weight travel on the roads is now being equated, for I see these provisions as achieving nothing more than that. For this reason, the reference to buses swinging around corners causing passengers to be upset or endangered seemed to me to be a lot of padding. The drivers are more careful than that, and I do not believe these risks exist.

Provision is also made in the Bill in relation to motor cars changing lanes. Motorists will be given until July 1, 1968, to equip their vehicles with semaphore or flashing light signals on the left side to show when they intend to change lanes, to move across the road, or to turn left. I agree with this provision, except for the exception made in relation to old or vintage cars. I do not think it would spoil the look of those cars if a turning indicator were fitted. I do not believe any distinction should be made between cars, because they all move about in traffic. I should like the Minister to examine this matter. Today we have the problem of cars weaving about in traffic and, unless the drivers indicate they intend to change course, accidents can occur.

I do not know much about the devices to which the Bill refers but I do know something about the device in the Bill to which the member for Glenelg referred, which is the device of by-passing Parliament and making retrospective decisions. I do not say that it is not right that the Road Traffic Board should be given authority to change speed limits and organize parking in council areas. However, previously in this House we have passed regulations and by-laws giving councils power to do these things, and now in one fell swoop we shall transfer these powers to the board. I believe this is a high-handed manner of bringing this transfer about. I do not like it, and I think it is a reflection on the House.

Mr. Hall: It should at least be confined to highways.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, where some impediment to traffic flow may be created. Where trouble is most likely to occur, angle parking is no longer permitted and only ranking is allowed. As the Minister of Agriculture knows, since the freeway has been established through Murray Bridge only ranking has been allowed; angle parking has been mostly relegated to back streets.

Mr. Quirke: This is amending legislation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, and I believe it is necessary. Like many other members, I have had to travel at a slow speed for a considerable distance. I have had considerable experience of the present speed restrictions through certain areas. In the case of emergencies, the 15 miles an hour speed limit applies a fair way in advance of people working and usually it is not observed because motorists cannot tell where people are working. They slow down at

the speed limit sign and start to increase speed by the time they get to the spot where the work is taking place. Therefore, the sign should be close to that place. This legislation is rather sweeping. It is taking powers away from Parliament. There are many other matters in the Bill that I have not had a chance to look at. I do not think any of them are important to me, but they are necessary amendments to the legislation. I do not intend to comment any further except to say I accept the Bill as it stands at this stage.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill because I consider it contains many things that are most important. As one previous speaker said, perhaps there is nothing that is of greater importance or needs more constant review than legislation pertaining to roads. Because of the road toll, which seems to be increasing year by year, not only in South Australia but throughout the whole of the Commonwealth and all over the world, any legislation that will reduce the number of road accidents and road deaths should be the first concern of those whose duty it is to make the laws. For this reason, I consider that the majority of the amendments included in the legislation before us are vital to the welfare and road safety of people who use our roads. I should like to reiterate what has already been said by members on this side of the House that this is not the type of legislation that can be dealt with quickly. It is technical legislation and requires consideration by those whose duty it is in this House to review and make certain that amendments made to the legislation from time to time are in the best interests of road users, whether they be drivers of motor cars, motor cycles or cycles, or even pedestrians who use or cross roads in our community.

It was suggested to me this afternoon that the amendments made to the Bill by the Legislative Council would be accepted, and for this reason it was expected that the Bill would have a fairly speedy progress through this House. I suggest that this is a very wrong premise on which to work, because we are here to consider this legislation from the point of view of this Chamber only. Because amendments have been made to legislation that comes to us from another place, that does not mean that the legislation will be accepted willy-nilly and that we will not consider it and see whether its provisions are good amendments to the legislation. It is wrong to suggest that we should hurry this Bill through just because members in another place have considered it and have perhaps seen, in their wisdom, that alterations are necessary.

It is also the duty of the Opposition in this House to consider very carefully not only the Bill but the original legislation. It is the right of members of Parliament to say what they think about legislation of this nature. I remember the other night watching a television programme in which the Attorney-General was speaking. I happened to have a pencil and paper handy, and I wrote down what he had said, which was that the Opposition talked far too much and held up legislation. The duty of all members in this House, particularly of the members of the Opposition (because members of the Government rarely speak on any legislation before the House), is to look carefully at the legislation and, if they are not in agreement, to say so and, if necessary, amend the legislation. If we did not speak on legislation, things would be railroaded through the House, and then we would have to answer to the people whom, even though we may be in the minority, we are here to represent.

In common with many other members of Parliament, I have received letters from the Auto Cycle Union about whether the wearing of safety helmets should be made compulsory and whether motor cyclists carrying pillion passengers should be restricted to a certain speed. I believe in the wearing of safety helmets by motor cyclists. It is interesting to realize that the majority of motor cyclists voluntarily wear safety helmets, because they have been convinced of the need for and the safety of this kind of protection. It does not require much imagination to realize what can happen if a motor cyclist is involved in an accident and thrown off his machine. Usually, the rider is thrown into the air and suffers head injuries. I have seen one or two accidents involving motor cyclists, and it is not a pretty sight to see the rider being picked up off the road and put into an ambulance, because most of the injuries are to the head. Although most motor cyclists wear helmets, I believe it would be a good thing if the wearing of helmets were made compulsory. Although seat belts have to be fitted to motor cars, it is not compulsory for them to be worn. I am convinced that if all motorists used seat belts there would be far less serious injury in many accidents. It is gratifying to notice that most occupants of cars now wear seat belts. Compelling the wearing of safety helmets by motor cyclists is an infringement of an individual's right to do what is best in his own safety, which right motorists have in relation to seat belts.

Although I am in favour of this legislation, I think this organization I have mentioned is right in saying that the compulsory wearing of safety helmets is an infringement of an individual's right.

I interjected when the member for Mitcham was speaking to say that I thought that a motor cycle travelling at 15 m.p.h., which was the speed beyond which a motor cyclist must wear a safety helmet, might be a danger to fast-moving traffic. How often have we been aware of this as we have been driving our cars and somebody on the road is holding up fast-moving traffic? This could lead to a safety hazard. While I agree with an amendment that provides for the wearing of safety helmets, I consider it is an infringement of an individual's rights. One of the people who appealed to me personally on this point (although I indicated to him that it was in the best interests of motor cyclists that they should wear safety helmets) was a man who is probably well known to motor cyclists in South Australia. He proudly pointed out to me that his motor cycle bears registration No. 1. He has ridden motor cycles all his life all over Australia and has never once been involved in an accident. This might well be said about many other people who use vehicles on the roads.

The change of "right of way" to "give way" is a wise change, but how does the person using a main road, which is protected by "give way" signs indicating to people using roads coming in on the main road that they must give way, know that he is coming to a road where there is a "give way" sign? If he is familiar with the right-of-way rule, how does he know that he does not have to give way to the person using the road on which there is a "give way" sign? The person with local knowledge is well informed about the roads in his district, but what of the stranger? This aspect should be considered. The Main North Road through Elizabeth has many "give way" signs, and on that road it is difficult to know when passing a sign "End of 45 m.p.h." which zone one is entering, because there is no indication of the speed zone into which one is moving.

Mr. Heaslip: The speed limit is then unrestricted.

Mrs. STEELE: There may be some doubt about that. If a driver has not taken much notice of the speed zone that he has entered, it is difficult for him to remember the speed at which he should be travelling. There should be a definite restriction on bus speeds: they should not travel above a speed of 50 m.p.h., because a speed of 50 m.p.h. when carrying 60 passengers is high enough. Anything above that would be asking for trouble and adding a traffic hazard that was not justified. I understood that it was now obligatory for motor vehicles to be equipped with flashing indicators. However, after studying the Bill I have been enlightened. This provision is most desirable, because some hand signals could mean anything. Flashing indicators should be made part of the motor vehicle and the use of them should be made mandatory. Drivers changing from one lane to another on a highway must use traffic indicators, but some drivers weaving from lane to lane are a menace to other road users. An ever-increasing practice noticeable in the metropolitan area is that of a motor vehicle passing on the left side of another vehicle on an unmarked road. This is a dangerous practice, and I hope something can be done for it to be more strictly policed.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Glenelg emphasized the value of another place in revising Bills. A month or two ago I drove to another State and found the courtesy of drivers much greater, both to each other and to pedestrians, than that shown in this State. The use of "give way" instead of "right of way" will be an advantage in this State, because drivers, thinking they have the right of way, insist upon taking it. We can pass legislation that can be breached without a person driving dangerously, but many acts of dangerous driving are undetected. Recently, a radar check on the 35 m.p.h. speed limit was conducted at Kanmantoo, and about 390 people were detected for speeding. Although the member for Albert said that a 15 m.p.h. sign is placed too far away from the roadwork, many such signs are placed too close to the work being done, and the driver is almost on top of the work before he realizes a sign is there.

Perhaps there are too many signs on our roads. On the highway through the Adelaide Hills, a road that has been built about five years, 20 m.p.h. speed limit signs are placed at many corners, but this should not be necessary on a modern road. A road that carried vehicles travelling at 20 m.p.h. or over 25 years ago was supposed to be a modern highway. I was driving in the Adelaide Hills recently and a chap on a bicycle passed me doing 50 m.p.h. in, I think, a 45 m.p.h. speed zone. He was under no obligation to wear a crash helmet then.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you might think I am being facetious, but I am pointing out that this concerns dangerous driving. Perhaps people are apprehended for technical breaches: in fact, I have been stopped for committing a minor breach. On one occasion in the hills when I was in a middle lane with my flashing indicator signalling for a right-hand turn, a big car tooted and crossed the two yellow lines on the road, went on the the wrong side of the road, came back, and forced me off the road. People like that driver should be hit with the book; yet if he had been seen, he would have been given the same fine as somebody going through Kanmantoo at 37 m.p.h. in a 35 m.p.h. zone. I support this Bill in general. Members have not had much time to examine every point but I believe that motorists should cultivate the feeling that people should give way courteously. This would be much better than what has gone on in the past.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I rise merely to compliment my colleagues on the fine speeches they have made on this Bill at such short notice. I marvelled at the speech of the member for Mitcham, considering that he had only a few hours to study this matter while, in the meantime, having to listen to a tin-rattling speech by the member for Wallaroo on another subject. I am sure his powers of concentration must have been greatly tried. It is not right that the Government should hurry this legislation through. We have had other examples of how badly framed legislation can be rushed through (such as the tow-truck legislation). The Premier refused to accept advice from the House and had the rather demoralizing job of accepting amendments the worth of which we tried to convince him of at that time. We hope that the procedure is not repeated with this legislation.

There are a few matters, most of which have already been mentioned by other members, that I could touch on. One of these points is the definition of "air-cushioned vehicle" in the Bill, which has been included because there is a possibility of one of these craft operating in this State. Having spoken to a person who has built one of these craft, I understand that the term "hovercraft" is a trade name. The person I spoke to gave his craft a different name because, as he said, the word "hovercraft" applied solely as a trade name. Whether we should include a commercial name in this legislation I do not know. It seems to me that this could be one of those errors which we are getting used to in this House lately. It will not affect the situation very much because we do not expect to be passed by one of these vessels travelling at 50 m.p.h., the speed at which the member for Stirling had a bicycle pass him. I think it is the responsibility of the Government to see that legislation is properly framed, and I do not believe that it is my duty to correct this obvious Government mistake: I have not the technical knowledge to do so. I believe that the term "hovercraft" is a commercial name.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You would not deny that that is the name by which it is commonly known, would you?

Mr. HALL: I would not deny that. I still fall into this error when I talk of hovercraft: it is like people calling a refrigerator a Frigidaire. I support the clause that provides that motor cyclists or pillion passengers shall wear safety helmets when travelling at a speed of over 15 m.p.h., but I become a little cynical when we, as legislators, appear to pick on those who have not the numbers: we pick on a section of the community that does not have much vocal effect in the community. This is not the only reason but it is, to some degree, a factor in politics. I am not blaming it on this Government: it occurs in politics generally. It could well be said that if motor vehicle users were made to wear safety helmets we could save lives. The Minister would not deny that, but he would not promote such a law, whereas motor cyclists are not numerous in the community.

Mr. Heaslip: But they are dangerous.

Mr. HALL: Yes, although one or two of them have told me that their accident figures are very light. It makes me cynical about the Legislature, not only this Legislature but Legislatures in general. Smaller items tend to be chosen rather than the larger ones which could be more effective but which it is more dangerous to touch.

I object to the clause dealing with angle parking, for I believe that it will result in an unnecessary intrusion into local government. However, I believe that a case exists for strict and uniform control of parking on a main road. We can probably all name towns that permit the undesirable practice of angle parking, thereby restricting the flow of traffic. But there is no need for the Road Traffic Board to control side streets in any town or suburb. That is a matter well left to the local council. I intend to move an amendment seeking to limit the control of angle parking to main roads, where I believe it is necessary.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Main roads or highways?

Mr. HALL: I am referring to highways. The Minister intends to move for a new clause which, on a cursory look at it, seems to be a good move. However, I understand the Minister would require an instruction in this respect.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I cannot move for the instruction until after the second reading.

Mr. HALL: I understood an instruction would be necessary and that the Minister had not obtained it in the required time. I am told that the notice of motion for an instruction is necessarily given in the early stage of the debate.

Mr. McKee: Aren't you at a loss?

Mr. HALL: I understand that the notice of motion for an instruction should have been given yesterday.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There was no necessity to give such notice. Further, as the matter is not before the House, it cannot be referred to.

Mr. HALL: I accept your ruling, Sir. I reiterate my dismay at the Bill's being introduced, with the necessary material being placed on our files only this afternoon, and with the pull containing the Minister's explanation also becoming available only this afternoon. That certainly does not reflect credit on the Government; nor does it induce sound and analytical debate in the House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): My first concern is about the fact that once again we are altering the concept (if not in law at least in the minds of the public) of the generally accepted rule in Australia of giving way to the vehicle on the right, which is more particularly accepted in this State. I am concerned that we so frequently in this place revise our ideas on that matter, because it creates constant confusion in the minds of the public. To the ordinary citizen, who drives not in the course of his employment but merely for pleasure, it is difficult to know exactly what the law provides, particularly in regard to this matter. I know of a number of people in the country who will not drive in the metropolitan area because of the constantly changing circumstances here, including road markings, and new traffic lights installed here, there and everywhere (which they did not see on their last visit to the city), etc. These people are reluctant to exercise what is their obvious prerogative to drive in the metropolitan area.

I believe that the rule that existed, laying down that there was no exception and that a motorist must give way to a vehicle approaching on his right, was a good rule. It was a simple rule that everybody could understand and contained much merit. However, because of the advent of median strips, cross-overs and the different names by which roads and junctions, etc., are described, the present definition has become more and more involved, with the result that people have become more and more confused. Therefore, the ordinary driver today finds it difficult to ascertain what are his rights, if any, in this matter. Further, the courts in recent years have adopted the practice of determining degrees of culpability, notwithstanding the fact that two vehicles meet at an ordinary intersection where the rule would prevail (without any complication, a driver having to give way to the vehicle on his right), and have assessed the damages in terms of, say, 70:30, 40:60, etc., apportioning the degree of damage caused by the two drivers concerned. That, again, has tended to undermine the motorists' general concept of what is the rule of the road.

Again, we are seeking to alter the wording in the Act and possibly to confuse further the motorist (at least for the time being) concerning the real position. Although we are working on a national code in this matter, the code does not comply with the provisions existing in oversea countries. I found myself constantly confused, when in Europe, by the instruction that giving way to the right there meant that I had to move to the extreme right side of the road to allow a vehicle to overtake me. To the driver who may operate in both areas, it is a matter of confusion. I join with other members who have expressed concern about clause 22, which provides that the Road Traffic Board shall have power to over-ride the by-laws of a district council in respect of angle parking. I consider that possibly there is justification for the Road Traffic Board to have an over-riding jurisdiction within the metropolitan area where councils are interwoven and where traffic passes rapidly from one municipality to another without the drivers knowing they have passed boundaries. However, I still believe that for the most part it would be good practice to leave the matter in the hands of the local council to decide. The Leader has foreshadowed an amendment that will probably meet the case. It may be acceptable to the Government if we define more closely the roads or highways on which the power of the board is to supersede the by-laws of the council.

It is a little dangerous for this Parliament, which has given its authority and blessing to

council by-laws (which provide for the power under which local government operates and are a long-standing establishment in our law) and which has also had the by-laws of councils laid on the table for the required period and raised no objection to them, to now, in one swift enactment, place the board in a superior position to that of councils. I do not believe that this is either proper or wise. In fact, I wonder where we are going with the Road Traffic Board. I know it was set up to do a job and, if it could do the whole job, we could shut up shop here; but it cannot do the whole job. Most important is the fact that the board cannot possibly exercise a wide jurisdiction, within the power proposed to be given to it, in the remote country areas of the State. Cummins, which I frequently visit to do my local business, has its busy days, along with most other country towns. For three business days of the week there is little congestion at all in the street. However, on the other two business days, particularly in the afternoons, there is some congestion. Surely the council in that area would be far better able to exercise control in this matter than the Road Traffic Board, because the members of the council live in the area and know it well whereas the board would visit it only fleetingly and would have to make a snap decision after having seen what may not have been the true picture.

Mr. Shannon: These things can have a detrimental effect on the business of the town.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member has touched on the point that was raised in another place. It was alleged by Government members in another place that local councils were far more concerned with the ringing of their cash registers than with the safety of their community. That is nonsense. After all, if any one is going to be hurt in a local town, the odds are that it will be a local resident. I believe this imputation on the motives of councils is completely unjustified and I resent it. I see no virtue or benefit in this provision, at any rate in so far as it operates in country areas. Earlier, the member for Eyre asked me who would decide these matters at Ceduna. I said that under clause 22 the board would decide them, and nobody else. I point out that it is becoming less and less frequent for highways to pass through a town because the current policy is to by-pass towns. Therefore, the necessity for this overriding authority is correspondingly diminished.

I agree with many provisions of the Bill, including the provision regarding signs, advertisements and hoardings. Much confusion is caused in the mind of a driver entering a country town by the multiplicity of red, green and blue signs stuck up all over the place. In the moment available to him, he has to decide which is a traffic light, a road traffic sign or an advertisement and to act accordingly. I point out that the advertisements are erected with the express purpose of catching a motorist's eye and attracting his attention and, therefore, they can become real hazards. I approve of the provision to deal with them.

I approve of the proposal that the speed limit for certain types of heavy vehicle should be increased. I do not go along with the member for Burnside in her remarks about the maximum speed for buses. The fact that a bus may brake suddenly and throw people out of their seats is not beyond the bounds of possibility but, if something must be done in this case, I think that a sensible approach would be to suggest that the proprietors of these passenger services, in their own interests, fit seat belts to their vehicles in the same way as they are fitted in aircraft and to serve the same purpose.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Some have them.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This would be a good safety factor. The standard practice in the United States is that passenger buses are allowed to travel at a speed five miles an hour less than the maximum speed permitted for any other vehicle. Frequently on the highways of that country can be seen road signs stating that the speed limit for motor cars is 70 m.p.h. and for buses 65 m.p.h. That seems a fairly well accepted practice. In any case, I believe that a blanket speed limit is not of much value. We have accepted the principle of speed zones solely for the reason that on one part of a highway 60 m.p.h. is perfectly safe whereas on another part of the highway 45 m.p.h. is too fast. To set a blanket speed limit for passenger buses would be a departure from the generally accepted principle that speed zones are desirable. I believe it is perfectly legitimate for modern passenger buses, which are extremely well constructed and equipped, to be permitted to travel at the speed suggested, and I should not object if they travelled at a slightly higher speed.

I cannot understand why the matter of hovercraft has been dealt with in the Bill. A hovercraft (or A.C.V., as it is commonly called) is no more a motor vehicle than is a ship or an aircraft. Why on earth this matter is dragged into this legislation, I cannot imagine.

Mr. Millhouse: Because they want to get control.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member made a very pertinent remark in this matter. Jules Verne, in his wildest dreams, could not have envisioned an air-cushioned vehicle racing along the main street of Wallaroo, even if it came from Cowell. Hovercraft are designed to operate on sea or on land that is unsuitable for any other vehicle. Several types operate on several different principles in respect of the jets of air and the way the air is directed in order to achieve buoyancy. There is no justification for bringing air-cushioned vehicles or hovercraft into the Road Traffic Bill. Hovercraft are intended not to replace motor vehicles but to operate over the sea or in marshy or swampy areas that are completely unsuitable for the operation of motor vehicles.

I regret that time does not permit me to make a more complete analysis of this legislation. I am afraid that we may discover, even after doing our homework as well as we have been able in the time, that some matters have not been attended to. It is all very well for Government members to say we ought to be able to do these things and learn from another place. In the last two sessions of this Parliament, Government members have taken very little interest in the measures brought down, first, because they are not allowed to say much and, secondly, because they accept what the Establishment dishes out to them. There is now a new concept of the word "Establishment". It used to mean well tried, well established, and old guard, but there is now a new definition, and we see an example of that in this place. I am prepared to support the Bill at the second reading stage and for the most part in Committee, but I shall support the Leader's foreshadowed amendment, particularly in regard to what I think is a serious injustice in the Bill, namely, in the control of angle parking.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I listened carefully to the rapid reading of the Minister when he introduced this measure as he succeeded in beating the dinner adjournment bell. The Minister reads very quickly, but his speed did not prevent me from understanding the measure. I found myself in complete agreement with most of the Bill. I firmly believe in the wearing of safety helmets by motor cyclists. Some years ago I asked the then Government whether it intended to make the wearing of safety helmets compulsory, and it said it did not. The rider of a motor cycle is in an extremely vulnerable position: the back wheel has only to be kicked and he will be thrown off the cycle and his skull can be fractured. The pillion rider is in an even worse position. I am not in disagreement with a measure that compels the wearing of crash helmets. If people are compelled to wear helmets, it is necessary that, when they go along to buy a helmet, it should be constructed to certain specifications so that it will do the job it is designed to do. An inferior article can be just as bad as nothing at all.

I do not agree with the control the Road Traffic Board is to be given over country roads, even main roads. How silly it would be to compel people to rank in the three-chain main street at Yacka, yet it is necessary to rank in the main street of Clare. This matter could be left to the district councils, particularly in relation to side streets. The Clare council compels people to rank in the main streets but not in the side streets. There is an area alongside the Clare Town Hall designed to take angle parking, and every car that angle parks in that area can get out by following a roundabout. There are side streets in which angle parking can be used. However, if one insisted upon ranking, it would be difficult to get cars in there at all. How could cars be ranked on the road outside the Burra Town Hall, which has an 18in. water table? The main street was laid down about 100 years ago. If this legislation is passed, people would have to get out of their cars on the off-side into the passing traffic. It is all very well to lay down a general principle that all cars must rank, but it would be unnecessary in many country towns. The authority should not be the beginning and the end of everything, and should not take away the power exercised by country councils. Another problem on our roads is the large heavy motor transport travelling at a fast speed and obscuring the road ahead of a following motorist, who has difficulty in passing the transport vehicle and who has to attain a high speed to do so. These are the points I consider to be important, and I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I deplore the necessity to introduce such important legislation in undue haste, without members having the opportunity to obtain the necessary information before considering it. Generally, I do not oppose this legislation, which will provide safer conditions on our roads. As this Bill affects the people of the State, they should know

what the law is and how they are affected by any changes. Obviously, the previous Government cannot be blamed for the haste with which this Bill has been introduced. We should not rush through this legislation before we are sure that its provisions are good. Pedestrians are as much concerned as are the motorists, because their lives are at stake, too, and they must be protected. Why cannot this legislation wait until we meet again? It has already waited two years. It could have been introduced sooner so that honourable members could have gone into all aspects thoroughly. I am sure that not many members know what they are talking about in relation to this legislation. I wanted a copy of the principal Act and I had to get the Clerk's copy, which is the only one in this House. Do all members claim they know what they are talking about, when there is only one copy of the Act in the House?

Mr. Hurst: What is it that the honourable member for Albert has?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know.

Mr. Hudson: What have you in your hand?

Mr. HEASLIP: The 1964 Act, but we are dealing with the 1966 Act. Generally speaking, I agree with the provisions of the Bill, as I believe in making everything as safe as possible. We should not pass legislation without having it considered fully. Government members are criticizing me for not knowing what I am talking about, but I know more than they do. I tried to turn up the axle loading section (section 146), and when I found it I saw it had been amended. I could not at first find the amending Acts, and it did not make sense without them. However, when I found them I could make sense of it, but I still have the only copy.

One or two clauses should be further considered but this cannot be done in the time that is available to us. A provision of the Bill exempts vintage cars from having a left-hand turn indicator, but why should they be exempted? They are more dangerous than an up-to-date car equipped with proper brakes and steering, which can be controlled much better than a vintage car. If the modern car has to have a left turn indicator, so should the vintage car. If there is no mechanical means of giving a signal a passenger on the left side should make a signal. Safety should be our first consideration, and we should not exempt vehicles 40 or 50 years old, most of which should not be on the roads, from certain provisions.

Safety helmets are a good idea, but why exempt riders from using them if they are travelling at less than 15 m.p.h.? Often vehicles are more dangerous when travelling at a slow speed than when travelling at faster speeds. Motor cyclists have passed within 4ft. of me, weaving their way between my vehicle and another. Every precaution should be taken by motor cyclists to ensure that they are not more accident-prone than are other road users. Why should motor cyclists be exempt in respect of speeds less than 15 m.p.h.? What happens if a person goes to work without his pants on? It is the same thing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The result would be slightly different.

Mr. Clark: There is a certain difference in the protection.

Mr. HEASLIP: The police would arrest such a person, and rightly so. Travelling extensively in the country as I do, I believe that the present system of informing motorists of speed limits is satisfactory, provided the motorist is paying proper attention. To my knowledge, buses have never been mentioned previously, the present Act dealing only with commercial vehicles.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They are covered in the Motor Vehicles Act.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think that a speed limit of 50 m.p.h. on an open road is excessive for modern buses. These vehicles have good brakes and are generally operated by competent drivers. Indeed, I have not heard of one case in which bodily injury has been caused by the speed at which a bus has been travelling.

I strongly object to depriving councils of their powers concerning angle parking. Indeed, I believe that we should have as much decentralization in all matters as is possible. Finally, although I regret the necessity for rushing this measure through in such a short time, I support the general principles of the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill, generally. However, I am concerned at the vesting of powers concerning angle parking in the Road Traffic Board. I think it is important that such powers be left with councils. The ranking of vehicles, particularly in country towns, limits the number of cars that may be accommodated, and this naturally hampers the business of those who conduct services for the benefit of local residents.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation among members. It is only showing disrespect to the member addressing the Chair.

Mr. RODDA: I believe that the problem of angle parking might be overcome by the building of by-pass roads close to country towns. Angle parking is particularly suited to our lady drivers, who would otherwise find parking a hazardous business. I do not agree with the provision giving powers relating to angle parking to the board.

I suppose that if we cannot get rid of motor cycles off the roads then we must provide for the compulsory use of crash helmets. In agricultural industries motor cycles have done away with stock horses and I wonder whether crash helmets will be required in this case.

Mr. Heaslip: The provisions don't apply on private property.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, but as the Minister of Lands knows, we share a detached feature in our South-Eastern districts. A man using a motor cycle on a property on a hot day and carrying a sombrero as well might find a crash helmet an inconvenience. However, this is only a minor point and perhaps it could be examined in Committee. Generally I see nothing wrong with the provision that crash helmets should be worn.

I should like to see introduced a provision to keep heavy vehicles out of the Adelaide Hills between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. on Sundays, when people from the metropolitan area are out motoring. If this provision were made, much of the banking up of vehicles that takes place behind semi-trailers would be avoided. Also, I should like to see provision made that heavy vehicles should remain a quarter of a mile apart when travelling on these roads. Trouble is caused when a vehicle may pull out to pass a semi-trailer and may have to pass two or three semi-trailers that are travelling close together. I should also like to see something done about the heavy iron railings used at railway crossings. If a driver swings to avoid a train his vehicle crashes into this substantial construction and perhaps lighter timber railings could be used.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I believe that all Opposition members who have spoken agree that this is an important Bill which will affect people. The Government also believes that it is an important Bill, therefore it is keen to see it passed this session. I do not disagree with the remarks made by Opposition members about the inconvenience to which they have been put in debating the Bill. In the main, their comments were perfectly reasonable and fair. Had I been in their position, undoubtedly I would have said something similar. However, I believe they should have placed the blame where it lies: it should have been laid on their colleagues in another place.

Mr. Millhouse: Not at all: we should be sitting next week.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Bill was introduced in another place on November 15 and it was reasonable to expect that it would have been introduced in this Chamber at least a fortnight ago. This would have given the member for Mitcham and his colleagues, and members of the Government who wished to speak, sufficient time to study the Bill properly and to give it the attention it required. As a result of actions in another place, we have been denied an opportunity to study the legislation as thoroughly as we would like.

Mr. Hall: Why didn't the Minister in another place do something about it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister in another place does his best, but it is extremely difficult for him when there are 16 Opposition members to four Government members. The Minister has to give a lot in order to get a Bill passed at all in many cases.

Mr. Hall: How many times has another place taken control out of the hands of the Minister?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It has never done it openly, but there is always a threat that if the Government does not do one thing then another matter will not be continued. Therefore, this is a hidden power that does not have to come out into the open. Opposition members in another place use that power effectively. I regret the inconvenience caused to members in this matter, and I know where the blame lies.

Mr. Millhouse: The blame lies in the front bench: we could sit next week.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member says that because it suits him to say it. I appreciate generally the remarks on this Bill made by Opposition members. Considering the short time they have had to study the measure, I believe that their remarks have been pertinent and useful. Any replies necessary to points raised can be given in Committee. Some points were raised and discussed in general terms. Members expressed slight objections to certain provisions but I do not think any further information than the details in the second reading explanation can be given.

One member opposite said that there should be a standard for safety helmets, but this matter will be controlled by the board so that

there should be a suitable standard. A speed limit for buses was discussed, and I believe members are aware that there is an escape clause which is desirable in this case. I know that many large buses are unable to use overdrive until a speed of over 52 m.p.h. is reached. If they had to travel long distances under this speed it would certainly increase running costs and would be an inconvenience. However, if they travel at speeds higher than the speed limit and can prove they are driving with due care, that is in order.

Mr. Quirke: What about angle parking?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that can be dealt with in Committee. I know the Leader has foreshadowed an amendment which can be dealt with reasonably and sensibly at the appropriate time. I do not think anything I can say now will assist. I am happy indeed with the general support that has been given the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to police powers as to vehicles kept for sale.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Speed zones."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is the first of a series of amendments in this Bill which greatly increase the powers of the Road Traffic Board. This amendment takes away from Parliament the right and duty of overseeing speed zones, which at present are prescribed by regulation, and gives that power to the three-member board. Parliament's powers are reduced, as we have seen time and time again, especially with this Government. The right we have to question Ministers is rendered almost nugatory by their refusal to give information. The Minister of Education laughs the loudest, but he is the greatest offender in this regard, as we have seen over the past few days, and it gets him into more trouble every time he refuses to give information.

I do not believe that the principle in the clause is a good principle. There are practical arguments which the Minister, in his sweet reasonableness, may advance, but there is good reason why we should not abdicate our authority. I should not be surprised if this abdication led to much discontent. I do not support the clause.

Mr. SHANNON: There is much confusion on Princes Highway through the Adelaide Hills. Certain speed zones are shown by painted signs on the road. Superimposed on those signs are recommended speed limits, varying from the speed limits denoted by the painted signs. This creates confusion in the minds of some people, particularly those not used to this system, because they do not know which speed limit applies. If a driver keeps within the speed limit on the advisory sign, can he be guilty of an offence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Certain signs indicate that there are advisory speed limits ahead, but I understand that such speeds are recommended in bad conditions. I think that such signs are primarily for strangers who do not know the road. While the speed is unrestricted, the advisory speed sign would not be enforceable by law. The signs, a convenience and guide for strangers, denote the speed at which one should travel under wet or normal conditions, provided one keeps within the actual speed limit laid down.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will this new power of the board over-ride local government regulations, or will the local government regulations over-ride the board's powers? It would be unwise, if this new provision came into force, to have it act against the regulation of a council that knows the locality well.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If it did not previously over-ride the local government regulation, I cannot see how it could do so now, because the clause (which amends section 32 of the principal Act) strikes out subsections (2) and (3), and it is not indicated in the old or new subsections (2) and (3) whether any over-riding power is given to the board in relation to regulations made by councils. I imagine that the situation previously applying is not altered by this clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the Minister could be incorrect in his argument. The Road Traffic Board had to make the regulation which meant it went to the Crown Law officers before it was made. Obviously, if there was a conflict, the Crown Law Office would have a look at the matter before giving a certificate. The fact that it was subject to a regulation-making power, in itself, meant that it had to be scrutinized by the Cabinet and by the Crown Law officers. The alteration I suggested to the Minister could also involve a change in procedure for the council.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand the Crown Solicitor has to see that it is a proper document and correctly worded. I doubt whether he has been responsible for checking the board's regulation against the council's regulation, even if the areas conflict.

Mr. Millhouse: He is responsible to see that the regulation is valid.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think he is concerned with the layout and wording of the regulation itself.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The regulation still has to run the scrutiny of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and, if there were a conflict in the regulation, that committee would take the matter up with the local member and ask if there was any objection to it. He, in turn, would write to the district council concerned and get its views. Under the new provision, the board will have an absolute right to make a decision on a speed zone: it would not have to consult anyone, and the regulation would not be subject to scrutiny. Will the Minister note my query and have the matter examined so we may see that council regulations are not over-ridden by the board's fixing a maximum speed in relation to a zone already covered by local regulations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The situation could be as the honourable member has suggested. I will take the matter up and have it examined to see whether any conflict is likely. I point out that provision is made in the clause for a person (or a council, for that matter) to require the board to reconsider any speed limit it has fixed, and for the Minister to confirm or over-ride the board's decision. Surely, that would protect the council's regulation if a conflict arose. I do not think the situation as outlined by the member for Gumeracha will arise. I am sure that the board would review something that directly conflicted with a council's regulation, and would allow that regulation to continue.

Mr. Millhouse: You have more confidence than I have.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is up to the person or the body concerned to appeal to the board. I am sure that in the case of a conflict the board's attention would be drawn to the matter immediately.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Subclause (3d) gives the Minister the right to over-ride a regulation that has been properly laid on the table of this Chamber. I do not think the Minister would care to have the responsibility of over-riding a law approved by Parliament. I suggest that the proper provision is that no decision of the board shall over-ride a properly made regulation of a council. Otherwise, what is the point in leaving councils with the power to make regulations concerning speed zones?

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Speed limit for motor buses and trailers."

Mr. McANANEY: I wish merely to emphasize the merit of this clause, which provides that, in the case of a technical breach, a person has the right to try to prove that he was not driving dangerously in the circumstances.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Giving way at intersections."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is, of course, one of the most important changes in the legislation.

Mr. Hudson: You said it was a play on words.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Indeed, it is. This is the third time, I think, in 12 months that we have altered this provision. The provision in the consolidated Act, bringing the legislation up to 1965 (section 63 (1)) is as follows:

The driver of a vehicle approaching an intersection or junction shall give right of way to any other vehicle approaching an intersection or junction from the right.

That fairly concise rule was laid down some time ago. Last year, however, that provision was taken out of the Act and another twice as long was inserted, as follows:

Subject to section 64 of this Act, when a driver has entered or is approaching an intersection from a carriageway and there is a danger of collision with a vehicle which has entered or is approaching the intersection from another carriageway the driver who has the other vehicle on his right should give way to the driver of that other vehicle.

I said in the debate just 12 months ago that that, in my view, was gobbledegook: it was making the provision nearly twice as long and not showing as clearly in more words what had been the rule in this State for a long time. Nobody on the other side would admit for a moment that I was justified in my comment, but the fact that 12 months later we have to change the rule again, I think, is some justification for what I said previously. The rule now provides:

Except as provided in sections 64 and 72—

and we now insert another section, so that we have one more section in the Act to examine before we can interpret this provision—

of this Act, the driver of a vehicle which has entered or is approaching an intersection or junction from a carriageway shall give way to any other vehicle on his right.

Will the Minister say whether, in his view, we now have stability in this provision? I doubt whether we have.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is not as good a provision as the first one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, it is not. Why is it necessary to change it again? Why was the provision enacted last year no good; and why, if it were no good, cannot we go back to the original provision? If we wish to take out the words "the right of" (which is the play on words), all right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would not have the temerity to think that I could explain anything to the satisfaction of the honourable member. The reason why the term "right of way" is no longer used was, I thought, adequately covered in the second reading explanation. The provision in the Bill has been strongly recommended by the Australian Road Traffic Code Committee and the Australian Road Safety Council, because they consider it implies a definite right to a motorist, as the term "right of way" is used. Apparently, there is a psychological reason for substituting the word "give" for the word "right". I do not exercise my right of way if a vehicle is bearing down on me at a high speed from my left. However, some drivers exercise right of way: because the word "right" is used, they believe it is their right. For this reason the word "give" has been substituted. The definition has been altered. Undoubtedly there is a good reason for this, but I cannot give it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Signals for right turns, stops and slowing down."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Paragraph (*b*) is designed to strike out paragraph (*b*) of section 74(2). We do not seem to be inserting anything in the place of that paragraph. Therefore, will there be provision for mechanical arms to be used if drivers wish to turn right? This will affect big commercial vehicles that use mechanical arms.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think "semaphore signal" can mean any type of mechanical device.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that relates to what is known as a trafficator. I cannot see anything in the Minister's second reading explanation about this matter and, if no provision were made for a mechanical arm, inconvenience could be caused to many people.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In my second reading explanation I said:

It is proposed to amend the regulations at the appropriate time to provide for the use of either semaphore type or flashing turn indicators for both left and right-hand turns.

A semaphore signal is not necessarily only a trafficator; it can mean a mechanical device such as is used on trucks.

Mr. COUMBE: Section 74(2)(*c*) provides for signals to be given as prescribed by regulation. However, section 74(3)(*b*) deals with the appropriate signal for stopping or slowing down. I believe that to be consistent paragraph (*c*) as well as paragraph (*b*) should be struck out, or both should remain.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As far as I can see, the whole of the Minister's explanation has been directed to new subsection (1a), which is inserted by this clause. There does not seem to be any reference in the explanation to the striking out of subsection (2)(*b*). In view of the difficulties we are running into on almost every clause, I wonder if the Government does not think now that it would be a good idea to hold this Bill over until we got some sense on this point. All these things illustrate the haste with which we are proceeding.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am informed that this matter is already provided for in a regulation; therefore, it is not necessary for it to be left in the Act. It has been deleted for this reason.

Mr. Coumbe: Why is it in another section?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Evidently that is not provided for in a regulation.

Mr. NANKIVELL: What is the use of having a turn indicator on the side of a vehicle that can be used only to indicate a stop?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is provided for by regulation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am grateful for the Minister's information, but it is a pity that there was nothing in his second reading explanation about this. Can the Minister give a reference to the regulation that covers the position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The regulation is No. 601, I think.

Clause passed.

Clause 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Council not to authorize angle parking on a road without Board's approval."

Mr. HALL: I move:

In new section 82a (1) after "road" to insert "maintained and under the control of the Commissioner of Highways".

I consider this new section is too much of an intrusion into local government affairs by the Road Traffic Board. We can all envisage areas of parking off main roads that can be more conveniently administered by councils, which do not have to submit their plans to the board. I consider this power should apply only to main roads.

Mr. COUMBE: I think the amendment should be acceptable to the Minister, because when this Bill was before another place the Minister in charge suggested that the word "main" be inserted. It was subsequently pointed out to the Minister that there was no adequate definition of "main road". The expression used by the Leader of the Opposition defines more clearly the roads to which this new section should apply.

Mr. SHANNON: The Princes Highway, which is the main highway through the Adelaide Hills, runs through many towns, in some of which there is ample room for angle parking in front of shops on both sides of the road and in others ranking only can be carried out. The Stirling and Mount Barker councils have dealt with this problem realistically and have permitted angle parking only where it can be done safely. Local shopkeepers should be able to get all the business possible, so people should not be forced to rank when angle parking is safe. I think it is unwise to over-ride the powers of local government in this matter, as there have been no complaints about its administration, which has been admirable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amendment is fairly restrictive: it provides that the new section shall apply only to roads maintained and controlled by the Commissioner of Highways. The main concern of the board was not so much in relation to country areas as to the metropolitan area. I wonder how many roads in this category would be in the metropolitan area. The Minister of Roads previously said:

In the city area, where parking is in greater demand and angle parking is generally provided, the accident situation is higher than on roads where parallel parking takes place. The three roads similarly placed through the parklands are King William Road, Rundle Road, and Peacock Road. The first two have angle parking and their accident rate is 24 and 15 accidents per 1,000,000 vehicle miles respectively, compared with three for Peacock Road where parallel parking occurs. It is not a matter of taking power from local councils: it is a matter of road safety, and that is where my interest lies.

I think it is obvious that the main concern is for the metropolitan area, and I am afraid the amendment might completely deprive the board of any control that is obviously desirable in the metropolitan area. If the Leader could prove that sufficient roads in the metropolitan area were maintained and controlled by the Highways Department, which might allay the fears of the board in this matter, I might view the amendment differently. Although I do not think it would be altogether unhappy about the way in which councils handled this matter, the board has made certain points for a purpose.

I think it is imperative in the interests of safety that the board have more control in this matter than it now has. Although it is not deliberate, decisions by councils are sometimes delayed because of local pressures, and the interests of safety perhaps forgotten. The board, however, is in a different position.

Mr. COUMBE: Many roads in the metropolitan area come under the main roads schedule and would be caught by the amendment.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's not as simple as that.

Mr. COUMBE: I am sure the Minister would be surprised if he knew the extent to which the Highways Department was responsible not only for constructing but also for maintaining roads in the metropolitan area. We do not like the clause at all; we are merely suggesting a compromise, particularly as the Minister in another place stated:

If members feel happier about this matter, I am prepared to add after the word "any" the word "main" so that it would then read "any main road". That should meet the objections raised by members. It would then mean that a council could not introduce a by-law affecting any main road unless approved by the Road Traffic Board. Back roads would not then be included.

The Minister then moved an amendment accordingly, but found that "main road" was indefinable. Our amendment contains the appropriate wording, which will have the same effect as that which the Minister in another place tried to achieve. If the Minister of Lands agreed to the amendment, he could refer it back to the Minister of Roads for his consideration.

Mr. HALL: I agree with the member for Torrens. I am merely seeking to limit the application of this clause to the area in which the board wishes to see it applied. I realize the board does not desire blanket control.

Indeed, I strongly object to Government instrumentalities receiving excessive power. Traffic backing out from an angle parking position represents a bigger menace to through traffic than does traffic reversing from a parallel parking position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: While it is true that, when the original Highways Act was passed, the Corporation of the City of Adelaide did not wish to come under the control of the Highways Department in any way, and was excluded from the Act's provisions, it subsequently realized it had made a mistake and desired certain city roads to be controlled by the Commissioner of Highways. The Government of the day agreed to a grant being made to support highways passing through the park lands, and $36,000 a year was provided to maintain those highways. The Road Traffic Board should not deal with the city of Adelaide, where provision for angle parking has been made in metered areas and where a most competent organization is maintained for traffic control. Fast moving traffic is not encountered in this area and the provision of ring routes was to achieve this. Of course, relatively fast traffic travels on the Anzac Highway, the Main North Road and other highways, and the Leader's amendment will enable the board to do everything required in this connection. As I have never yet known a case where power given was not exercised, I support the Leader's amendment.

Mrs. STEELE: The Leader's amendment goes some way towards removing doubts expressed by members. The same clause was debated in another place where a similar amendment was defeated by one vote. I realize difficulties are associated with the Leader's amendment in that there is no definition of a main road but, if the amendment were accepted, it would be an indication to members of another place of our doubts and, perhaps, the matter could be further examined there.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the Minister realizes the ludicrous provision to be included in new section 82a (2). This gives the board power to direct a council to repeal or alter a by-law on parking. What happens to a repeal or amendment of a by-law? It comes to this place in the form of a by-law and is subject to disallowance here or in another place. A council may be obliged to do this and we may not agree with what the council does. I cannot believe that this aspect of the subclause was considered when the subclause was drafted. The board is given power over the council to direct it to amend its by-law. It could come here and we could knock it out.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: So the by-law remains as it was previously.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I challenge the Minister to get up and say this was considered when the subclause was drafted. Is the Minister going to answer?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed. He has given the answer: he does not know.

Clause passed.

Clauses 23 to 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Driving of hovercraft prohibited without consent of board."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: What does this clause mean? I consider that it should be amended. Although the marginal note states that the driving of a hovercraft is prohibited without the consent of the board, I point out that "driving" as defined in the principal Act includes "riding". Therefore, every passenger in the hovercraft would commit an offence and be liable to a penalty of $100. Does the clause mean that every passenger in the hovercraft would have to get the approval of the board before crossing the road? This is just another example of how ridiculous it is to bring in such legislation as this at such a late hour in the session. Surely the clause should be limited to the driver of an air-cushioned vehicle.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Section 52 of the Road Traffic Act, 1961, provides:

A person shall not drive a vehicle on a bridge at a speed greater than that shown on signs erected pursuant to this Act on or near the bridge.

Section 100 of the Act provides:

The driver of a motor vehicle shall sound the warning device attached to his vehicle when it is necessary to do so for the purpose of giving warning of danger.

Does every passenger have to sound the horn? This Act has operated since 1961 without difficulty. I would think, therefore, that this legislation would also operate without difficulty.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): Of course, the Minister is completely correct in this matter. The member for Gumeracha is at his usual business of making mischief and wasting members' time in doing so.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I resent that imputation. I am debating a Bill before the Committee and trying to get some sense out of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member would try to make sense of

the Bills before the Committee stage he would be serving the Parliament and members rather better than he has been doing this evening. What the honourable member referred to was the definition of "drive" in the principal Act, and that includes "ride" in the appropriate circumstances; but it does not say that "drive" means "ride in" and those are the words that the honourable member has been constantly using. They are not in the principal Act. In order to substitute the word "ride" the honourable member would have to do so without the word "in" being added. New section 161a would then read: "A person shall not ride an air-cushioned vehicle . . ."

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is what we are saying.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member thinks that the court would consider "ride" as appropriate, I should be interested to see him give an appropriate demonstration.

Clause passed.

Clauses 28 and 29 passed.

New clause 26a—"Defect notices."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): I move to insert the following new clause:

26a. Section 160 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by inserting after subsection (2) thereof the following subsection:—

(2a) A member of the police force may, at any time when any premises where vehicles are exhibited or kept for sale are open for business, enter into or upon those premises and, if he is of opinion that any vehicle exhibited or kept for sale therein does not comply with any one or more of the requirements of this Act or for any reason cannot be safely driven on roads, he may give to the owner or person in charge of the vehicle a direction referred to in subsection (2) of this section.;

(*b*) by inserting after the passage "subsection (2)" in subsection (3) thereof the passage "or subsection (2a)";

(*c*) by inserting after the word "section" in subsection (3) thereof the passage "and no person shall hinder or prevent a member of the police force from acting in exercise of the powers conferred on him by this section";

(*d*) by inserting after the word "road" in paragraph (*b*) of subsection (5) thereof the passage "or sold or otherwise disposed of";

(*e*) by striking out from subsection (6) thereof the passage "a vehicle" secondly occurring and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "or permit a vehicle to be driven or";

(*f*) by inserting after the word "road" in subsection (6) thereof the passage "or sell or otherwise dispose of a vehicle";

and

(*g*) by inserting after subsection (6) thereof the following subsection:—

(6a) It shall be a defence to a charge under subsection (6) of this section of having sold or otherwise disposed of a vehicle contrary to the terms of a defect notice if the defendant satisfies the court that at the time of the sale or disposal he had reason to believe that the vehicle was not intended to be used on a road after such sale or disposal.

The new clause is designed to extend the provisions of section 160 of the principal Act dealing with the use of unsafe vehicles on roads to new and used vehicles that are for sale. Section 160 of the Act as it stands empowers a member of the Police Force, who is of opinion that a vehicle does not comply with the requirements of the Act or cannot be safely driven, to direct the owner or person in charge of the vehicle to produce it for examination. Paragraph (*a*) of the new clause inserts in that section a new subsection (2a) which empowers a member of the Police Force to enter premises where vehicles are for sale and, if of the opinion that any vehicle in those premises is unsafe, to direct the owner or person in charge of the vehicle to produce it for examination. Paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of the clause are consequential amendments to subsection (3) of the section.

Subsection (5) of section 160 enables members of the Police Force to issue to the owner or person in charge of a vehicle a defect notice if, upon examination, the vehicle is found to be unsafe and paragraph (*d*) of the clause extends the application of that subsection to vehicles offered for sale or disposal. Paragraphs (*e*) and (*f*) extend the provisions of subsection (6) of the section to cover vehicles offered for sale and paragraph (*g*) inserts into section 160 a new subsection making it a defence to a charge under subsection (6) of having sold or otherwise disposed of a vehicle contrary to the terms of a defect notice if the defendant satisfies the court that at the time of the sale or disposal he had reason to believe that the vehicle was not intended to be used on a road after such sale or disposal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Government will note that the Opposition did not block the introduction of this provision, even at this stage, although I point out to the Committee that it

was within our power to do so, because to bring in this new clause required a suspension of Standing Orders. Had the Opposition cared to divide on the matter, the Government would not have had an absolute majority of members here to get it through. We did not block this, however, because it is an important matter. I again protest at the way in which this measure has been brought in, and I think that the fact that Opposition members did not block it as we could have blocked it doubles the force of my protest. This should not have been done, and I hope it will not be done again. I wonder how the new clause will be received in another place after they had the Bill for so long and the Government did nothing to include it there. Turning now to the clause itself, I point out new section 160 (2a) provides for a sweeping power to give to the police. The new clause provides:

A member of the police force may, at any time when any premises where vehicles are exhibited or kept for sale are open for business—

That is all right; that is in business hours—

enter into or upon those premises—

one does not complain about that, but the next part is the one open to serious objection—

and, if he is of opinion that any vehicle exhibited or kept for sale therein does not comply with any one or more of the requirements of this Act—

there may be many reasons why a vehicle does not comply with one of the requirements of the Road Traffic Act, which have nothing to do with roadworthiness. Yet a police officer merely has to have this opinion to give him the right to give a direction. But that is not the end of it—

or for any reason cannot be safely driven on roads . . .

That drags in every conceivable aspect: it is as wide as the world. I do not intend to oppose the clause in this form, because I think the power of inspection is desirable. However, I think the power has been more widely drawn than is necessary to give effect to the intention. I hope it will not be necessary for this provision to be brought back to Parliament again within a few months, but I suspect that it will be, because the clause could be a most objectionable one.

Mr. SHANNON: I support the new clause. Only today I saw a vehicle, of which the driver had allegedly just taken possession. The back wheel had fallen off in Franklin Street, and the car (fortunately without damaging anyone) finished up on the side of the road opposite to the side on which it had been travelling. The clause contains an important safety provision and will be applauded, I am sure, by the general public and particularly by the genuine car dealer.

Mr. COUMBE: I support the new clause, as constituents have made representations to me concerning malpractices that have occurred not only in the selling of a vehicle but in the subsequent danger caused to the driver, as well as to innocent road users. However, some genuine second-hand car dealers may not have facilities for repairing vehicles and, if a police officer on inspecting a vehicle finds that a major defect exists (so that the car may not be driven on the road), arrangements will have to be made for the vehicle to be repaired. Does the Minister consider that the new clause should operate as from the date on which the legislation is proclaimed?

Mr. HEASLIP: The accident instanced by the member for Onkaparinga could happen in respect of any vehicle, and I do not think a policeman will be able to detect some faults purely by looking at a vehicle. I do not oppose the clause, however, for it will reduce the number of unroadworthy cars on the roads. Unfortunately, legislation can never be as effective as we wish it to be, when we are expected to rush it through as we are doing here. I believe it would have been better to delay the passage of this Bill until next session.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support this provision. In fact, it will not extend greatly the provisions already included in the Act. All that will happen is that the powers the police have in relation to the road will be extended to apply to premises. The provision will prevent a faulty vehicle from coming on to the roads. If a car is faulty, the person who buys it is liable now but, under this provision, the person selling the car will be liable.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If this provision is passed, sellers of motor vehicles will possibly say that a vehicle has been inspected by the police and will use that as a recommendation in selling the vehicle. However, the police will have inspected a vehicle only with regard to its roadworthiness. It could have a cracked cylinder head or something of that nature that would not interest the police under these provisions. Frequently, vehicles that are perceptibly faulty and have been involved in an accident are sold merely because the person owning them cannot afford to repair them. Therefore, this provision should relate not to the sale of a vehicle (which is merely a transaction) but to its use on the road.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am grateful to Opposition members for allowing the suspension of Standing Orders. The member for Torrens referred to hardship that may be caused to people now exhibiting for sale vehicles that may be found unsafe under the new provisions. I contend that this would not create many difficulties, if any. If a vehicle is not safe to be sold, it should be repaired before it is sold.

Mr. Coumbe: People might dispose of vehicles quickly.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it the honourable member means that the market could become flooded with unsafe vehicles, but that risk would apply whenever the new provisions were introduced. The member for Gumeracha said that the emphasis should be on the use of a vehicle on the road rather than on the sale of a vehicle.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I have no objection to police going on to premises and inspecting vehicles, but the prohibition should be on the use of the vehicle.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can see the validity of that point. This does not mean that every car in every used car lot in Adelaide will be inspected. No doubt the Police Force would choose suitable people to do this job, as they would be looking at the aspect of safety. The member for Mitcham spoke about the very wide powers: this provision is already in section 160 in relation to people using a vehicle on the road. I cannot see the danger that he finds inherent in everything produced by the Government—of a power being wielded unethically or unnecessarily. I have the greatest respect for members of the Police Force, and any policeman who exercises this power is subject to the Commissioner of Police. I hope there will be no difficulty with this matter in another place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was interested in the Minister's statement that he had a great deal of faith in the Police Force. This comes strangely, in view of one Government measure on the Notice Paper that I suppose we will reach—the Police Offences Act.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The honourable member is not to discuss that now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I welcome the expression of confidence by the Minister, and wonder whether all of his colleagues would give the same expression of confidence. I agree that section 160 (2) gives the Police Force wide powers, but I see a difference between seeing a vehicle actually being driven on the road which, by the manner of its being driven (that is, by the noise it is making or by the smoke it is emitting), draws the attention of the police, and seeing a vehicle in a used car yard and looking at it coolly and calmly for the purpose of giving a defect notice. I do not say that this power will be deliberately abused: I merely point out how wide the power is.

Mr. McANANEY: Are we actually protecting the buyer by this provision? The buyer will get a false sense of security from thinking that, if he buys a car from a lot, it will be safe to drive on the road. It is up to the buyer to see that the car is in a safe condition before he buys it.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 43 to 51 and No. 56; insisted on its amendments Nos. 6 to 9, 11 to 19, 53 and 65; did not insist on its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 21, 29, 31 to 38, and 40 to 42, but had made alternative amendments; had disagreed to amendments made by the House of Assembly to amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 20; and had amended its amendment No. 52.

In Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to amendments Nos. 6 to 9, 11 to 19, 53, and 65.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 21, 29, 31 to 38, and 40 to 42, and disagree to the alternative amendments made in lieu thereof.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendments to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 20.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the House of Assembly disagree to the amendment made by the Legislative Council to its amendment No. 52.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Burdon, Coumbe, Dunstan, Hall, and Loveday.

Later:

The Legislative Council granted a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 2.15 a.m.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the House to continue during the conference on the Bill. Some members wish to speak on another measure, and it is not intended that a vote be taken while the conference is held. Further, the debate on that measure will not be concluded by the Minister, and members absent from the Chamber will not be prevented from speaking. There is much debate still to take place on the Licensing Bill, and the Government intends that the second reading of that Bill should be completed before Parliament prorogues.

Mr. Millhouse: You're waving a big stick.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am merely suggesting that this will save some time, and will not place members in difficulties.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the motion. On another occasion we agreed to a similar motion and we ran into certain difficulties. This is not as simple as the Attorney-General would have us believe. Members would raise matters in the debate to which they would like replies from the responsible Minister.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

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

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As there are 18 Ayes and 15 Noes and as there is less than an absolute majority, the motion lapses.

At 2.16 a.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended.

They returned at 10.53 a.m. The recommendations were:

As to amendments Nos. 1, 2, 21, 29, 31 to 38 and 40 to 42:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its alternative amendments to Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1, 2, 21, 29, 31 to 38 and 40 to 42, but make the following amendments in lieu of those amendments and alternative amendments:

Page 19, line 9 (clause 26)—Leave out "which in the opinion of the court involves a question of law,"

Page 19, line 12 (clause 26)—Leave out "issue to the board" and insert "make such order and give to the board and any party to the appeal"

Page 19, lines 14 to 16 (clause 26)—Leave out "shall confirm or vary its determination in accordance with those directions" and insert "and the party to whom such directions are given shall be bound thereby and give effect thereto"

Page 19 (clause 26)—After subclause (3) insert the following subclause:

"(3a) An order or direction made or given by the Supreme Court under subsection (3) of this section is final and without appeal."

Page 19, lines 20 to 21 (clause 26)—Leave out "board has confirmed or varied its determination in accordance with the court's directions" and insert "court has made its order thereon".

Page 19, line 25 (clause 26)—Leave out "as so confirmed or varied" and insert "and the order of the court affecting the determination".

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 3, 4, 6 to 9 and 11 to 20:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its amendments to Legislative Council amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 20, that the House of Assembly do not further disagree to amendments Nos. 6 and 20, that the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments Nos. 3, 4, 7 to 9 and 11 to 19, but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Page 10, line 11 (clause 8)—Leave out "nine" and insert "eleven".

Page 10, line 22 (clause 8)—Leave out "five" and insert "seven".

Page 10, lines 40 to 43 and

Page 11, lines 1 to 3 (clause 8)—Leave out subparagraph (v) and insert:

"(v) one shall be selected by the Governor from a panel of three names chosen by the governing body of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated, and submitted by that association to the Minister;

and

(vi) one shall be selected by the Governor from a panel of three names chosen by the governing body of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia Incorporated and submitted by that association to the Minister".

Page 11, line 23 (clause 8)—Leave out "or" and insert a comma.

Page 11, line 24 (clause 8)—After "Incorporated" insert:

", the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated or the Real Estate Institute of South Australia Incorporated".

Page 11, line 29 (clause 8)—Leave out "or (iv)" and insert ", (iv), (v) or (vi)".

Page 11, lines 34 to 45 (clause 8)—Leave out subclause (9).

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 52:

That the House of Assembly do not further disagree to the amendment made by the Legislative Council to its amendment No. 52, that the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment No. 52 but makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 26, line 23 (clause 35)—After "thereof" insert—

"; but, if the area of a council or any part thereof lies within a planning area that lies outside the Metropolitan Planning Area, the authority shall not prepare a supplementary development plan affecting any part of the area of the council—

(*a*) unless the council has requested the authority to do so;

or

(*b*) unless the council has failed or refused to prepare and submit to the Minister within six months after being requested to do so by the authority, a supplementary development plan relating to the area or part of the area of the council that lies within the planning area;

or

(*c*) unless a supplementary development plan of the area or part of the area of the council that lies within the planning area prepared by the council has been returned to the council by the Minister under this section."

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 53:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its amendment No. 53 and the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement thereto.

As to amendment No. 65:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment No. 65, but amend its amendment to read as follows:

Page 56 (clause 63)—After subclause (4) insert new subclause as follows:

"(4a) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section—

(*a*) the authority shall not subdivide or resubdivide any land acquired or taken by it under powers conferred on it by this section except for the purpose of redeveloping it or rebuilding on it, or rendering it suitable for redevelopment or rebuilding on it; and

(*b*) the authority shall not sell any land so subdivided or resubdivided except for carrying into effect the purposes of an authorized development plan.

And that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The effect of the amendments agreed to in relation to clause 26 is that we agreed to a right of appeal to the Supreme Court from decisions of the Planning Appeal Tribunal on matters not restricted to matters of law, but that is the final appeal and gives no right of further appeal to the Full Court of South Australia.

The effect of the amendments agreed to in relation to clause 8 will be that the authority will consist of 11 members and, in place of the Legislative Council's proposals for one each from the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, the Chamber of Commerce and the Real Estate Institute, the member from the Chamber of Commerce will be deleted from the Legislative Council's proposals.

The alternative amendment to clause 35 proposed by the Legislative Council relating to supplementary development plans will now apply only to councils outside the metropolitan planning area. This will be a workable arrangement simply because in those planning areas it is unlikely that more than one or two councils will be involved in a particular planning area.

Amendment No. 53, which was not much discussed in this House, concerns the Minister's powers over development plans and his power to override the authority upon the application of the council.

The effect of amendment No. 65 is that the Legislative Council's amendment as sent to us no longer contains restrictions upon the price of land to be acquired and types of development to be allowed. In consequence, while this is not entirely satisfactory from the Government's point of view, nevertheless it allows the planning authority to continue in a workable manner.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It restricts it, to some extent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but it does not, in effect, restrict development in the metropolitan area and, as far as acquisition of open spaces is concerned, while certain restrictions are involved, these will not be ones that, in these circumstances, will seriously hamper the authority.

In Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I have explained in some detail the effect of the amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. I believe that the Bill as amended will provide workable legislation for this State, because it does not inhibit planning of any consequence in the foreseeable future. I am pleased that, as a result of the conference, the matter has been resolved in this way.

Motion carried.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DAMAGES).

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1. Insert title as follows:

"A Bill for
An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1966."

No. 2. Page 1. Insert words of enactment as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Governor of the State of South Australia, with the advice and consent of the Parliament thereof, as follows:"

No. 3. Page 1. Insert new clauses as follows:

"1. Short Titles.—(1) This Act may be cited as the "Supreme Court Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1966".

(2) The Supreme Court Act, 1935-1965, as amended by this Act, may be cited as the "Supreme Court Act, 1935-1966".

(3) The Supreme Court Act, 1935-1965, is hereinafter referred to as "the principal Act".

2. Commencement.—This Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by the Governor by proclamation.

3. Incorporation.—This Act is incorporated with the principal Act and that Act and this Act shall be read as one Act.

No. 4. Page 3, line 25 (clause 6)—Leave out "interlocutory" and insert "declaratory".

No. 5. Page 3, line 26 (clause 6)—After "judgment" insert "finally determining the question of liability between the parties".

No. 6. Page 3, line 36 (clause 6)—Leave out "interlocutory" and insert "declaratory".

No. 7. Page 3, line 37 (clause 6)—After "judgment" insert "finally determining the question of liability between the parties,".

No. 8. Page 3, line 38 (clause 6)—Before "assessment" insert "final".

No. 9. Page 3, line 40 (clause 6)—Leave out "In any such case it" and insert "It".

No. 10. Page 3, line 41 (clause 6)—Leave out "interlocutory" and insert "declaratory".

No. 11. Page 3, line 41 (clause 6)—After "and" insert "for any judge of the Court".

No. 12. Page 4 (clause 6)—After line 10, insert:

"Provided, however, that where the declaratory judgment has been entered in an action for damages for personal injury such payment or payments shall not include an allowance for pain or suffering or for bodily or mental harm (as distinct from pecuniary loss resulting therefrom) except where serious and continuing illness or disability results from the injury or except that where the party entitled to recover damages is incapacitated or partially incapacitated for employment and being in part responsible for his injury is not entitled to recover the full amount of his present or continuing loss of earnings, or of any hospital, medical or other expenses resulting from his injury, the court may order payment or payments not to exceed such loss of earnings and expenses and such payment or payments may be derived either wholly or in part from any damages to which the party entitled to recover damages has, but for the operation of this proviso, established a present and immediate right or except where the judge is of opinion that there are special circumstances by reason of which this proviso should not apply."

No. 13. Page 4, line 19 (clause 6)—After "given" insert "in the final assessment".

No. 14. Page 4, line 20 (clause 6)—Leave out "of the court".

No. 15. Page 4, line 27 (clause 6)—Before "the" insert "any judge of".

No. 16. Page 4, line 34 (clause 6)—Leave out "court" and insert "judge".

No. 17. Page 4, line 35 (clause 6)—After "just" leave out full stop and insert:

": Provided that, in an action for damages for personal injury, upon application for an order that the court proceed to final assessment of damages, the judge to whom such application is made shall not refuse such order if the medical condition of the party entitled to recover damages is such that neither substantial improvement nor substantial deterioration thereof is likely to occur or if a period of four years or more has expired since the date of the declaratory judgment unless the judge is of opinion that there are special circumstances by reason of which such assessment should not then be made.".

No. 18. Page 4 (clause 6)—After line 35 insert:

"(6a) If it appears to the court that a person in whose favour declaratory judgment has been entered has without reasonable cause failed to undertake such reasonable medical or remedial treatment as his case might have required or require, it shall not award damages for such disability, pain or suffering as would have been remedied but for such failure.

(6b) If at any time it appears to a judge that a person in whose favour declaratory judgment has been entered and who is incapacitated or partially incapacitated for employment, is not sincerely or with the diligence which should be expected of him in the circumstances of his case, attempting to rehabilitate himself for employment any payment or payments under subsection (2) of this section shall not include by way of allowance for

loss of earnings a sum in excess of seventy-five per centum of such person's loss of earnings."

No. 19. Page 4, line 36 (clause 6)—After figure "(7)" insert "(*a*)".

No. 20. Page 4, line 40 (clause 6)—Leave out "interlocutory" and insert "declaratory".

No. 21. Page 4 (clause 6)—After line 43 insert:

"(*b*) Where a party dies after declaratory judgment has been entered in his favour but before final assessment of his damages in circumstances which would have entitled any person to recover damages, solatium or expenses by action pursuant to Part II of the Wrongs Act, 1936-1959, it shall be lawful for the executor or administrator of the deceased to proceed in the same action for the recovery of such damages, solatium or expenses for the benefit of such person notwithstanding the declaratory judgment or that the deceased has received moneys thereunder, provided, however, that in any such proceedings all moneys paid to the deceased pursuant to the declaratory judgment in excess of any actual and subsisting pecuniary loss resulting to him from the wrongful act of the party held liable shall be deemed to have been paid towards satisfaction of the damages solatium or expenses awarded pursuant to the Wrongs Act, 1936-1959, and no further damages shall be payable in respect of the injury sustained by the deceased. In any proceedings hereunder, the declaratory judgment and any finding of fact made in the course of proceedings consequent thereupon shall enure as between the party held liable and the executor or administrator of the deceased.

(*c*) Where a party dies in the circumstances referred to in the preceding subparagraph of this subsection except that the death of the deceased is not wholly attributable to the personal injury, the subject of the declaratory judgment, but was accelerated thereby, it shall be lawful for proceedings to be taken and for the court to assess damages, solatium or expenses as in the preceding subparagraph but such damages, solatium or expenses shall be proportioned to the injury to the person for whom and for whose benefit the proceedings are taken resulting from such acceleration of death;

(*d*) The court may, if the justice of a case so requires, assess damages under subparagraph (*a*) of this subsection notwithstanding the commencement or prosecution of proceedings under subparagraph (*b*) or (*c*) of this subsection and the damages so assessed shall be for the benefit of the estate of the deceased and no damages shall be awarded under subparagraph (*b*) or (*c*) of this subsection.

(8) In the exercise of the powers conferred by this section the court shall have regard to the facts and circumstances of the particular case, as they exist from time to time, and any allowance, or the final assessment, as the case may be, shall be such as to the court may seem just and reasonable as compensation to the person actually injured or to his or her dependants as the case may be."

No. 22. Page 5 (clause 7)—Leave out lines 1 to 5 and insert:

"Section 50 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the words 'every judgment' first occurring therein the words 'including every declaratory judgment entered pursuant to section 30b of this Act and any final assessment made thereon' and by inserting in paragraph (*b*) of subsection (3) thereof after subparagraph (v) the following subparagraph:

(va) Any assessment of damages not being a final assessment made pursuant to section 30b of this Act:".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The amendments really fall into two parts: the first is an amendment of some substance recommended by the former Chief Justice after the measure had been considered by the conference of Chief Justices in Tasmania. This substitutes for the proposal in the original measure for an interlocutory judgment liability a declaratory judgment liability, and thereby provides a right of appeal as of right to the High Court that the original measure did not. This is a significant amendment to which the Government readily agreed.

The other amendments of the Legislative Council have been considered by the judges. Some of them were proposed by the Law Society and some of them have arisen out of amendments originally considered by the Law Society and discussed with the judges. No objection is raised by Their Honours to these amendments and, although His Honour Justice Hogarth and I considered that the original measure went far enough and that it was not necessary to spell out some of these matters, nevertheless there is no harm in spelling out matters in this way.

Therefore, I see no reason to disagree to the amendments made. I had some slight reservation about a four-year limitation on interim damages after the original declaratory judgment, but this may be extended where, in the view of the court, there are special circumstances. In consequence, I think that so substantial a degree of agreement to the original measure has been reached and that there is so much benefit from the measure that there is no point on insisting on any disagreement with the Legislative Council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Have these amendments been circulated? I would like to have a look at them before we agree to them and before I speak to this measure, which I want to do briefly. What opportunity does the Attorney-General propose to give members of this Committee to look at the amendments? Can he give me at least 10 minutes to go through them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope I can do that. I had hoped the honourable member might be informing himself of the course of the measure in another place. In endeavouring to reach agreement, I had consultations with Opposition members in the Legislative Council and with counsel at the bar who had been advising them over some period. I would have thought he would be informed by his own Party and would have known what was going on. However, I am quite happy for the honourable member to have some minutes to look at these amendments.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate the courtesy that the Attorney-General extended to me, although it was unexpected. He gave me 10 minutes to consider the Bill and this has stretched to 10 hours. This time has been of great benefit because in the atmosphere of this place at this time of the session it is useless to concentrate on the *minutiae* of a technical Bill. I have read it through and it would take time, concentration, and discussion with other people to consider it adequately. I hope these amendments will work. When I asked the Attorney-General for time to consider these matters he chided me with not having been familiar with them before they came to this place. I remind him, however, that members on this side have enough work to do in this Chamber to keep them busy without being able to keep in touch with what is going on in another place. We should never have to do that, because this is the place in which amendments of this nature should be considered, not outside. This measure (with another separated from it in another place) was originally introduced by the Attorney-General on November 10. He was on that occasion, as on so many others, in a hurry, and we were obliged to debate it on November 15. I remind the Committee of what he said in his second reading explanation. It is particularly appropriate that we should be reminded of it in view of what has happened since. He said:

> This proposal is simple: it was formulated by a Supreme Court judge and has been examined by members of the profession and by all the other judges. I am authorized by Their Honours to say that they all wholeheartedly and enthusiastically commend this measure.

I complained about the haste with which he compelled the debate to proceed in this Chamber, and he, rather self-righteously, said:

> Turning to the third matter contained in this Bill—

that is, what is contained in the Bill now before us, because the other two matters were excised—

> I draw attention to the accusation of the member for Mitcham that I was discourteous to the House in bringing this measure in so late. It was stated that there was not sufficient time for the Law Society to examine it. In fact, the Law Society did see a draft of the amendment that had been prepared by His Honour Justice Hogarth prior to November 2. The Law Society wrote to Justice Hogarth on November 2 and provided the judge with a number of points raised by members of the law revision committee of the society. The judge prepared a reply and let both me and the society have it. I then received some further submissions from the chairman of the law revision committee of the society, and consulted with him personally regarding the provisions of the Bill.

He went on to say how co-operative the Law Society had been and how everything in the garden was lovely. No other measure has taken the profession so much by the ears as this one has. That process has been going on since the learned gentleman introduced the measure. The longer people have looked at the Bill the more traps and pitfalls they have found in it. Now we are presented with these amendments and, if I had not asked specifically, we would not have had the opportunity even to look at them. At this stage of the sitting we are presented with a *fait accompli*, and a substantially different set of proposals from those that left this Chamber. There has been a substantial re-write of the provisions that the Attorney-General so vigorously and self-confidently defended before they left this Chamber. Now we are asked to let them go through in the dying hours of the session.

I hope that the provisions work: I hope that they do, in fact, represent an improvement in the law of this State, but only time will tell. I hope that on this occasion the Attorney-General's impatience, which has been checked by another place, on which he relies to put the Bill right (and that is what he said, and that is the effect of his actions)—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that at all: you did not listen.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Legislative Council has put the Bill right for him, and we hope it will represent an improvement in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As usual, we have had a diatribe from the honourable learned and gallant member.

Mr. Millhouse: You only get a diatribe from me when you deserve it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable gentleman remains as pettily petulant on this matter as on any other matter. So far from my saying that it was necessary for the other place to put this measure in order, I related to members the view of Justice Hogarth (with which I agreed) that the Bill was all right as it was.

Mr. Millhouse: Most of the profession would not agree with you: you know that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know there were divisions in the Law Society in the matter, and that many people in the society could see there were no advantages or disadvantages in spelling out in the Bill what was already the discretion of the court. Since then, some people in the profession have asked for these amendments. The judges have considered them necessary, although in many cases it was considered there was no improvement in the measure. The amendments have been made not for the sake of improvement but for the sake of accord, and I made that perfectly clear last night.

Amendments agreed to.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (PENOLA UNDERTAKING) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 6 (The Schedule)—Leave out "and" where it occurs between paragraph (1) and paragraph (2).

No. 2. Page 6 (The Schedule)—After paragraph (2) insert:

";

(3) All transformers, switchboards and distribution equipment situated on the land referred to in paragraph (4) of this Schedule;".

No. 3. Page 6 (The Schedule)—Leave out ", switchboards," in paragraph (*a*) and insert "and".

No. 4. Page 6 (The Schedule)—Leave out ", conductors and transformers".

No. 5. Page 6 (The Schedule)—Leave out paragraph (*c*).

No. 6. Page 6 (The Schedule)—After paragraph (*d*) insert:

";

and

(4) The whole of the land comprised in certificates of title register book, volume 759, folio 195, volume 1953, folio 116, and volume 1953, folio 117, together with all buildings, fixtures, and improvements thereon.''.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That the amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

I do so because the amendments seem to be not justified, because of the circumstances that brought this Bill into being. It will be remembered that when the Bill was before members it was stated that the franchise holder and the Penola council could not agree on the operation and the continuation of the franchise. The Government and the Electricity Trust, when requested to take over the assets or part thereof, agreed to take over the distribution section of the undertaking at Penola. This resulted in the appointment of a Select Committee, which thoroughly considered these matters and improved the original Bill. The assets are those that warrant being taken over by the Electricity Trust. If this does not happen, the assets of the contractor will be worth only their scrap metal value.

Mr. Quirke: They will go to scrap in any case.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Under the Bill as it left here certain compensation will be paid for the distribution plant as a going concern.

Amendments disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

That the amendments are not justified in the circumstances which made this legislation necessary.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 1 to 6 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

CONSTRUCTION SAFETY BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. **Page 7, lines 16 to 21 (clause 9)**—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause as follows:

"(2) The principal contractor, or some person acting on his behalf, shall place or caused to be placed the name of the appointed safety supervisor or supervisors on a notice board on the site within twenty-four (24) hours after every such appointment is made.

Penalty: Fifty dollars."

No. 2. Page 7, lines 31 to 34 (clause 9)—Leave out:

"advise the principal contractor and every employer of persons working in the place in respect of which he is appointed, of the requirements of this Act for the safety and protection of any workmen and shall".

No. 3. Page 7, line 35 (clause 9)—Leave out "aforesaid".

No. 4. Page 7, line 35 (clause 9)—After "requirements" insert "of this Act".

No. 5. Page 8 (clause 10)—After line 19 insert new subclause as follows:

"(4) No employee shall, without authorization, remove any safety equipment provided or fail to carry out such protective or safety measures as are required of him, or act in such a way as to render ineffective any safety or protective measures provided by his employer."

No. 6. Page 8, line 20 (clause 10)—After "Penalty" insert "for any breach of this section".

No. 7. Pages 8 and 9 (clause 12)—Leave out clause 12 and insert new clause as follows:

"12. Every employer, when carrying out work to which this Act applies, shall provide and keep at his principal place of business a copy of this Act and the regulations so as to be available for inspection by any of his workmen at all reasonable times.

Penalty: Fifty dollars."

No. 8. Page 9, lines 8 to 15 (clause 13)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclause as follows:

"(1) On and after the expiration of a period of one year from the day of commencement of this Act, wherever work of a greater height than thirty feet to which this Act applies is being undertaken, no employer shall cause or permit any work to be performed unless a person who holds a current certificate as in subclause (3) is, whilst structural steel, plant (not being scaffolding), building materials, are being erected, placed into position or dismantled, in charge of such operations."

No. 9. Page 9 (clause 13)—After line 15 insert "Penalty: One hundred dollars."

No. 10. Page 9, line 16 (clause 13)—Leave out "as a rigger".

No. 11. Page 9, line 20 (clause 13)—Leave out "to riggers".

No. 12. Page 13, line 5 (clause 16)—After "may" insert "with the approval of the Chief Inspector".

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 to 4.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) moved:

That amendments Nos. 1 to 4 be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 5.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 5 be disagreed to.

There is no need for this amendment. Clause 10(2) covers the position. In any case, the terms used in this amendment are too vague and not defined. The appropriate place to make a provision of this nature, properly drafted, is in the regulations, as is done in regulations under the present Scaffolding Inspection Act.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister's explanation does not satisfy me. It seems to me, on a superficial reading, that the clause inserted by the Legislative Council provides much more compulsion upon the employee to do his share. I oppose the motion.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has pointed out what subclause (2) does: new subclause (4) goes a little further by providing that the employee shall not remove any equipment without authorization. It also provides that the employee shall not damage any safety or protective measures provided by his employer. I have seen deliberate damage done to safety equipment, and this is inexcusable, as this equipment is supplied expressly for the protection of the workmen. No harm can be done by accepting the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think this amendment should be accepted, as I do not think subclause (2) meets the position. Even if a welder using oxy-acetylene equipment uses the goggles and gloves supplied to him he can still get into trouble if he fails to carry out the routine procedures essential in the use of the equipment. An operator of a press knows there are certain procedures which, to keep his hands intact, he must follow.

[*Midnight.*]

An operator may use all the equipment supplied but fail to observe the rules for operating the press and, as a result, may become entangled in it. I think the other place has made a wise amendment. I do not agree that the words "fail to wear or use" are adequate to meet the position envisaged by another place. In fact, the amendment provides an added protection to the workman.

Mr. SHANNON: Animosity might be engendered among workmen or between employer

and employee. For instance, a man may want to get even with the employer, and all he has to do is render inefficient some of the equipment supplied by the employer for his safety. Under the amendment, however, the employee will become responsible for that equipment, and rightly so.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I may have misled the Committee previously. I think honourable members will find that subclause (1) covers the position.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I cannot see that our arguments fall down on that account. If there is an obligation on the employer to provide safety equipment, surely there should also be an obligation on the employee to respect his employer's equipment and to use it properly.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We are not seeking any change; we are leaving the position as it is under the present Scaffolding Inspection Act. No trouble has arisen under the existing provision, so we do not expect any trouble to arise under this measure.

Mr. McANANEY: I presume the purpose of the legislation is to improve conditions.

Mr. Broomhill: This is not the proper place for the amendment: it can be covered by regulation.

Mr. McANANEY: We merely seek to place an obligation on the employee to observe every safety method made available to him by his employer. For instance, an employee would, under the amendment, be prevented from removing the railing from a scaffold. It is ridiculous to say that this can be covered by regulation. The Minister has given no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister said that the Bill, as drafted, was in line with certain provisions of an old Act. However, I understood that the whole purpose of the Bill was to improve these provisions and to impose quite a few additional obligations on employers over and above those contained in the old Act. We accept that this is reasonable, but surely it is equally reasonable to ask employees to accept the responsibility for the obligations placed on them in this amendment. Extra safety provisions will be provided by the employer without cost to the employee and entirely for his benefit. Surely the Minister cannot logically oppose the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Bill imposes direct charges on the employer. As the employer has to provide this equipment and so on, surely it is only right and proper that the employee should have the obligation to preserve and wear the equipment provided, and thus to protect himself from accidents. If this amendment were not included, an employee could possibly claim compensation for an accident that was caused by his not using equipment provided or by his not looking after it.

Mr. HUDSON: Clause 10(2), which imposes an obligation on employees, provides:

No employee shall fail to wear or use such protective equipment provided. Penalty: $100.

The Legislative Council's amendment is vague where it states "or fail to carry out such protective or safety measures as are required of him". What is the limitation on what can be required of him under the term "protective or safety measures"? The amendment cannot be accepted in its present form because it might create a situation where unnecessary obligations could be imposed on an employee. We do not want to impose unnecessary obligations on employers or employees. I believe we should disagree to this amendment and, at a later stage this evening, a satisfactory solution could be found to incorporate in the Bill the general aim of this amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

In new subclause (4) to strike out "fail to carry out such protective or safety measures as are required of him, or".

New subclause (4) will then provide:

No employee shall, without authorization, remove any safety equipment provided or act in such a way as to render ineffective any safety or protective measures provided by his employer.

As far as I can see, the new subclause will now meet most of the circumstances that may arise.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I ask the Committee not to agree to the amendment moved by the member for Onkaparinga, as the position is not satisfactory.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Why is the honourable member's amendment no good?

Mr. HURST: I oppose the Legislative Council's amendment, even as amended by the amendment of the member for Onkaparinga. The removal of certain safety equipment could easily mean the death of an employee on the job. The new subclause is far too vague. To accept the Legislative Council's amendment could result in a gross injustice.

Mr. McANANEY: The arguments that the member for Semaphore has advanced against new subclause (4) could be used against subclause (2), so why not oppose subclause (2)?

There must be flexibility in relation to safety measures. The regulations should not be too rigid. New subclause (4) gives added protection to an employee whose life might be endangered by the action of another employee.

Mr. SHANNON: The employer is obligated to provide such protective equipment as may be prescribed, so it is the employer's responsibility. We are merely trying to ensure that such equipment, having been provided, cannot be discarded by the employee to the detriment of the employer. Obviously the member for Semaphore did not realize that the equipment to be used by the employee must be provided by the employer.

Mr. HEASLIP: I cannot understand the objection of honourable members opposite to the Legislative Council's amendment, because it protects the employee.

Mr. SHANNON: As I understand that one of my colleagues wishes to move an amendment, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. FREEBAIRN moved:

To strike out new subclause (4) and to insert the following new subclause:

(4) No employee shall remove any safety equipment provided in accordance with the regulations or fail to carry out such protective or safety measures as are required of him by the regulations or act in such a way as to render ineffective any safety or protective measures provided by his employer in accordance with the regulations.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; Legislative Council's amendment as amended agreed to.

Amendment No. 6.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS moved:

That amendment No. 6 be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 7.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 7 be disagreed to.

The object of the clause as passed by this Chamber was to enable workmen to have means of readily ascertaining the requirements of the Act and regulations. The clause, as amended, only provides for the employer to keep a copy of the Act and regulations at his principal place of business. This is of no use at all to an employee working at Whyalla, if his employer's principal place of business is in Adelaide; nor for an employee in Adelaide who is working for an employer, whose principal place of business is in another State.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 8.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

Although the amendment will require a certificated person to be in charge of the erection and dismantling of structural steel, plant and building materials at a greater height than 30ft., this does not recognize the fact that on many occasions heavy loads must be lifted during building construction operations to a height of less than 30ft. It is just as important to have a certificated person to be in charge of the lifting of heavy loads, for example, structural steel members being erected in the excavation for a large new building. The weight and position to which it is moved must be considered, as well as the height.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Why does the Government wish to harass people in industry unnecessarily? Under the present provision, only a certain class of people holding a certain certificate will be able to undertake particular work. Surely many such certificated people will consequently be required. No justification exists for such a wide application of this clause.

Mr. COUMBE: Whereas an employee may be required to use materials or equipment at any height above 10ft., the clause could at present apply to somebody asked to fit a timber joint (or to take one out) in a single-storey building. Clause 13 relates to structural steel, plant, buildings and so on. This provision does not deal with safety so much as with the qualifications of the tradesmen to be employed. Under this provision, possibly only a certificated rigger would be allowed to be in charge of erecting or installing a timber joint in a building over 10ft. high. Therefore, there would not be enough riggers to go around to do the jobs. I know of many jobs where a certificated rigger would be asked to work on jobs now being done by other competent tradesmen. I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 9.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS moved:

That amendment No. 9 be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 10.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 10 be disagreed to.

By the amendment, the word "rigger" has been omitted. If it is necessary to have qualified persons in charge of this work they must have a name: they cannot just be called "certificated", and that is the effect of the clause as it now stands. The clause as passed

by this place did not require a person who had a certificate as a rigger to be restricted to a person paid as a rigger under an award.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 11.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 11 be disagreed to.

The same reasons apply in this case as applied to amendment No. 10.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 12.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That amendment No. 12 be disagreed to.

The clause as originally drafted is the same as the section in the Industrial Code. An inspector can be expected to act reasonably and should not have to refer to the Chief Inspector on each occasion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The provision the Minister would like to see remain in the Bill does not appear in the Scaffolding Act. It is not reasonable to allow an inspector, at will, to engage the services of a police officer to assist him in making an inspection of work. The amendment will provide some restraint on an over-zealous inspector and will require him to refer to his superior before he engages the service of a police officer to assist him.

Amendment disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12 was adopted:

Because the amendments unnecessarily weaken the proposed legislation.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the amendment made by the House of Assembly to amendment No. 5; that it had made alternative amendments in respect of amendments Nos. 7 and 8; that it did not insist on amendments Nos. 10 and 11; and that it had insisted on amendment No. 12, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

Alternative amendments Nos. 7 and 8.

7. Clause 12—Strike out the word "ten" in line 1 on page 9 and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty".

8. Clause 13, page 9, lines 8 to 15—Leave out all lines and insert the following:

> "(1) On and after the expiration of a period of one year from the date of the commencement of this Act, wherever work to which this Act applies is being undertaken, no employer shall cause or permit any person to perform any work which involves the lifting, lowering, moving, placing in position or dismantling of structural steel, plant, material or equipment (other than scaffolding) unless a person who holds a current certificate as a rigger is in charge of such work: Provided that this subsection shall apply only in any case where the structural steel, plant, material or equipment (other than scaffolding) concerned
>
> (*a*) exceeds 2,000 lb. in weight; or
>
> (*b*) is to be lifted, moved, placed into position or dismantled to or at a height which is more than twenty-five feet above the horizontal plane from which the load is to be moved; or
>
> (*c*) is to be lowered, moved or placed into position at a level more than fifteen feet below the horizontal plane from which the load is to be moved."

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That the alternative amendments made by the Legislative Council in lieu of its amendments Nos. 7 and 8 be agreed to.

Alternative amendment No. 7 returns the original subclause to the Bill but deletes from the subclause "ten" and substitutes "twenty". This amendment was carried without dissent in another place. The alternative amendment will provide that the clause will apply to large building sites. Alternative amendment No. 8 was also carried without dissent in another place and is a better way of dealing with the matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree to the amendments: they are acceptable.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 12.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 12 made by the Legislative Council.

That amendment was debated earlier this morning and, although members here have at one stage disagreed to it, the amendment is now considered not unreasonable and I recommend that we do not insist on our disagreement.

Amendment agreed to.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS (TRADE PRACTICES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 7 (clause 1)—After "proclamation" insert "pursuant to section 4 of this Act".

No. 2. Page 2, line 4 (clause 2)—Leave out the figure "4" and insert the figure "5".

No. 3. Page 2, lines 19 to 23 (clause 4)—Leave out clause 4 and insert new clause as follows:

> "4. No proclamation shall be made fixing a day for the coming into operation of this Act until legislation to the effect of sections 2 and 3 of this Act has been passed by the Parliaments of each of the other States of the Commonwealth and

the Governor is satisfied that that legislation will be in force on the day fixed for the coming into operation of this Act."

No. 4. Page 2—After new clause 4 insert new clause as follows:

"5. (1) At any time during the continuance of the reference made by this Act, the Governor may, by proclamation issued with the approval of both Houses of Parliament expressed by resolution—

(a) declare that the reference made by this Act shall continue until a date specified in the proclamation, in which case the reference shall continue until that date, and shall, subject to the effect of any later proclamation under this subsection, terminate on that date, or

(b) declare that the reference made by this Act shall continue without limitation of time, in which case the reference shall not terminate unless and until this Act is repealed.

(2) If no proclamation under this section is made before the 31st day of December, 1972, the reference made by this Act shall terminate on that date."

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

There are, in essence, two amendments made by the Legislative Council. First, no proclamation shall be made fixing a day for the coming into operation of this legislation until legislation to the effect of clauses 2 and 3 has been passed by the Parliaments of each of the other States of the Commonwealth and the Governor is satisfied that that legislation will be in force on the day fixed for the coming into operation of this legislation. This means that, if any one State holds out in this matter, nothing can be done. The effect of that amendment is to defeat the measure. There is no purpose in having this measure on the Statute Book in those circumstances and, in consequence, it would be pointless to agree to the Legislative Council's amendment. I have had discussions with the Commonwealth Ministers on this matter, and they agree with the view I have expressed.

The second basic amendment is to replace the power of the Governor to make a proclamation for the transfer subject to a time limitation and instead to provide that the Governor may, by proclamation issued with the approval of both Houses of Parliament expressed by resolution, declare that the reference shall continue until a date specified in the proclamation, or declare that the reference shall continue without the limitation, in which case it will not terminate until the legislation is repealed. The difficulty about this amendment is that, in the first place, the reference is to be for a specific period. The reference then ends; it has no legislative force. There is no provision for a further proclamation, so that the reference is only for a particular period. Then there has to be a further Act of Parliament.

Alternatively, the reference is to be without limitation of time, but the reference should not terminate unless there is an Act of Parliament repealing the particular measure we are considering. That is the very matter the member for Mitcham pointed out quite rightly to the Chamber although, with respect to him, he slightly confused the issue between the two processes. However, he quite rightly pointed out that the High Court certainly had not decided the issue of the power to repeal the basic Act making the reference. It has made it clear that it has not determined that issue. The point the High Court determined was that a valid reference limited in time on a future event could be made in the way proposed in the original Bill.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: By proclamation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the proposal to substitute a process of referring the powers and withdrawing them only by repealing the Act is entirely different. That has not been decided by the High Court, which has left that matter completely open. While there is good legal authority to argue that that would be a valid method of proceeding, and the validity of the State Act would be upheld, there is nevertheless nothing like the clear expression of opinion from the High Court on that matter as there was on the proposal that was originally put before members. Consequently, I do not think we should make this alteration.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): An amendment seeks to remove many of the fears expressed by members on this side when the Bill was originally before us. As the Bill was originally drafted, it was feared that people in industry or commerce might be frightened by this legislation and, as a consequence, gravitate to States in which this type of legislation did not operate. Therefore, I support the amendment that provides that the Bill could not function here unless similar legislation were passed in other States. I believe it might be a wise safeguard if the legislation terminated at a specific date. As

the Attorney-General agrees with the member for Mitcham in respect of the second part of the amendment, it is probably not a good one. However, the present indication is that a conference will be held, at which this matter may be settled.

Amendments disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments render the proposed legislation ineffective.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted upon.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference, at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, and McAnaney, and Sir Thomas Playford.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 11.30 a.m.

At 11.29 a.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 12 noon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have to report that the managers have been at the conference on the Commonwealth Powers (Trade Practices) Bill, which was managed on the part of the Legislative Council by the Chief Secretary (Hon. A. J. Shard), the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, the Hon. H. K. Kemp, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, and we delivered the Bill together with the resolution adopted by this House, and thereupon the managers for the two Houses conferred together and no agreement was reached.

LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 22. Page 3973.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Before continuing, I wish to refer to something the Leader of the Opposition said when the member for Mitcham was speaking in a debate following my earlier remarks today on this Bill. The Leader mentioned the "tin-rattling speech" of the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Clark: That was an offensive thing to say.

Mr. HUGHES: It did not worry me in the least, because I had already proved the point I had been making about how conscious of his inefficiency the present Leader was, compared with the efficiency of the previous Leader. The member for Burnside referred to the lack of speeches made by Government members in various debates, and intimated that, if it were not for Opposition members speaking, Bills on the Notice Paper would be rushed through without proper examination. I do not want any Opposition member to make this charge against me this morning if I continue to deal with this matter at length. The more I say, the more I shall be able to convince the member for Burnside and other Opposition members that Government members also examine Bills before the House and debate them when they feel it necessary.

Earlier, I referred to a letter written by a lady to a newspaper stating that longer hours meant more drinking. This letter reminded me that 6 p.m. closing was the result of a referendum, and any alteration to that hour must be as a result of a referendum. When I said that trading hours would increase the sales of liquor, various members said I did not know what I was talking about, that there was no foundation to my statement, and that the fact could not be proved from what had taken place in other States. In the financial pages of last Friday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Late Closing Lifts Victorian Hotel Sales" appeared the following article:

Melbourne, March 16—Carlton Brewery Ltd's hotels had improved overall sales since the introduction of 10 o'clock closing, the chairman (Mr. J. M. Baillieu) said at the annual meeting today. A significant feature was that demand for bulk beer had increased while sales of packaged beer had declined, he said. Carlton Brewery is the largest shareholder in Carlton and United Breweries Ltd. and owns 13 hotels. Mr. Baillieu said that all of Carlton Brewery's hotels were in "good shape," and should help profitability in the future. Referring to the $10,000,000 debenture issue by Carlton and United Breweries, one shareholder said he would like to have seen a greater part of the issue reserved for Carlton Brewery shareholders. Replying, Mr. Baillieu said it was considered to be novel and unusual for any portion to be reserved for shareholders in a holding company. The conditions of the issue were considered to be the best at the time.

The financial climate had improved since then. "The issue has been a great success," he added.

If this company says that 13 hotels have increased their sales because of 10 p.m. closing, then I think this is proof that other hotels must have benefited from 10 p.m. closing. This should convince members that I know what I am talking about, and it should show that people from other States who have said the same thing to me have also known what they were talking about. If this House, in its wisdom, passes a Bill to allow 10 p.m. closing in South Australia, the sales of liquor here will increase. The Rev. Alan Walker, for some years attached to the Central Methodist Mission in Sydney, had this to say:

It is just untrue to state that there is no significant relationship between bar trading hours and sociological consequences.

Continuing, he said:

The social changes brought about by 10 p.m. closing here are great. Late trading has created the beer garden. It has related entertainment to liquor consumption in a new way. It has drawn women and girls into hotels at night. It has made Sydney streets unpleasant as intoxicated people leave hotels at 10 p.m. On numbers of occasions, we have been forced to get police assistance to allow the young people to get away from our teen-age cabaret unmolested by drunken men after 10 p.m. on a Saturday night.

Many members know the Rev. Alan Walker and know, as I do, that there must be much truth in what he says, because he has had great experience in mission work in Sydney and is highly respected in that area.

Mr. Rodda: There wasn't much evidence of drunks around the streets when we went to Sydney a few weeks ago.

Mr. HUGHES: From that I take it that the honourable member does not agree with the Rev. Alan Walker's statement. However, I believe Mr. Walker has had more experience and would be better able to judge this matter, which vitally concerns his mission, than would the member for Victoria who had a short visit to Sydney of a few hours or a few days. Therefore, I am prepared to accept the word of this reverend gentleman who is well known not only in New South Wales but also in South Australia. He has made a great contribution to the progress of Australia. He is vitally concerned with the actions of certain people that have been brought about by 10 p.m. closing. Mr. Walker supplied some interesting statistics about this matter when he said:

Traffic statistics show that the highest percentage of road deaths occur between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m., and the second highest between 10 p.m. and midnight. This follows the heavy drinking periods in New South Wales hotels. Road fatalities occurring between 10 p.m. and midnight have almost trebled since the introduction of 10 p.m. closing in New South Wales. Thus, to claim there are no sociological consequences is nonsense.

Therefore, I suggest that what the member for Victoria said had happened since 10 p.m. closing was introduced in New South Wales was absolute nonsense, because this man has supplied statistics to back up his argument. I will listen very attentively if the member for Victoria speaks on this Bill and is able to pull out some statistics that will knock down those supplied by Mr. Walker. He continued to say that because arrests for drunkenness in New South Wales had not risen since 10 p.m. closing there had been no ill effects from the change. The number of police on the beat at 10 p.m. as against 6 p.m. will also have an effect on the number of arrests. As a result, many people in New South Wales believe that to base an argument on the number of arrests for drunkenness is misleading. I consider that would also be correct. A man who visited South Australia on a fact-finding mission in connection with alcohol in 1962 gave evidence before the Royal Commission in Victoria. Later, he made a further statement after his first appearance. I can understand Mr. Walker's amazement towards the reasoning of this learned man to give evidence before the Commission for the retention of 6 p.m. closing, then to make a further statement in evidence that he wished to change the statement previously made regarding hours of trading and to move from a position of advocating for 6 p.m. closing to a position of neutrality. This indicated to Mr. Walker, and also to me, that there must have been more behind this move than was apparent on the surface. I have never been able to find out the real reason for his change.

Late in 1962, this same man spoke to delegates to an all-Australian fact-finding convention on alcohol at a dinner held at Pennington Hall, North Adelaide. He said, on the basis of readily available well-attested evidence that liquor was killing more people, ruining more careers, causing more accidents, crime and divorce, costing more money, and creating more sheer human misery and degradation than any other factor in the country.

Mr. Rodda: Do you advocate prohibition?

Mr. HUGHES: When I was in Opposition, I think it was the member for Burra who asked me whether I believed in complete abolition, and I said, "No." I believe in moderation

and I have not altered that view. There are many people in the world, such as the honourable member for Victoria, who have only one or two drinks and know how to conduct themselves in moderation. I would be the last one to tell him or anybody else that there should be complete abolition. The statement made by the man who addressed the convention at the Pennington Hall appeared in the *Advertiser* the following day. As far as I am aware, his statement has never been challenged. Yet, the same man told the Commission in Victoria that there was no significant relationship between the hours of trading in hotel bars and the social consequences of the consumption of alcohol. I find it difficult to know how this man could come out such a short time later and say that certain churches were neutral on the subject.

As an elected representative of the people it is my duty when dealing with social questions to brush aside Party differences and deal with serious problems, which will not be solved by extending the hours for drinking liquor.

Mr. Rodda: Will you vote against the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: I said earlier that I would vote for the second reading of this Bill and, if members in their wisdom vote out the things I disagree to or they are amended to suit me, I will vote for the third reading. Naturally, I will express my dissatisfaction in Committee about the matters of which I disapprove. Some problems will not be solved by extending the hours of trading for the sale of alcohol. Such problems include driving motor cars under the influence, broken homes, and alcoholism. When the hours for drinking liquor are increased, the danger to various sections of the public is also increased. I think this has been clearly demonstrated by the statement made by Rev. Alan Walker. I do not think for one minute that every person who consumes liquor is a menace to human life; that thought is the farthest from my mind. But there is always a section of people who abuse privileges given to it. As a result, innocent people can be injured both physically and mentally and, in some cases, the outcome is fatal.

How often have we heard the statement in connection with other avenues of life "If it means saving one life it is worth while"? I understand there are about 300,000 chronic alcoholics in Australia and that number is increasing at such an alarming rate that at this rate one in every 14 drinkers in Australia either is or will become a chronic alcoholic. Therefore, members can see that alcoholism is becoming a serious menace to health and happiness throughout the Christian world.

We are confronted with a great challenge, and I ask members whether they are prepared to face the responsibility squarely and find some solution, whether they are satisfied with the character of our people, and whether we are giving our youth the best possible education in this field? Is there a deterioration in our moral values? These are the questions we will have to consider in connection with the Bill before the House. We are a privileged people. Australia is a wonderful country to live in and the privileges we enjoy impose on us an obligation to play an active and worthy part in shaping its destiny.

I had received many letters that would take something like two hours to read. Other members have also received letters. Some of my letters have come from various organizations, but I have been impressed by the large number I have received from individual people, all expressing their alarm and their fears that 10 p.m. closing will be introduced in South Australia. That will only be for this House and another place to decide. Some of these letters have come from people whose age would be about 60 years, but I have also received letters from young people, the people of tomorrow, who have to take over where the older ones leave off. It was heartening for me to receive these letters. One letter I received stated:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Moonta Methodist Christian Endeavour Group who wish to express their opposition to the following points which have been included in the Bill which is at present coming under so much discussion in Parliament. The two particular points which we strongly oppose are—

and they have been limited to two points, which shows that much study has been given to the Royal Commissioner's report and to the Bill. It appears that these young people have studied this matter with great sincerity. They have also showed intelligence in studying the report and the Bill. The letter states:

The two particular points which we strongly oppose are:

(1) 10 o'clock closing of hotels.
(2) Abolition of local option polls.

It finishes by saying:

Trusting that you, as our representative, will vote accordingly and do all within your power to oppose the Bill.

I have always been against the extension of trading hours for the sale of alcoholic liquors, but the mere fact that this letter was signed by a young man and a young woman has

influenced me even more than before, because I know that there is a section of young people in my district who opposes the introduction of these two things in this State. I inquired about these young people because I did not know them personally: I found that the young man, a Mr. Peter Easter, is a senior student of the Moonta District High School, and that the young lady, Miss Jan Alchin, is a teacher at Moonta. This shows that these young people are alive to what is taking place in this House with regard to social reforms, and they have indicated to me, by signing this letter, that they have looked at this matter intelligently.

I have received other letters. In particular, I received one from a lady expressing her concern with regard to 10 p.m. closing. That came from Moonta, but I have received them from Kadina, Bute, and Cunliffe, as well as from churches and various branches of the Women's Christian Temperance Union in my district. This lady's letter shows that she has also looked at the measure and studied the question. Her letter states:

As a member of your constituency I want to express my convictions concerning the proposed alteration to liquor laws in South Australia. I agree with the retention of the present age for minors to protect our young people, and am thankful that wineshops have "had their day". I cannot see any advantage or necessity for the introduction of taverns, and can picture a very unsavoury atmosphere growing around them. They encourage the type of publican whose only aim is to "get at" the public for his own ends, with no consideration for their welfare. If the system of local option is voted too costly, there must be a clause in the Act giving local people right of appeal.

Alcohol is admitted to be a "potentially dangerous commodity". From observation of the number of lives damaged and homes ruined and people committing a slow form of suicide from consuming the poison, I would regard this an understatement. While later trading hours may lessen the more explosive and dramatic effects, they will increase the slower, longer term effects. Medical science could (if they would) give plenty of evidence of the destroying of body tissue and the causing of certain diseases by alcohol. The more that is consumed, the greater these harmful effects. A year's experiment in Victoria would not reveal this. The prospect of "beer orphans" and "beer widows" in South Australia is a most unhappy one. Later trading hours cannot but damage home life.

A .05 per cent B.A.C. similar to the Victorian policy would be preferable. This would be a far greater contributing factor to lessen road deaths than the later trading hours. The .08 per cent proposed in South Australia is at least a step in the right direction. Thinking of drinking drivers—an acknowledged menace on our roads—it seems illogical to me to be licensing motels in one clause, and trying to lessen drinking drivers in another. I, with many others, still would choose the quieter unlicensed motel. I am strongly against motel licences.

In conclusion, can I suggest that the ludicrous situation revealed in police attitude to drinking laws at the Royal Commission be acted upon by Parliament. We vote in our Parliamentary choice to govern our State, not the policemen. We expect the latter to enforce the laws made by the former. You have my full support, Sir, in the Christian stand which I believe you will take in the fear of God and best interests of your fellow men and women. Yours faithfully, Betty Oldfield.

Although I have never met Mrs. Oldfield, from inquiries made, I know that she has had much experience in social work, particularly in cases of broken homes and divorce, etc. I think honourable members will agree that her letter (together with the one from the young people of Moonta) shows that the people of South Australia are intelligently examining the Commissioner's report and the Bill before the House.

Mr. Nankivell: Have they seen a copy of the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know about that, but they have obviously studied the Commissioner's report, or they would not have been able to write such excellent letters. Although I have received dozens of other letters, I will not read them to the House, as they contain practically the same representations as those contained in those I have read. I support the second reading, but at this stage I will not disclose my intentions concerning the Committee and third reading stages.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill's general provisions. We have heard much about the evils of drinking. This legislation poses a serious problem in that, whereas one section of the community may favour the extension of liquor trading hours, the other may not. However, I believe that, provided that such an extension does not adversely affect those who are not in favour, 10 p.m. closing should be permitted. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) some time ago preached for about three hours on the total prohibition of liquor.

Mr. Hughes: Never!

Mr. McANANEY: However, having been in the United States of America soon after prohibition was lifted, I saw the undesirable effect the banning of liquor had had on Americans.

Mr. Hughes: I never advocated prohibition.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member once preached on temperance for three hours, during which he engaged in a running battle with the former Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott).

Mr. Ryan: That wouldn't be unusual!

Mr. McANANEY: I saw that, where the authorities had tried to prevent the consumption of liquor, people tried to obtain any type of liquor possible. Indeed, I recall one night going to a function in Washington—

Mr. Clark: Did you have that Communist girl with you?

Mr. McANANEY: I concentrate on one thing at a time. The quality of the liquor handed to me at that function was such that whenever the host left the room I tipped the contents of my glass into the nearest flower pot, with the result that the plant had wilted considerably before the night was out. I believe that liquor will be consumed more slowly and leisurely with the introduction of 10 p.m. closing and that the swill that now occurs will largely disappear. In fact, I believe that bars could be eliminated entirely and liquor sold only to people seated in a room, who would consume the liquor in a more leisurely fashion. Although it has been suggested that such an innovation would be too expensive, I am sure that, in addition to less liquor being consumed, it would be cheaper and better for the individual in the long run.

I have not studied the Commissioner's report, but I do not think much would be gained by doing so, anyway, for most of us have travelled to the other States and have seen how 10 p.m. closing works. When in Melbourne recently, I visited various lounges between about 9 p.m. and 10 p.m. and saw few young people present. Those present were drinking in a leisurely way, and I am sure that they would have been capable of driving their cars and of passing the .08 per cent blood alcohol content test. Speaking about the matter to taxi drivers, I was told that, whereas their busiest time was previously between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m., workers did not now stay to drink at city hotels but normally went straight home and perhaps took their wives to a nearby hotel for community drinking. I believe that that has benefited the community as a whole.

In the light of the Government's advocating non-discrimination among people and equality for everybody, I should have thought that it would permit the employment of barmaids, who are capable of performing their task well. Indeed, I think that the introduction of barmaids would be a good thing. Most men have sufficient respect for the other sex and would behave reasonably in their presence. Having seen barmaids at work, I can see no reason why they should be debarred from hotels. In fact, if nobody moves an amendment in this respect, I will certainly move one seeking to allow barmaids to be employed, as I believe they would be a decided acquisition. I believe that the question of the various types of licence for clubs, etc., should be reconsidered, for I believe in the club way of life.

When recently at the St. Georges Club in Sydney, I was told that on one Saturday evening the club had sold 180 kegs of beer. Strict membership rules exist at that club, and anybody in the least intoxicated is warned first and deprived of his membership if subsequently found intoxicated. Control is exercised to ensure that nobody drinks to excess. I think licences for clubs should be fostered as much as possible. Although it may be argued that hotels must be protected, I think that in the interests of the community we must consider what is the best way in which people may consume liquor socially. Indeed, I am sure that the club way is superior by far.

We know that much illegal drinking has been taking place. I recently heard of a case in which a policeman in one of the small towns in my district was dispensing liquor at the local bowling club on a Sunday. I believe the general trend is for people to think that this is the right thing to do, provided they do not go to excess. Safeguards, such as the breathalyser test, should be taken and, if anyone takes too much liquor, he should be penalized severely. One of the bowling clubs in my district was not doing particularly well until it decided to have a keg of beer on Thursday nights for the young people in the town. In the short space of a year, people have been going there to play bowls, and the drinking of the beer is a secondary consideration. The players have a drink after the game and then go home. No-one complains about that.

There must be some distinction between the licensed clubs that have developed in country towns and those in the city. They should be conducted on a different type of licence for the sporting clubs. It would be good if we could legislate in this Bill to make legal the activities that are good. People object to the fact that, although they are doing something that is not harmful or illegal in their own homes, they cannot get together and enjoy a social existence. Much tidying up is necessary in relation to the licensing of clubs. If the Attorney-General does not draft amendments within the

next month or two, many amendments will have to be moved in this respect.

Many cabaret entertainments have been held in my area for which permits to operate until midnight have been obtained, and they have been tremendously successful. Instead of most of the young people drinking in their cars at 11.30 p.m., they are inside the dance hall enjoying themselves, without being intoxicated. I would go the extent of preventing people from drinking on public highways instead of the restriction applying only to a distance of 300 yards from a dance. People argue that one would not be able to drink under a tree if out for a drive on a Sunday, but I see no reason why liquor should be consumed under such conditions. The sale of wine at cellar doors should not be prevented. Wineries should not be able to sell a bottle at a time, but they should be able to sell in two-gallon lots at a price that would give both the buyer and seller an advantage. I oppose price control, and this Bill brings liquor under price control to a certain extent. It is interesting to note, although this is a State with price control, how our beer prices compare with those of other States. I hope that our wine prices will not go up to the same extent. The price of a 5oz. glass of beer in Adelaide is 11½c, in Sydney 8c, and in Perth 10c. A 7oz. glass of beer costs 14c in Adelaide, 13c in Perth, 12c in Melbourne, and 11c in Sydney. This shows how effective price control can be. A 10oz. glass of beer costs 18c in Adelaide, 17c in Perth, 15c in Melbourne, 15c in Brisbane and 14c in Sydney. So, the argument that price control keeps down prices can generally be proved fallacious.

I think the value of liquor consumed in Australia this year will be about $700,000,000, of which perhaps $70,000,000 worth will be consumed in South Australia. A large percentage of this figure is tax that the Government will collect. This amount represents a big investment: it is between one-fifth and one-quarter of the total spent on food and liquid refreshments. Although people should have reasonable conditions under which they can drink, I do not think we should make it too easy in all ways. I applaud the Government's action in not introducing Sunday trading. Although an argument could be advanced that this was something people should be able to do under certain conditions, because people would have to work on Sundays to provide this service I believe the Government has made a right decision in not allowing Sunday trading.

This is a Committee Bill that will be dealt with clause by clause. I will support the second reading and the general principle that we should have drinking conditions similar to those in other States and in other parts of the world, because I do not think it will mean any great increase in the consumption of liquor. People will become better educated in their drinking habits if they do not have to congregate in bars and drink quickly before six o'clock, and later closing will be generally beneficial to the community as a whole.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading because I consider that some changes in the State's licensing laws are required. At present, I cannot go further than that, because nobody knows just how the Bill will end up or how it will look by the time we go into Committee. I do not propose at this stage to discuss any of the pros and cons of the matters contained in the Bill, because I think the proper place to do that is on the clauses in Committee. However, I do propose to discuss three general matters which arise out of the Commissioner's report but which have not been included in the Bill that the Attorney-General has presented to this House. I am here not to apportion blame or praise but to point out the facts, but before doing so may I say how much I admire the way in which the Commissioner set about his task and the logic and clarity exhibited in the report. I do not agree with everything in the report, and I do not suppose any members in this House could say they agree with everything in it. It is a valuable document and it will be, I hope, a guide to us as we debate this Bill.

The three matters I want to talk about are, first, interim provisions; secondly, barmaids; and thirdly, Sunday trading. None of these matters is contained in the Bill, although all of them were in the Commissioner's report. Yesterday, in Question Time, I asked the learned Attorney whether, as appeared from his answers to questions a week ago, the Commissioner had changed his mind on any of these things, because he said in answer to a question by the member for Gumeracha that the Commissioner was without qualification satisfied with the Bill. I say without hesitation that the Commissioner is not satisfied with the Bill as it stands: I go so far as to say that I am absolutely confident that he is not satisfied with it. Why should he be satisfied when three of the matters on which he made recommendations have been cut out of the Bill? I believe the Attorney knows the Commissioner

is not satisfied with the Bill, and I was surprised at the answers he gave and the equivocation he showed when I asked him about this matter. I asked him straight out whether he knew if the Commissioner had changed his mind, but he did not answer because he knew the Commissioner had not changed his mind.

The Attorney, in his second reading explanation, spent much time explaining why he did not introduce an interim measure for 10 p.m. closing straight away. He said it would be impossibly complicated to do so for a mere six months. He said:

I believe that if honourable members give this matter their due attention we will be able to complete the second reading and the Committee stages of the Bill so that the new provisions may be introduced not later than September of this year.

If the Attorney thought we were likely to get through the Committee stages of this Bill in this session he was sadly mistaken, as we can now see.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Whose fault is that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is the Government's fault for not allowing the House to continue sitting. There is no earthly reason why the sitting could not be continued after Easter.

Mr. Ryan: You get more now than you did under the previous Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Port Adelaide is trying to cloud the issue. The Attorney went to some pains in his second reading explanation to excuse the fact that he had not brought in the interim provision recommended by the Commissioner. What he said was, I think, an insult to the Commissioner. What the Commissioner had to say on that point can be found at page 28 of his report. To add insult to injury, under the terms of reference he was asked to report on interim provisions: term of reference No. 3 required the Commissioner to report whether any and what time should elapse between the passing and coming into operation of all or any of the recommendations, and which recommended amendments and (or alternatively) what transitional provisions if any should be enacted. The Commissioner said:

There is clearly apparent an urgent sense of anticipation by the South Australian public of relaxation of restricitons on trading hours—indeed there has been almost throughout the time of this commission a curious misapprehension by many members of the public that this inquiry is solely or largely into "the question of ten o'clock closing". This misapprehension has even survived the extensive and headlined publicity given by the press and over the radio and television during the three working sessions to each of the other topics dealt with in evidence and argument. However, there will undoubtedly be public impatience for implementing at least the "hours" part of my recommendations, and if that is to be acceded to (both in substance and in timing) then the new "impairment" law relating to driving of motor vehicles whilst having a certain blood alcohol concentration should be effective as from the same day. I cannot see any reason against the coming into operation as soon as legislatively practicable the recommendations under Term of Reference 1 (*g*) (the hours during which and the conditions under which intoxicating liquor may be sold supplied or consumed upon licensed premises or upon premises in respect of which permits may be granted) and of the recommendations under "Driving of Motor Vehicles".

So, the Commissioner said that the hours part of his recommendations could come in straight away, yet this is not what we have: we have merely an excuse from the Attorney for not bringing them in straight away. He said his Draftsman had done the impossible and prepared the Bill, and apparently he thought he would get it through the Committee stages this session. I suggest that all that was needed to bring in the interim provisions was not the impossibly complicated clauses that he mentioned in his speech: all that was needed was a Bill to extend the hours to 10 p.m. and an interim provision giving jurisdiction to the present Licensing Court and the licensing magistrates to sanction variations in hours to take care of places like the East End Market, the wharves or places in other parts of the State. That was all that was required, but instead of a relatively simple provision like this which could have gone through this session and which could have come into operation we have what can only be described as a long botch of a Bill that has obviously been prepared hurriedly, as the Attorney admitted when he said people had been working long hours and had done the impossible. Frankly, I do not think they have achieved anything. Obviously the reason for this is that the Government, led by the Attorney (as soon will be the case in law as it is now in fact) is keeping this thing for a time nearer to the election, and is hoping to use it as election bait. All it is doing is depriving the people of this State of something they have desired, for about six months.

Mr. Langley: For 10 or 15 years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What on earth is the member for Unley talking about? Maybe he will make a speech shortly. If this was what the Government was doing then there was no

reason at all why the hours part of the recommendation should not have been brought in as the Commissioner recommended. Of course, the Government chose not to do that but to try to get the whole jolly thing through in one fell swoop.

The question of barmaids is important in itself, but it is even more important because it demonstrates the disabilities under which members opposite labour. Every other State in Australia now has provision for barmaids and I know of no valid reason at all why South Australia, in this matter, should be the odd man out, yet that is what is proposed by the Government and the Party opposite. This is important because it is a prime example of the way in which Australian Labor Party members are bound hand and foot. I do not think we can get any better exposition of this than the Attorney's exposition in his second reading explanation. The Attorney said:

It is not included because it is clearly contended in the stated policy of the Government that a provision for barmaids cannot be introduced by a member of the Labor Party.

The member for Gumeracha then interjected, "Yet it is a free vote!" and the Attorney replied:

It is a free vote except that every member of the Labor Party is bound by a pledge that he has signed. The Labor Party has a policy, and before the Commission was appointed it was well known to those who bothered to read the policy.

He then went on with a little denigration of members on this side.

Mr. Coumbe: I thought this was a conscience vote on the part of members opposite.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently not, because members are bound hand and foot by their policy. The interesting point is that the Attorney said this was known before the Commission was appointed. If memory serves me correctly, the Commission was appointed about the start of 1966. On this point I have taken the trouble to look at the evidence in some of the submissions made by the dear old friend of most of us, the former member for West Torrens (Mr. J. F. Walsh). As a result of the evidence the Commissioner recommended straight out, under the heading of "Employment": "I can see no reason for the continuation of the prohibition of the employment of females in public bars." On page 2 of the submission of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union of Australia, under the heading "Employment of Persons on Licensed Premises", appears the following:

It is submitted that sections 182 to 188 of the Licensing Act should remain unaltered. Since the Government in office is a Ministry composed entirely of members of the Australian Labor Party the Commission is asked to note item 150 of the State Convention motions of 1966 of the A.L.P.

I pause here to say that this means (if I am correct in thinking the convention was later in the year than the appointment of the Commission) that these things were not known, as the Attorney said, when the Commission was appointed. The motion of the union was as follows:

That convention declares its opposition to any amendments to the Licensing Act that will permit the employment of females in hotels and wine bars other than that already allowed under the existing Act.

The submission then continues:

The union submits that the Government is bound or highly persuaded in its policy by the above motion. In any event the union submits that the motion reflects the opinion of the majority of the electors of South Australia that no change in the above section of the Act be suggested. In any event the union submits that it is right and equitable that no change in this respect be made.

That is the submission Mr. Walsh made because, of course, he is the President of that union. At page 2136 of the evidence, he was asked whether he thought that women could compete with men as bartenders. I think members would agree that his answer was typical of him. The transcript of evidence on this point states:

So I follow you correctly when I say that, for some hotels, some female employees would be better value for the same money (if they had the same money) and in some cases some male employees would be better value? . . . No. I could not say a female would be any better unless she were a young and attractive woman.

He then went on to say why he had made the submission he had made on this point. At page 2139 the transcript of evidence states:

The Commissioner: At the bottom of page 2 there is a reference to a resolution at the A.L.P. State Convention in 1966, deploring the position. The resolution declared opposition to any amendment of the Licensing Act to permit the employment of females in hotels and wine bars. I told Mr. McRae that I was not concerned about the wording of the resolution but that I was more interested in the reasons for the resolution relative to this Commission, but not relative to the industrial aspects of the matter. In other words, if the resolution related entirely to conditions of employment in the industrial sense, such as equal pay for equal work, I feel that it would not be a matter I should go into. Can you tell us what sort of consideration was covered

by the resolution? . . . It came from a general cross-section of the debate. I think I can truthfully say that those who opposed it did so on the grounds of equal pay and the rights of women to compete for employment with males.

What about those in favour of the motion? . . . Some expressed opposition to the atmosphere in hotel bars and the unsuitability of women for that class of work.

Those who favoured the motion on that ground were running counter to your experience in other States? (he had given evidence of this earlier) . . . That could be said, but you are talking about my experience, and not my personal views.

Yes. No inquiry was held by the convention regarding the operation of the laws in other States concerning barmaids? . . . I think that was quoted in the debate.

What was quoted? . . . The position in the other States.

There was no inquiry by the convention? . . . No. There rarely is unless a matter is referred to a committee.

Later, in another part of the evidence, he admitted that the resolution was passed by only a handful of people. Yet, with no inquiry (as he admits) and from a small group of people comes a policy that binds hand and foot the present Government to oppose the employment of barmaids in this State. Of course, this is completely contrary to the report that has been brought in by the Royal Commission. The Commission was unimpressed by the evidence advanced. Of course, the pith and substance was, "It is Labor Party policy; you can't make a recommendation like that because it won't be accepted." On that, the Government omits this recommendation from the report.

I come now to the third point which, in my view, is a most important one. We have been told that the Government will not introduce legislation for Sunday trading in this State but, of course, that is not correct. The Bill provides for very extensive Sunday trading in South Australia and, if I may say so, in a most undesirable way. It is provided for in a way not approved by the Commissioner. At page 6 of his report the Commissioner states:

> Generally speaking, the several recommendations which I make for amendments to the law are so interlocked and inter-dependent that it would be impossible to treat each recommendation separately, or to amend or reject one without thereby affecting or even reversing another or a whole series of others.

And yet that is precisely what the Government has done with the provisions contained in clause 61, to which I shall refer in a moment. It has, in effect, completely pulled the plug out of the scheme of legislation that is intended by the Commissioner. It has done that in two ways: first, by excising what the Commissioner regarded as an essential part of his scheme of legislation (by that I mean Sunday trading); and, secondly, by allowing Sunday trading under what he considers obviously are most undesirable conditions. Under the heading "Clubs" (of course, it is club trading that is to be allowed under the Bill in South Australia) at page 14 of the report, the Commissioner says:

> I am certain that the crux of any proper law relating to clubs is that any group of persons should be able to form any club for any lawful purpose whenever they please, and, if they can satisfy the Licensing Court that they have a proper case, add to their other activities the sale and supply of liquor to their members for consumption upon club premises and at times and under conditions comparable with similar times and conditions in hotels.

Farther down the page, the Commissioner goes on to say:

> . . . a most essential ingredient of my view that no club should have any liquor rights more extensive than hotels.

He repeated that in the appendix at, I think, page 102, where he says:

> I regard as essential, as appears from another part of the report, that the general trading hours and conditions for the sale and supply of liquor in clubs should be the same as in hotels.

What are we to get in this particular piece of legislation? Clause 61 provides:

> Any club whether licensed under this Act or not may apply to the court for a permit for the sale and supply of liquor for consumption on the premises of a club on such days (including Sundays) and during such periods as the court thinks proper having regard to the practices of such club during a period of two years prior to the commencement of this Act.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Whether the practice is legal or illegal!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Exactly. I do not think even the Attorney-General would say that that was recommended by the Commissioner. It certainly was not. This is a clause that has been dreamt up and introduced by the Government on its own initiative; and the Government can take the responsibility for this. Clause 61 is the only clause I have looked at and it is wrong: it refers to a number of subsections (12, in fact) in what it is pleased to term section 57 of the Act, and it provides that they shall apply to permits under this section. Of course, section 57 has only two subsections and, obviously, that is not the correct reference. It is another example, in my view, of the hasty preparation for which the

Attorney-General has become so noteworthy. It is a pity he does not check his work before he brings it into the House.

Mr. Hudson: You ought to talk.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is an obvious error. Anyway, it does not matter for the purposes of the point I am now making. The fact is that the Government intends that any club should be allowed to go to the Licensing Court and say, "This is how we have been carrying on in the last two years; it has been quite illegal, but this is the way we have been carrying on. On the basis of what we have been doing, you give us a licence to trade on Sundays." The Government has the gall to say it will not introduce Sunday trading in this Bill. That is an absolute falsehood, because this is Sunday trading, and it is Sunday trading of a most undesirable kind. It is undesirable because it means that the clubs at present established, which have been flaunting and breaking the law, will get an advantage, and those clubs that have been observing the law will pay for it, because they will not be able to go to the court and say that, because of their practice over the last two years, they should get a licence. That is all this clause provides for. One club at least has been abiding by the law on this point.

Mr. Ryan: Which one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Holdfast Bay Bowling Club, in fact.

Mr. Ryan: Are you a member?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I have taken the trouble to look at the evidence on this point given by the Secretary of the club, which is a licensed club.

Mr. Hudson: The Glenelg Football Club is another one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Holdfast Bay club has been observing the law and not trading on Sundays.

Mr. Hudson: Doesn't that, in fact, apply to all licensed clubs, at present?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The evidence at page 774 in respect of this club is as follows:

When you say it is not all sold in legal trading hours, is it sold outside legal trading hours at night or on Sundays, or both?—We do not trade in liquor on Sundays, definitely; only at night after 6 o'clock.

I suppose bowls are played at the club on Sundays?—Bowls are played at the club on Sundays.

Is there no demand on the part of your members for liquor facilities?—Yes. They go away to other clubs and get it.

They are not breaking the law with regard to Sundays. What is the effect of this? The effect is that the Holdfast Bay Bowling Club, because it has been observing the law and not trading on Sundays, will now be penalized and will not be able, under this clause, to get a licence, whereas other clubs that have been breaking the law will be able to get a licence because they will be able to go to the court and say, "This is what we have been doing for the last two years." Do members of the Government on the front bench think that this is a fair thing? I certainly do not, and I think it was wrong of the Government to try to tell the people of this State that there was to be no Sunday trading. Let us look at the practices in the clubs at present. I am sure this will satisfy the member for Glenelg. It shows that there is widespread trading on Sunday by these clubs.

Mr. Ryan: Are you the legal representative of this club?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know nothing of this club. I have followed it through the Commissioner's report and have found out that it was the Holdfast Bay Bowling Club. I have never been there. I do not play bowls, and I do not know any of the members as far as I am aware.

Mr. Hudson: There are other clubs that observe the law.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If there are, then they, too, will be penalized under this ridiculous clause.

Mr. Hudson: That clause does not prevent them from getting a permit on Sundays.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have noticed, particularly in the last week, that there is no subject on which the honourable member for Glenelg is not an expert, and there is no subject on which he is not willing to try to put every other member right. This is another example of it. Why does he not make his own speech in his own time if he wants to put us right on this matter.

Mr. Hudson: Really, you are the end!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no doubt that the interpretation I have given is the only construction one could put upon the clause as the Attorney-General has introduced it. It cannot mean anything else.

Mr. Hudson: You would be the greatest expert of all time on the meaning of a clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know we will be put right by the member for Glenelg eventually.

Mr. Hudson: I would not try to put you right again, because obviously it would not sink in.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What does the Commissioner say about the present Sunday trading practices in this State? At page 101 of his report, he states:

There is at present a significant volume of sale and supply of alcoholic liquor on Sundays.

He deals with clubs and with the general practices of the football clubs on Sunday mornings, and then he deals with the clubs whose members are predominantly players rather than spectators. He deals with bowling clubs and golf clubs. He does not deal with the Returned Servicemen's League sub-branches on Sundays, but I think he states somewhere else that he has no evidence on Sunday trading there. The evidence on Sunday trading is very significant when one looks to see what the clubs ask for on Sundays. Most of the trading was from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. The South Australian Bowling Association in its preliminary submission sought trading hours from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m., and later, following the private sessions, the bowling clubs asked for trading hours entirely unlimited by law on Sundays, but would settle for 12 noon to 7 p.m. The football clubs first of all asked for entirely unlimited trading or, alternatively, limited on Sundays from 10.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m.

These are the hours in which trading is now being carried on. The Commissioner in his report and recommendations recommended Sunday hours from 12 noon to 9.30 p.m., but it is obvious that, as the Government has introduced this provision, not only will there be large-scale trading on Sundays but it will be at hours altogether different from those recommended by the Commissioner. This must be so, because they will get a licence based on their illegal practices in the last few years. This is a most unsatisfactory position. I admit that we are all in a dreadful dilemma on Sunday trading. It is widespread, and the Commissioner has now officially called attention to it. He has said some fairly harsh things about what he termed police tolerance of the practices that have grown up. Sunday trading is being conducted on a wide scale. It is not regarded as wrong by those who indulge in it, yet it is against the law. I do not believe that, attention now having been drawn to it in the report, it can be allowed to continue as at present. Either it has to be made legal or the law has to be enforced. We cannot wink at it any more.

On the other hand, I am convinced that Sunday trading is not acceptable to the people of this State, so we are in the dilemma that it is going on, that people who indulge in it do not regard it as wrong, but that the Government states that it will not introduce Sunday trading, because it is not politically acceptable to South Australians. I do not know the answer, but, for the reasons I have given, I do not believe that clause 61 is the answer. This is a weak compromise worked out and introduced by a weak Cabinet, and I do not consider it should be allowed to stay in the Bill.

The three matters I have referred to are most unfortunate. I think the Government can be blamed for its attitudes and actions in these matters. First, we could have 10 p.m. closing probably within the next few weeks if the Government chose to do what the Commissioner recommended and bring in an interim provision. Now we have hardly got anywhere this session. Secondly, there is no reason I know of, except for the binding nature of the pledge taken by members opposite, why we should not have barmaids in this State Thirdly, it is wrong for the Government to mislead people on the question of Sunday trading, to say that there will be none when obviously it is provided in the Bill, and then on a most undesirable basis.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nobody ever said there would be no Sunday trading. All that was ever said was that there would be no Sunday trading in bars.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be technically so.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You have been deliberately misquoting me all the time you have been speaking, as you always do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not been deliberately misquoting the Attorney-General. I do not think I have quoted him on this point. There is no doubt about the impression which the Government (or the Attorney-General) has given and which, I venture to say, he meant to give: there would be no Sunday trading in this State. I hope that that impression will be dispelled now anyway. I hope he puts it accurately so that people will know the importance of what he is saying.

Mr. McKee: You are the only person in this State who does not know what's going on.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so, but there it is. I hope the Government will have second thoughts in regard to this matter and in regard to barmaids. I regret that it has

gone too far to have second thoughts on what would have been a very popular move in this State and one that would have been supported by the majority of members: the early introduction of 10 p.m. closing.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I think the Commissioner has done an excellent job indeed. I think his task was perhaps more difficult than the member who just resumed his seat realizes. If the honourable member lived in a hotel for a few years, he might understand the complications that would arise if he was to say in one mouthful, "We will have 10 p.m. closing," and leave it at that. A statement like that is ridiculous. I have lived and worked in a hotel for many years, and I understand the complications that could arise from this measure. I say categorically that a new Bill must be brought in (as has been done) in order to simplify the whole Licensing Act as we have known it over the last decade. The honourable member's statement that members of the public have only wanted 10 p.m. closing for the last six months is also ridiculous, and I am astounded that the member for Mitcham would even contemplate making such a statement, not to somebody outside who does not understand, but to members of this House. Closing at 10 p.m. has been advocated by many hotelkeepers for the past 20 years, and for longer than that by others. My father, who was a publican for most of his life, wanted 10 p.m. closing 25 years ago. He said it would come; he could look into the future. Yet we in this State are still 20 years behind the other States (perhaps not technically), but when I was going to school interstate teachers used to say, "Poor old South Australia, you are 25 years behind the other States." We have to bring this legislation up to date, and I believe this is getting down to some sanity within the community.

The Bill deals with many things on which I will have more to say when in Committee. However, I want to impress upon members that hotels throughout this State have been placed at a great disadvantage in relation to the sale of liquor. Originally, hotels were constituted for the sale of liquor but, over the years, licences to sell liquor have been granted to small shops and wine saloons. Even in a town with a population of 40 or 50 people, there is a hotel and a storekeeper who has a liquor licence. He competes with the hotel, yet the hotel has to pay a much greater licensing fee than the storekeeper pays. This is most unjust and unfair to the hotelkeeper.

Sunday trading has never appealed to me, and I do not think it appeals to most publicans. They are entitled to one day off each week and Sunday would be a day for them to have a well deserved rest. There are certain other measures in the Bill which I am not clear on. I think permanent boarders in hotels should be allowed to purchase liquor at any time, provided the publican is prepared to serve it to them. I realize this goes on now. I see no reason why clubs should not be permitted to sell liquor on Sunday afternoon. Many people play sport on Sunday afternoons, and I agree with that. I see no harm in playing a game of tennis or golf then. In my opinion, it is complete relaxation, and I see no reason why clubs should not be permitted to sell liquor at the clubhouse provided the liquor is purchased from the local hotelkeeper. I do not think it is fair to the hotelkeeper that these clubs should be segregated from the normal run of clubs and be able to buy their liquor direct from the wholesalers. Provided that they buy it from the hotel, I commend this provision to the House.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Would you say that with regard to all clubs? Will not established clubs fulfil the purpose of hotels?

Mr. CASEY: I am only talking about sporting clubs. With those few remarks I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): We all have opinions on the matters dealt with in this legislation and I think we are all morally bound to express those opinions. I join with some members who have expressed appreciation of the report that has been furnished by the Commissioner. I have read it and I consider it a worthwhile and lucid document. It indicates the scholarship and ability of the Commissioner.

What I have just said does not imply that I agree with the Commissioner's findings: the contrary is the position in many cases. Whatever one's personal views may be, there is obviously a public demand for the overhaul of the licensing legislation. A substantial majority of people desires the lengthening of the trading hours of hotels and the provision of additional facilities for the sale of liquor. For as long as I can remember it has been argued that other countries have had more extensive facilities for trading in liquor than we have had and that no harm has resulted in those other places. We Australians have a vastly different attitude to the handling and consumption of liquor from that of people in other parts of the world. It may be said that

the attitude, if it exists, derives from the long restraint to which we have been subjected in regard to trading hours, and that may be so.

One can live in hotels in England and America for a week without knowing where the bar is. The bars do not occupy prominent positions in the premises as they do here. If one goes to the dining room for a meal, without fail one is served with a glass of iced water. This is astonishing to the Australian, who is accustomed to having a drink waiter ask what he would like to drink as soon as the diner is seated. On occasions I have had the temerity to ask for a glass of water in an Adelaide hotel and have been looked at with astonishment and ill-concealed disgust. It is not logical to compare trading hours in Australia with those in other countries. However, it is logical to compare the position here with that in other States. My observations in other States, particularly in New South Wales and Queensland, which have had extended trading hours for many years, show that there does not appear to be any greater problem resulting, and I use the word "appear" advisedly.

There is, however, a vast upsurge of delinquency, crime, problems in family life, and disruption of the social and moral fabric of the community deriving from the extension of facilities such as is proposed in this Bill. Some members will not agree with that statement, but something is at the root cause of the growing problems in our community life. I do not suggest that liquor is the only contributor to the problem. We must also consider the conditions in which people live and work in this industrialized age and the possible monotony of a daily job involving no mental effort but merely requiring the pressing of a button. People react against that kind of existence in various ways.

Substantial responsibility for the problems that increase as the number in our community increases must be laid at the door of legislation of the kind that we have spent most of the last 12 months considering. I approach this problem with the same degree of circumspection as that with which I have approached those other matters. There are curious anomalies in our attitudes to the community that it is our privilege to govern. We, as legislators, are extremely and acutely concerned about the welfare of the community in the physical sense and in the medical sense, yet we are patently unconcerned about the wellbeing of the community in the moral sense.

I listened to the speech made by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) earlier this morning. I was astonished that he gave his blessing on a broad scale to everything that could be desired by every section of the community, and that everyone interested in the liquor trade must be given full and unrestrained opportunity to supply liquor to all and sundry. This morning we considered legislation dealing with road safety, but now we are debating a measure that the Royal Commissioner has definitely and precisely linked with road safety. It is obvious why these two things are so closely linked. Apparently, the Commissioner and the Government have concluded that if extended facilities are provided for the sale of liquor something must be done about drunken drivers.

I have not yet decided whether I shall support the second reading or the Bill in Committee, because I want to know more about the proposed amendments. I listened with much interest and respect to the speech of the member for Mitcham and his penetrating analysis of the machinations of the Government in introducing this legislation, and his statements are so obviously true. The honourable member successfully revealed what lies behind the timing and phasing of this legislation. The Commissioner vaguely suggested that Sunday trading should be prohibited. I agree with the member for Frome that hotels, under the Act and under the Bill, are at a substantial disadvantage because of the number of other outlets that are to be permitted to supply liquor. For many years hotels have been recognized as the official channel through which people purchased liquor, and if that position were to continue they should not be eroded by a proliferation of other licences for people to supply liquor. If many more outlets are provided, we should take the lid off altogether and make liquor as free as Coca-Cola.

The Commissioner has said that we are dealing with a dangerous product. Some people consider that Coca-Cola is dangerous but, if that is so, many people are suffering because it can be purchased anywhere in the world. It has been suggested that a man is not a man unless he can take grog, a statement that has worried many people. I am concerned that the Government intends to consider Sunday trading later, because it is a pity that in our enlightened and educated community we cannot get through one day in the week without liquor. The hotelier and his staff should not be expected to work seven days a week,

and it reflects on our intelligence, our common sense, and our maturity if we cannot do without liquor on this day. I am also concerned about facilities which, under the Bill, will be increasingly available to minors to obtain liquor. I think this is where our real problem lies. People say piously that minors are precluded and that the onus of proof on minors is stiffened under this legislation, but with the proliferation of the types of licence it is inevitable that minors will have access to liquor on a far wider scale than the present law permits. I regret that very much. A mature adult learns to hold his grog, or he may well become an alcoholic by the time he is 25 or 30 years old.

Secondly, I do not wish to see in our State the development to such positions of power, authority and influence of certain types of club, similar to clubs in other States and in other parts of the world. I believe there is a legitimate case for the long-established clubs, which are more or less of a private nature, and which have a selective membership, to continue to function as they have functioned in the past. I point out that I have not heard reports to the detriment of such clubs operating in our country areas. I view with concern the growth of sporting clubs whose objects and articles of association are obviously designed to permit certain types of sport, yet emphasizing social development, and which rely on the revenue obtained from the retailing of liquor. We should study the Bill carefully in Committee, when we shall have more time at our disposal and more information on which to base our remarks.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): First, I congratulate the Commissioner (Mr. A. K. Sangster, Q.C.), who was appointed by the Government to inquire into the State's licensing system and to make recommendations. In carrying out his duties commendably, the Commissioner brought down a very good report, although it contains some recommendations with which I do not agree. His task in sifting through the large volume of evidence given by many persons and organizations (many of whom had conflicting interests) would have been exceptionally difficult. This Royal Commission was the second Commission in the history of licensing in South Australia. In 1879 a Liquor Law Commission, appointed by the Government of the day, brought down certain recommendations that were embodied in legislation. No doubt, because of the haste with which the work on the Bill was undertaken by the Attorney-General and his officers, prior to its introduction, the measure contains certain imperfections, errors and omissions. I trust, however, that they will be rectified when the Bill is again considered by members next session. I point out that an error exists in clause 18, where an association in my district known as the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Association Incorporated has been labelled the Barossa Village Vintage Festival Association Incorporated.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: A printing error!

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I point out, too, that reference is made in clause 19 to paragraphs (*f*) and (*g*), whereas these paragraphs are not contained in the clause. Errors also exist in clause 3 and in some of the clauses dealing with clubs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Angas!

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The first attempt made to restrict the sale of liquor in England dates back to the reign of Edward II, I believe, in 1552. It is interesting to note the following part of the recital of that legislation:

> For as much as intolerable hurts and troubles to the Commonwealth of this realm doth daily grow and increase through such abuses and disorders as are had and used in common ale houses and other houses called tippling houses. . . .

It then proceeded to limit the number of such houses. The justices under that Act were to "remove, discharge and put away common selling of ale and beer in the said common ale houses and tippling houses after the first of May"; when next none should be "admitted or suffered to keep any common ale house or tippling house but such as shall be thereunto admitted and allowed in open sessions of the peace or else to two justices of the peace". That is the first reference there is of any restriction being placed on the sale or supply of liquor in Great Britain.

It is interesting to note that in South Australia in 93 years there have been six consolidating Acts in connection with liquor licensing legislation, the last one being in 1932; but in England and Great Britain over 411 years there have been only four consolidating Acts dealing with the matter. The first attempt made in South Australia to deal with the sale and supply of liquor was Act No. 4 of 1837, passed by the Executive Council, which was an Act for the granting of licences and regulating the sale of wine, beer and spirituous liquors,

the prevention of drunkenness, and the promoting of good order in public houses. That Act was disallowed. Another Act, No. 1 of 1839, remained in force, with a few subsequent amendments, until 1863. Under it licences were granted by an annual meeting of justices, but the Government had the right to fix the number of such licences. There were three types of licence: publican's licence, wine or malt liquor licence, and storekeeper's licence. The Act provided that no liquor was to be supplied to Aborigines, that licensed houses were to close at 10 p.m., and that licensed houses were to be closed on the Lord's day, except between 1.30 p.m. and 3 p.m., when open for the sale of malt liquor which was not to be drunk on the premises.

Another Act was passed in 1839 (No. 2) which was for the prevention of gambling in public houses. The District Councils Act, 1852, gave councils the power previously exercised by justices to grant licences. The councils were also to receive the fees. Act No. 14 of 1855-56 introduced 11 p.m. closing on week days; publicans had the option to close at 10 p.m., and Sunday trading was allowed between 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. and between 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. Act No. 14 of 1858 repealed the wine and beer licence provision of the 1839 Act. Act No. 10 of 1861 took away from district councils the power of granting licences and receiving fees. Act No. 9 of 1863 was a consolidation of all the laws relating to the retailing of liquor. Distilled liquor was not to be supplied to children under 12 years, but to them could be sold beer not to be consumed on the premises. "Travellers on Sunday" were defined as persons not resident within one mile of the hotel. The matter of vignerons has assumed some importance in this debate, as regards cellar-door sales. The legislation of 1863 provided that vignerons having not less than two acres of vineyards were allowed to sell one gallon of wine and upwards.

In the following year, Act No. 14 provided that vignerons could sell wine, irrespective of the size of their vineyards. Act No. 2 of 1865-66 reduced licence fees and enabled wine to be sold for consumption on the premises. Act No. 10 of 1868-69 provided for the sale of liquor on goldfields. Act No. 16 of 1869-70 provided for the granting of licences by justices to be abolished; power was given to the Governor to declare separate licensing districts and to appoint a bench of magistrates to grant licences. Act No. 22 of 1872 made it optional for hotelkeepers to open on Sundays. Act No. 52 of 1876 provided that no licence was to be granted for public houses unless a memorial was presented in its favour signed by more than two-thirds of the ratepayers within a certain distance thereof.

Act No. 68 of 1877 provided for the closing of hotels on Sundays, except between 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. Act No. 191 of 1880 consolidated the licensing laws and gave effect to certain recommendations made by the Liquor Law Commission appointed by the Government in 1879. Between 1891 and 1905 there were six amending Acts which made provision, in the main, for matters relating to local options. Consolidating Act No. 970 was passed in 1908, and five further amending Acts were passed between 1910 and 1917. Act No. 1322 of 1917 was a further consolidating Act. Between 1917 and 1932, a further 11 amending Acts were passed. The next Act passed, the consolidating Act No. 2102 of 1932, is the principal Act at present. Since 1932 there have been a further 12 amending Acts.

So members will see that the present Act is really like Joseph's coat—a thing of threads and patches—in view of the number of amendments that have been made, and I think the time is ripe for a further consolidation. This Bill purports to give effect to the recommendations of the Sangster Commission, with the exception of the recommendations made for the employment of barmaids and Sunday afternoon trading in hotels and club lounges. I think the time is ripe for a change. It is time that new legislation got on to the Statute Book to keep abreast of the times. Reference has been made on a number of occasions by judges of the Supreme Court to the desirability for the legislation to be brought up to date.

As recently as 1965, the then Chief Justice (His Honour Sir Mellis Napier) said in a case before him that he thought that the judges were not exceeding their duty when they called the attention of the Legislature to the fact that the Licensing Act was no longer operating in accordance with the intention with which it was enacted, namely, to provide, among other things, for the needs of the public when travelling. He also said that he regarded the motor car as a most important factor in the metamorphosis of our hotels. Just as the horse and buggy has been replaced by the motor car, so is the old-fashioned inn being replaced by the motel. When dealing with a case involving a certain motel, he said that despite the habits and needs of travellers the Act remained unchanged. I consider that this legislation will do much to meet the requirements of the

public, which should be a paramount consideration. The Bill repeals the 10 Acts relating to the supply of intoxicating liquor, and consolidates the law by re-enacting many of the provisions contained in those Acts. It also seeks to amend substantially the Statutes dealing with the supply of liquor.

The principal alteration to the existing law is the setting up of an entirely new and permanent licensing court to consist of a chairman and deputy chairman and a panel of licensing court magistrates, which I think is highly desirable. This is provided in Part II of the Bill. The second alteration concerns trading hours, which is provided for in Part III, Division II, of the Bill. Pursuant to clause 19 the publican will be able to keep his premises open until 10 p.m. I am not happy about that provision. I wonder whether perhaps the suggestion of the Australian Hotels Association that it be optional would not have been a more satisfactory provision.

Pursuant to the clause, the Licensing Court can fix the period of trading and it need not necessarily be from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. If a publican applies to the court for a different period of trading, it is left to the discretion of the court whether it shall be allowed. My attention has been drawn to this difficulty experienced by some licensees in remote country districts. They point out that they are satisfied there is no public demand for the closing of the only hotel in the town at 10 p.m. They consider that the requirements of the locality would be met if the hotel remained open no later than 7 p.m. or 8 p.m.

I consider that clause 19 (1) (*a*) is sufficiently wide to cover a case such as this, because the licensee may apply to the court to have a shorter trading period than the 13 hours between 9 a.m. and 10 p.m. If the court is satisfied that the needs and requirements of the area will be met, the application will have every chance of success.

[*Sitting suspended from* 8.55 *to* 10 *a.m.*]

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The third principal alteration concerns the type and scope of licence that can be granted under the legislation and that is provided for in Part III, Division II, which provides for 10 types of licence. The fourth principal alteration is the removal of provisions for memorials and local option polls. As I said earlier, legislation in 1876 initiated local option polls and memorials, and this matter was further dealt with in greater detail by legislation in 1891.

I am particularly interested in certain provisions in the Bill. First, clause 18 deals with a special licence that could be obtained by the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Association Incorporated, which is incorrectly referred to as the Barossa Village Vintage Festival Association Incorporated in the Bill. This is of particular interest to the district I represent because, since 1948, 10 vintage festivals have been held in the Barossa Valley. People in the district are naturally anxious that this clause should receive favourable consideration. The Royal Commission made a special inquiry into the activities of the association and the Commissioner deals with the matter on page 16 of his report. I am gratified that the Commissioner discussed the matter with all the parties interested in it and also with some of the local church bodies. I believe that only a few of the church bodies voiced opposition of a kind. The Commissioner convened a conference on August 12 last of all people interested, including the local church and temperance interests, and it appears that no real objection was raised to the activities of the association. In his report, the Commissioner says:

> Special considerations apply to the subject of submissions made by the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival Association Incorporated. Some indication of opposition from local churches was suggested, and on August 23, 1966, I had a conference at Tanunda with representatives of the Tanunda District Council, the Angaston District Council, a former police sergeant sometime in charge at Tanunda, representatives of the festival committee, and of local church and temperance interests.

There were three festival activities discussed. The three activities discussed were the wine auction, the dinner prior to the queen crowning ceremony and the weingarten. The use of the word "wiengarten" in the report is wrong because this means a garden of Vienna. The correct name is weingarten which means a wine garden. The vintage queen crowning ceremony has taken place at every vintage festival held in the past. It has been a custom to offer wines and brandies at a restaurant on the evening of this ceremony. Referring to this matter, the Commissioner says, "I know of no objections from church or temperance interests." On page 17 of the report, the Commissioner says:

> My overall impression from the conference is that no insurmountable objection from any interest stands in the way of an amendment to the law to cover the festival association's functions.

He then recommends that a new section be inserted in the Act to enable the Licensing Court to grant a licence. I am delighted that

provision has been made in the Bill to give effect to the recommendations made in the Royal Commissioner's report. Lest there be people who consider that the activities of the festival association are not in line with their own views, I shall refer to the official statement of the Temperance Alliance of South Australia Incorporated on the Report of the Royal Commission into the Licensing Act of South Australia. On page 4 the following comment is made regarding the Barossa festival:

The concern of the alliance in this matter has been to ensure the festival vintage festival does not become an undesirable event. The steps taken by the Commissioner to bring all sections represented in the Valley, including the churches, together is commended. Considering the circumstances and the nature of the festival, the alliance accepts the recommendations of the report and trusts it includes sufficient safeguards.

The clause provides for the granting of a special licence on such conditions as the court shall approve, on an application being made. These functions are held every two years, and a function of this kind will be held on March 31 and April 1 next. It may also be pertinent to state that, since the first vintage festival was held in the Barossa Valley, $28,500 has been distributed by the association to local charities. The function is regarded in the Barossa Valley not only as an occasion for traditional celebration of the vintage but also as a publicity venue for people from all over Australia and from elsewhere to experience the partaking of South Australian wines. Mr. Pollnitz (Director of the Tourist Bureau), giving evidence before the Commission, said that past Barossa Valley vintage festivals had proved that they had a large potential for attracting visitors to the Barossa Valley from other parts of the State, from other States, and from overseas. The festival has given the district and South Australian wines much publicity overseas.

No similar festival is conducted elsewhere in Australia, and it follows the pattern of large wine and vintage festivals in other parts of the world, particularly Europe. This year the Rhine vintage queen from Germany will crown the local vintage queen on April 1. This festival is important not only to my district but also to the State and the Commonwealth. I commend the Commissioner for recommending the granting of a special licence on application being made, and I commend the Attorney-General for accepting that recommendation and including provisions to enable such an application to be made.

The question of cellar-door sales by wineries has been dealt with at some length by the member for Burra. No-one else in this House is more conversant with viticulture and its problems than is the honourable member. In 1863, legislation was passed for the first time securing the vigneron the right to sell wine on his premises.

That right was further secured by the 1864 Act, and the practice has continued for over a century. Subsequent legislation has always included this right and to take it away now would be wrong. Although it has been suggested that the Commissioner was averse to this practice continuing, I find from his report that this is not so. His recommendation, however, does not go as far as we who represent viticultural districts would like it to go. Cellar-door sales are allowed in all States, and the retention of this trade is important to most of the wineries as, in some cases, it is the lifeblood of their existence. Many tourists are attracted to the cellars, particularly at vintage time. One winemaker in the Barossa district states that during January and February tourists from other States provide 70 per cent of his cellar-door trade, and this applies particularly to tourists from Victoria. Many smaller wineries do a similar trade with visitors from other States, and the practice should be encouraged because it advertises South Australian wines. Many wines sold in two-gallon lots at cellar door cannot be obtained at hotels. This trade should be allowed to continue. According to the Commissioner's report, the Wine and Brandy Producers Association submitted that the minimum quantity provisions should be retained, and the Australian Hotels Association stated that it welcomed the proposed division into wholesale and retail licences, but opposed removal of provisions requiring minimum quantities. I agree with those statements. If the practice of selling wines at cellar door is to continue, I believe that a minimum quantity should be stipulated. Whether that quantity should be one gallon or two gallons, I have no particular preference, although it has been two gallons in the past. The member for Burra, however, suggested that the minimum should be one gallon. I believe that the Commissioner considers that sufficient grounds exist for retaining cellar-door sales, because he states at page 10 of his report:

There are, in addition, sufficient grounds for providing for the sale by retail to members of the public of wine and brandy at what is known as the cellar door, partly to satisfy

the need of the producer and partly to satisfy the convenience of the public, in the long-standing and widespread practice of visitors to wineries and distilleries being invited to taste the product and make a purchase and the equally long-standing and widespread practice of the local winery or distillery selling its products to local residents for home consumption.

Although the Commissioner has not indicated that he is opposed to cellar-door sales, he refers to selling by retail. The member for Burra, other members representing wine-making districts, and I consider that a sale at the cellar door should not necessarily be at retail price. In the past, these sales have been made at a price somewhere between the wholesale and retail prices. In dealing with wholesale licences at page 13, the Commissioner details the following example:

To provide for cellar-door sales of two broad categories, namely, sales promotion involving a visit of a member of the public to a winery or distillery and the purchase by that visitor either of sample bottles or ordinary bottles, but substantially of the character of a sample order, and the other the substantial local trade now existing in a number of wineries and distilleries, particularly in four-flagon lots of sweet wines in wine-making areas and in one-gallon lots of spirits.

Although the Commissioner refers to sweet wines, to my knowledge, the sale of minimum quantities is not limited only to that category: it applies also to dry wines. Then, referring to retail licences, the Commissioner states:

Winemakers' cellar-door sales—the existing habits of winemakers cover in various cases the sale of a substantial proportion of the output to members of the public, spasmodic sales particularly to visitors, and proportionately minimal sales by major winemakers some of whom are not really keen to retain that business . . . retail licences restricted by suitable undertakings or conditions should meet these cases.

I do not favour the suggestion that provision be made for a retail licence for winemakers' cellar-door sales. I believe that the Bill should contain a special provision ensuring that the winemaker who wishes to engage in cellar-door sales may obtain a licence for that purpose. I suggest that it should be a separate winemaker's licence, not a retail licence. Further in the report we see a recommendation that cellar-door sales should be allowed but not necessarily at retail price. The Commissioner, at page 96 of the report, states:

I am of the opinion that the Licensing Act should contain provisions:

(1) prohibiting any retail sale at below normal retail price or advertising any price below that price, with two exceptions—

(*a*) a reasonable discount for quantity, or

(*b*) a reasonable discount for taking delivery at the cellar door,

but the total discounts not to reduce the price below wholesale plus three-fifths of the wholesale-retail mark up . . .

I believe that in view of that statement provision should be made not for a retail licence but for a separate winemaker's licence that would enable a winemaker to sell in minimum quantities of one gallon or two gallons to people who call at the cellar door. I have pointed out that these sales mainly take place in the case of visitors, tourists, or people living in the locality, including the man on the land who may want to buy several gallons for consumption whenever he wishes.

Another category of buyer should be catered for under such a licence. I have not seen any reference to this category in the Commissioner's report, but I refer to the winemaker's employees. In most businesses, whether wine-making or any other kind, it is the practice for employees to be allowed to purchase from the business either at wholesale rates or at rates less than the ruling retail price. I understand that brewery employees may purchase liquor from the brewery at either the wholesale price or a price less than retail. It has also been the practice for many years past for employees of wineries to purchase whatever they require from the winery.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to extend the same courtesy to the member for Angas as he has always extended to other members.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I think the practice to which I refer should be allowed to continue. If the suggestion that I have made for a separate licence to be known as a winemaker's licence is acceptable, it could also cover cellar-door sales to strangers as well as to the employees of the winemaker.

The final matter with which I wish to deal relates to certain clubs. At present the Licensing Act prohibits the sale or supply of liquor unless by a club registered under that Act. The Commissioner has dealt thoroughly and fully with the matter of clubs on pages 14 and 15 as well as on pages 61 and 62 of his report. On page 14 he states:

I am firmly of the opinion that there does not exist in South Australia at the present time, any substantial social evil arising out of the conduct of clubs or their members in relation to the sale, supply and consumption of liquor.

I want to make it clear that my concern is with clubs other than sporting clubs (such as football or golf) and I refer to those that have been long-established in South Australia. There are many of them including some that have virtually been fulfilling the functions of a hotel; for example, a club at Parndana on Kangaroo Island is the only establishment selling liquor in the district. However, there are many other clubs, some in country towns—

Mr. Clark: The honourable member has a pretty good one in his own town.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I will come to that in a moment. Another such club is situated at Eudunda, with several in the towns on the Murray River and in other parts of South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Mannum has a good one.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes, and so has Loxton. Most of such clubs have had a long and honourable existence. One such club of which I have a particular knowledge is the Tanunda Club, established in 1891. In its 76 years it has conducted its activities lawfully, pursuant to the legislation that has enabled it to function and sell liquor to its members. During the whole of that time no convictions have been recorded against the club and I believe that could be said of many other such clubs. Indeed, the Registered Clubs Association of South Australia has about 66,000 members, the Tanunda Club having a membership of 450.

The clubs I have mentioned are not sporting organizations and cannot be placed in the same category as football, bowling, and others, many of which in the last few years have been trading illegally. It is very harsh to suggest that such clubs which have been trading illegally should now be able to apply for a licence under this Bill, so legalizing their activities, and enjoy the same privileges as the clubs to which I have referred, which have existed for three-quarters of a century, and which now stand the risk of having their off-licence sale rights taken from them.

Mr. Casey: Some have been registered for 75 years?

The Hon B. H. TEUSNER: Yes, and many of the clubs in which I am interested have been registered for over 50 years. Further, some of these old-established clubs do not exist entirely for the benefit of their own members. The Tanunda Club has as one of its objects—and I quote from the constitution of the club:

The objects of the club shall be . . . generally to promote the comfort, happiness and welfare of the members and other citizens.

The club has used a large part of its finances to promote the interests of the town and district generally. It built a large town hall which in 1920, for a small consideration, was vested in the trustees as a war memorial for the town and district. A sum of many thousands of pounds was involved in that gesture, but the club has also spent hundreds of dollars in past years on other town activities. In one instance $800 was spent to provide fine stone gates and a ticket office at the entrance to Tanunda park. Regular financial assistance has been provided to civic and sporting bodies as well as to the Tanunda Youth Club and many other activities in the town and district.

The sale of bottled ale yields 40 per cent of the bar income of the Tanunda Club, and I think that that is typical of many of the clubs to which I have already referred. To penalize this club and those whose activities are similar by not allowing any more off-licence sales after three years of the passing of this Bill is, I think, very harsh. The whole financial structure of many of these clubs has been built up from income from off-licence sales These old-established clubs function not only in the interests of their members but in the interests of the community in which they are established. I think that the Commissioner realized that there was a lot of merit in these club activities, and was placed in a somewhat difficult position as to what he should do. He says, at page 14:

I take a somewhat restricted view of the question of clubs having an off licence. I am well aware that all registered clubs have, ever since 1908 or their later registration, enjoyed the right to sell liquor to their members for removal from the club premises. It has been very strongly and very properly urged upon me that these rights have been long enjoyed, that they do no harm, and that they meet a very substantial convenience of members. With these propositions, as so stated, I have no quarrel.

I think that the Commissioner concedes that these clubs are in a different category from that of the sporting clubs to which he also refers in his report. However, he then goes on to say that he still considers that these old-established clubs should have no off-licence sales after the expiration of three years of the passing of this legislation. I strongly urge the retention of the rights these clubs have had for so many years, rights that have been given to them by legislation. Before 1891 they were allowed to make off-licence sales, but this right was taken away between 1891 and 1908. The 1908 legislation again secured for them the right to sell bottled liquor to be

taken away from the premises by members. I trust that, when the Attorney-General puts the amended Bill on file next session, there will be a provision that will secure for these clubs the right to sell liquor to members for carrying away from the premises.

It has apparently been the experience in other States that the later closing of hotels has meant a smaller sale of bottled beer, because at page 53 of his report the Commissioner states:

The broad concensus of opinion of hoteliers is that the net profit from the sale of bottled beer for taking away is lower than that arising from the sale of draught beer for consumption on the premises, and, with early closing, there is a higher proportion of beer sold for taking away than there is in the case of later closing.

The report further states:

The extension of trading hours from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. in Victoria quickly resulted in an increase by 25 per cent in the sale of draught beer and a reduction by 15 per cent in the sale of bottled beer.

So, if there is going to be an increase in the sale of draught beer as a result of the extended trading hours, it cannot be argued that the loss suffered by the hotels will be so great. I think the Commissioner was concerned that hotels, being in competition with clubs, would suffer as a result of the increased trading hours for clubs. Experience in other States shows that the sale of bottled beer diminishes and the sale of draught increases following an increase in trading hours.

I trust that favourable consideration will be given to the clubs to which I have just referred, and also to the matter of cellar-door sales. I hope, too, that when this Bill appears in a new garb next session, it will not be the labyrinthine and Draconian code, a term used by an eminent Queen's Counsel who has now gone to a better place. I support the Bill.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I, too, support the Bill, which is a progressive measure. I, like many other members, have received communications from various organizations and individuals expressing views on certain recommendations in the Commissioner's report. Those statements are the opinions of those organizations, which opinions they have the right to express and, if necessary, convey to members for consideration when dealing with a matter of this nature.

I do not intend to speak at length on this matter. I appreciate the work done by the Royal Commissioner, the way in which he inquired into all aspects of this complex question and the way in which he delivered his report setting out fully all the material and submissions put before him. He has done an excellent job. I should like, too, to congratulate the Attorney-General on being so expeditious in compiling a Bill covering the wide variety of questions associated with this matter in the short time available. It is clear that the liquor laws of South Australia were somewhat outdated and that practices that had been going on within this State needed tidying up in a form that would make things legal and enable the various parties, associations, bodies and businesses to plan more accurately.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think the previous Premier had any intention of ever introducing a measure like this?

Mr. HURST: I shall deal with that later. Certain clauses in the Bill need to be amended. Although the Commissioner has done an excellent job, submissions possibly were not made to him as extensively as they should have been to meet the circumstances regarding registered clubs in South Australia. When a club has been licensed, it should have the right to make sales of liquor for consumption by its members off club premises. It is my intention to move an amendment to give effect to this if an amendment dealing with the matter is not placed on the file beforehand. I do not intend to speak at length, because I sincerely believe, like the member for Burra and some other members opposite, that reform is necessary. I believe that members opposite have been taken for a ride in relation to this Bill, because we know that the member for Gumeracha—

Mr. Hudson: Is he taking them for a ride?

Mr. HURST: He is the man who is taking them for a ride. That is my opinion, but whether they would agree with me I do not know. I am permitted to express my opinion in this House. I believe some members opposite are anxious to see this reform debated in Committee, so that people in South Australia will know just what is the position.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think that the member for Gumeracha is trying to prevent the second reading debate from ending?

Mr. HURST: I believe so, and I believe that he, unbeknown to some of his own members, organized opposition to other Bills in order to deliberately delay matters by filibustering and causing this Bill to lapse before the second reading debate ended.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think that the member for Gumeracha was responsible in view of what happened last night?

Mr. HURST: It is most unfortunate that he caused a situation where he would not permit this debate to continue when the Government desired it to continue. It is most unfortunate, particularly in relation to the staff of this House who have done an excellent job in rendering service. Tactics of this kind are to be deplored. It is most unfair when a programme is set out and members know that in Committee they will have ample opportunity to express their views on various clauses. I regret that there was such a situation.

I am confident that the Leader of the Opposition is not aware of what the member for Gumeracha is leading him into. With respect, I believe he has not the foresight to see what he is being led into. It is regrettable for Opposition members because, following these tactics, they will probably remain in Opposition for some years as a result of the failure of the Leader of the Opposition to see what is happening. More skilful politicians opposite are bringing about a result they themselves really do not want. There are other clauses in the Bill on which I will most probably speak in Committee.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I rise to speak on this Bill after having not only studied as carefully as possible the report of Commissioner Sangster but also after having previously considered the report of Commissioner Phillips in Victoria, which I consider to be a very good report. Certain matters raised by other members lead me to make some comments. First, last night the member for Wallaroo referred to several matters that I should like to challenge.

Mr. Hall: That will take some time.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but I will try to be concise. The member for Wallaroo referred obliquely to the change in attitude of the Rev. Mr. Westerman in Victoria, when he presented a case on behalf of the secretariat of the churches, comprising the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, the Churches of Christ, the Congregational Union, and the Salvation Army. On page 11 of Commissioner Phillips's report there is this statement by the Rev. Mr. Westerman:

You invited me then if I were at any time convinced that some portion of our agreed case should be changed to be prepared to express my own personal opinion and leave it to others to come into this Commission and express disagreement with my opinion if they wished to do so. On a matter so vital a part of our case as the one on which I wish to make further submissions to you now, I do not feel free to do this. Accordingly I followed the procedure which I will intimate to you after these submissions have been made.

The crux of the matter is this:

Working paper No. 1 has I believe established the fact that the amount of consumption of liquor is not related significantly to the hours of trading.

He concluded:

. . . I have been compelled to arrive at the conclusion that there is no significant relationship between hours of trading in hotel bars and sociological consequences from the consumption of liquor. This conclusion has not been arrived at easily or lightly and it will be recognized that this represents a complete departure from what has been a fundamental belief of many people over a very long time.

That is the report that was referred to by the member for Wallaroo yesterday. I would further refer him in this report to information relating to the consumption of liquor and hours of trading in New South Wales.

Mr. Hughes: I have read it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The figures for New South Wales do not agree with the Commissioner's. There has been no significant increase in drinking, as a result of the increase in trading hours—no more than an increase of 3 per cent or 4 per cent in total consumption as a result of the change to 10 p.m. closing.

Mr. Hughes: What about the quotation from the financial page of the *Advertiser?*

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am interested in quoting figures that can be substantiated from the *New South Wales Year Book* and the *Commonwealth Year Book.*

Mr. Hughes: Then that is not correct.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In New South Wales, this matter, after inquiry by Mr. Justice Maxwell from 1951 to 1954, was submitted to the people by way of referendum. It is interesting to note that this was the third referendum held on this matter in New South Wales, referenda having been held there in 1916, 1947 and 1954. In 1954, when 1,800,000 people voted at a compulsory referendum, only 50.3 per cent favoured an extension of hours. From the evidence I have obtained through reading these reports and from my own observations, I am led to believe that good grounds exist for a change in trading hours in this State. I have considered the matter carefully because I feel just as strongly about it as the member for Wallaroo feels. I believe that the present restricted hours have only served to aggravate the

problem. They have created habits not in the best interest of social drinking, which, after all, most drinking is.

Mr. McKee: When did that strike you?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have believed it for a long time, ever since I got into a vicious school of shouting—ever since I got involved with people who go into a hotel at 4 p.m. and oblige the hotelkeeper by drinking as much as they can in the normal hours during which the barman is employed.

Mr. McKee: How long has that been?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Since I was 21. In any case, I am only expressing my point of view and the member for Port Pirie can express his. Also, Australians take pride in saying how much they can drink, and statistics prove that Australians drink a lot. From inquiries, I have discovered that, apart from any other social evil associated with drinking hours, there is the question of road safety in relation to motorists returning home after 6 p.m.

Figures about accidents during the hours from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. were quoted by the member for Wallaroo, but I have not checked the figures he gave on the hours between 10 p.m. and 12 midnight. I agree that the figures for 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. prove that social drinking between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. has been a factor in many accidents. This is borne out by figures produced for the Commissioner in this State by the Police Department and also by figures produced in other States on this subject. All the figures show that the accident rate is high during this period. In his report, the Commissioner stated that .08 per cent blood alcohol content was a serious impairment level. By way of question, the member for Burra obtained information indicating how much alcohol in various forms is required to produce that percentage. Some members may have been surprised at how little was required to produce the figure. The information given to the honourable member was based on the assumption that the person consuming the alcohol had an empty stomach and had drunk it as quickly as possible. Of course, that is precisely what has happened with the restricted hours that have applied in this State.

Although the Commissioner was not prepared to accept the figures regarding the reduction in the accident rate in Victoria as significant in relation to this matter, they are fairly conclusive for they show that, since the change in liquor trading hours in Victoria, the number of accidents involving driving under the influence of liquor has been reduced. The figures in this State are also interesting because they indicate that we are becoming aware of the problem. The accident rate in South Australia attributable to driving under the influence of alcohol has remained fairly constant (varying from about 600 to 620 a year) over the last four years. It was suggested that this was because people were becoming better educated in coping with the results of liquor consumption. So far as I could ascertain, there was no argument to sustain the statement that licensing hours were in any way related to drunkenness. Concerning another matter to which he draws attention, at page 7 of his report, the Commissioner states:

> . . . I was appalled by the nature and extent of the illegal practices actively or tacitly allowed to grow up and thrive in our community.

I believe that attention should have been drawn to that matter. It is not something that we, as responsible members of Parliament, should continue to condone. The licensing system was being tacitly abused by our preserving an Act that was acceptable to some people who wanted a restricted Act but who, strangely enough, were deliberately breaking the law as members of unlicensed clubs. I have said for a long time that I cannot accept a law of that nature. If people require the legislation to be amended (and they have obviously displayed their desire for that by their actions) we have the responsibility to legislate accordingly.

We have shown tolerance concerning the interpretation of the law which, together with other factors, has convinced me that something should be done. Whether I support the Bill will depend on what happens in respect of certain clauses. I have already drawn the attention of the Attorney-General to the fact that weaknesses exist in certain parts of the Bill. Indeed, I know that he agrees that that is so, because he has told me personally that he intends to move substantial amendments.

It is difficult to comment on the measure as it stands without knowing what those amendments will be. However, I draw the House's attention first to the requirements concerning club licences and to the necessity for a closer examination of them, and to licences that it is intended to issue to those people at present distributing liquor as wholesalers. Such people do not wish to be wholesalers under the present Act, nor do they wish to be retailers: they prefer to retain their present wholesale activity and to have a licence with a two-gallon minimum which enables them to trade with private

customers, as well as with licensed premises in respect of wholesale requirements.

I cannot accept the case advanced by the member for Frome on behalf of the person whom he called the poor hotelkeeper. Any observant person will know what has happened in the last 10 years. I refer particularly to motels and unlicensed places that provide a certain type of accommodation for people who travel interstate as well as intrastate, and who obviously desire that type of accommodation. Motels have proliferated and have become profitable by providing a service that was supposedly part of the triune service supplied by hotels in providing meals and drink as well as accommodation. We have also seen restaurants mushrooming throughout the city and suburbs providing a service which people obviously desire and which no-one can tell me the hotels could not have provided. The crux of it is in the evidence, namely, that the selling of beer is the hotels' prerogative. Throughout the report this is insisted on: the hotels are not prepared to relinquish that line.

The original licences were granted to serve a three-fold purpose. I cannot be sympathetic towards the hotels at present, when they seek to serve in only one category. Of course, we in Parliament have a vested interest in this matter, as has the publican: we want licence fees, and we have been increasing fees all round; and the Commonwealth Government wants excise fees. Therefore, the tendency is to promote the consumption of liquor without regard to the creation of social upsets and public outcries. We have a responsibility in this matter because we, in turn, are looking for a reward from it just the same as anyone else. We must realize that we live in an affluent society in which people are enticed to drink regardless of the price. They will not be prevented from drinking by the price: when the price is increased consumption is not reduced. Although smokers may complain when they have to pay a few cents extra for a packet of cigarettes, this does not stop them from smoking. We must provide for education in these matters. The member for Burra has already drawn attention to this matter, pointing to the need to inform people of the social consequences of drinking, and of what they may safely drink in certain circumstances. I believe that, as a consequence, we have to enforce penalties for lesser drinking offences, which although not directly serious, are indirectly serious as they may affect the welfare of other people.

Although I am not jumping on the band waggon concerning barmaids, I point out that I have been in every State of the Commonwealth over the last 12 months, and that in nearly all the other States barmaids are accepted. In fact, I was in Melbourne when the extended liquor hours first operated. I asked several of these women whether there were any objectionable factors associated with their work, and they replied, "No." I have spoken to barmaids in Western Australian country towns and have taken every opportunity to find out what the problem is in relation to their working in hotels. They say they have no problems or trouble with people misbehaving. They are efficient; they do not take time off to drink; they are courteous; and when they are in charge of a bar it is far more orderly than it is under some other circumstances. Often women work the late shifts when there are extended hours, and I do not believe their employment keeps permanent staff out of employment. The normal finishing time of bartenders is 6 p.m., and barmaids work the later hours. I do not think they are taken away from their families, but, even if they are, women are employed in other jobs involving late hours: for example, the cleaners at Parliament House and other buildings in Adelaide.

It is said that barmaids will be asked to confront the public, but this applies to women who now work in cafeterias and to those who will be working in betting agencies. What is the difference, except that it is perhaps thought that people who drink become abusive and unruly, which need not be so? I say advisedly that this unfortunate attitude of not providing for the employment of barmaids has been thrust upon the Government. I do not think all members opposite support it, and I hope they will give some tacit support to a move to correct the situation because, as barmaids are employed elsewhere in Australia, this will bring about uniformity in this matter as it will in relation to trading hours.

The concern of the Commissioner about the proliferation of clubs is inexplicable. He seems to fear that clubs will spring up like other premises have done: he seems to forget that he has recommended an adequate provision for a licensing court. The court will not be obliged to grant a licence unless it is satisfied that the applicant will give a necessary service and is functioning in association with some organization—in other words, that the premises will not be just a drinking place. Why is he so concerned about this? I cannot understand it, as I believe the provisions made for setting up a licensing court are fair. I have no quibble about local option polls, but I

believe the provision in this Bill for setting up a court constitutes a more equitable method of granting licences.

People will be able more adequately to protest before the court. This is far more democratic than a local option poll, under which a bloc of people not intimately associated or concerned with the premises in question can veto a move to obtain a licence. This court could operate effectively. I believe the provision to enable a court of this type to function in relation to licensed premises will be in the interests of this change in the law brought about by the Bill.

I cannot see any reason why, with a court of this nature, there should be this unnecessary fear about clubs. We all have faith in our courts, as they protect the people. If we have no faith in them, we have no faith in this Parliament. If this power is given to the courts, it will be administered justly and wisely. I cannot understand this attempt to support a particular section of the trade by creating this fear of competition, which I do not believe is as serious as it is made out to be. I can see no reason for not giving more serious consideration to the claims of these clubs, which I think should have more liberal provisions in relation to their activities.

I do not intend to say any more except that I will watch during the progress of the Bill to see what amendments are introduced to certain clauses in which I am interested, particularly in relation to Sunday drinking. I will reserve any further remarks until that time. At this stage, I am prepared to support the second reading.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): At this late stage and after so many speeches, there is very little left to be said on the Bill. However, I congratulate the Government on its early action in introducing this legislation. It was most amusing to hear the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham on this Bill. They made an all-out effort to blame the Labor Government for the confusing state of the liquor licensing legislation in this State, but surely they must realize that one of the main reasons for their Party's defeat was that the Playford Government continually ignored the wishes of the people of this State. Their contributions to this debate were the worst speeches I have ever had the displeasure of listening to. It was obvious from their remarks that they knew little or nothing about the subject and that during their time on the Governent benches they had not thought about the matter or attempted to influence the Government to consider the wishes of the people. For many years the Liberal and Country League Government regarded the electors as children, to be protected against their own wishes. I am afraid it is a little late for members opposite to jump on the band waggon after having ignored the people for over 30 years.

I believe that if the Liberal Government had remained in power this Bill would not have seen the light of day. This legislation, along with other social legislation introduced by the Labor Government, is no doubt appreciated by the people, because it gives them a freedom that has been denied them for many years. The Leader also complained that South Australia had been deprived of extended hours for another year because the Government did not support his move. However, the Leader, who was a Government member for six years, should explain why he did nothing during that period to alter the situation.

Perhaps the member for Gumeracha could give a better explanation. Since the Labor Government has been in power it has introduced social legislation that was denied the people by the Liberal Government for over 30 years. The Labor Government has torn down the social barrier that denied the people the right to live like normal human beings. The type of disciplinary control exercised by the previous Government is unheard of in other countries. This has been confirmed by migrants I have spoken to. This legislation is a credit to the Labor Government and will be appreciated by the people for a long time to come. This is a great credit to the Government after years of strict disciplinary control exercised by the previous Government.

Hotels should be considered, because they were the first on the scene. From the early days of settlement, hotels have given a service to the people not only in the cities, but many a country traveller has welcomed the sight of an outback pub. I am sure that many members opposite have often welcomed the sight of an outback hotel, particularly when the temperature is about 100 degrees in the water bag. The member for Eyre comes from a dry country, and I am sure he has often appreciated the sight of a pub.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not think you should have used the word "pub".

Mr. McKEE: There is a song about a pub with no beer. Sunday trading should be considered. I do not think there is a great

demand for Sunday trading in the metropolitan area, but some of the hotels on beach fronts might desire to serve people on Sundays. In N.S.W., I think outside a radius of 30 miles of the metropolitan area, hotels open for certain hours in the morning and afternoon on Sundays. The hotels give a service to the people, and I cannot see anything wrong with that. If a person feels like a drink he should not be told he cannot have one. Sunday opening could be made optional. No doubt licensees would arrange with one another, or they could have a roster in certain areas for Sunday opening.

If Sunday trading is not to be permitted, the Bill should contain some provision under which guests at a hotel can entertain people. There are people employed by contractors who go out into the country and live in hotels. They meet people and friends and call at people's homes in the town and build up friendships. They like to invite people back to the hotel. I believe that one lodger can have six guests at present. This is reasonable, and I consider that this should not be deleted by the Bill: in Committee we should consider this aspect.

The other matters I wish to mention are the licensing of clubs and bottle sales, which have been mentioned extensively by members opposite. No doubt we will get support for bottle sales from licensed clubs and the retention of licences by clubs that have enjoyed this privilege. I do not intend to delay the business of the House any longer. I support the Bill and will have more to say during the Committee stage.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I expect that the report, on whose recommendations the legislation we are considering is framed, will go down in history as the Sangster report, in the same way as the Phillips report, in 1965 in Victoria, and the Maxwell report, in 1954 in New South Wales, are known in their respective States. I have read the Sangster report, but I do not intend to touch on more than one or two matters this afternoon. By this legislation South Australia will be brought very much into line with developments that have taken place in this field in other parts of Australia in recent years. Like other members, I consider that the Sangster report is a very good report. It covers many facets of this subject, and is a matter for congratulation of the Commissioner, who was responsible for the vast mental effort entailed, for the tremendous physical work involved, and for the consideration given to the recommendations. I say this advisedly, because I was not popular with Mr. Sangster at one stage when the Royal Commission was appointed. It will be interesting to see in the final account what this Royal Commission cost South Australia and whether it was more or less the amount allocated for it. Whatever happens, however, I, too, add my congratulations to Mr. Sangster, Q.C., the Royal Commissioner.

Mr. Millhouse: If we use the report properly it will have been worth it.

Mrs. STEELE: I raise the point whether we needed to have been involved in such a comprehensive report, in view of the fact that the two reports in Victoria and New South Wales were available for our scrutiny in considering whether some of the action taken in those two States could not have been taken in South Australia. Many of the aspects of the subject covered were common to the three States. In this way, perhaps we might have saved the time of a busy legal man and also saved some money in connection with the Royal Commission. Undoubtedly interest has been shown in this legislation by all sections of the community. As members of Parliament, we know how wide the interest has been because of the many communications we have received from individuals, church groups, hotel associations and all the other people interested in the Bill. I have great respect for the views put forward by the churches in particular for they naturally have a real and obvious concern in how this legislation may affect the morals of the community.

In recent years in South Australia we have seen a great many changes. One change we can be proud of is the way in which the standards of hotels have been improved. New hotels have been erected in many parts of the metropolitan area and in country districts, and motels have become popular and profitable throughout South Australia since they have been in vogue. The standard of accommodation and service given now in South Australian hotels reflects great credit on the people prepared to invest capital in this direction. They have added greatly to the tourist potential in South Australia by providing hotels that are attractive to people coming from other States.

Other social changes that have occurred in the last two or three years will have a profound effect on the life of practically every person in South Australia. I refer to the introduction by this Government of the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting, lotteries, dog racing, and liquor law reform.

The member for Flinders said (and I agree) that this type of legislation had been the major legislation introduced in South Australia since the Labor Government took office. We have yet to see the effect of increased betting facilities (and perhaps liquor marketing facilities) on the life of the community, as well as the availability of lottery tickets.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Savings Bank deposits will drop.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. I was a little surprised to read in the newspaper yesterday that a T.A.B. agency was to be established in a city store. I am indeed sorry to see what I consider a most reprehensible step. I believe the number of T.A.B. agencies that can be provided throughout the city, suburbs and country is sufficient without introducing an agency in a city store.

Yesterday, the member for Wallaroo spoke at length on the matter being debated and gave figures of the increases in accidents and so on in New South Wales that have occurred as a result of later closing hours in that State. Although I have not studied the figures in detail, I am aware that since late closing has been introduced in Victoria the number of road accidents and the losses of life on the highways in that State have decreased. Another significant factor is that there have been no great reproaches by those who opposed the move in the first place about the changes that have followed the introduction of later closing hours in Victoria. The churches were vocal on the matter when it was being considered in Victoria but they have levelled no criticism at what has taken place since.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I think there is now more drinking in suburban hotels than in city hotels.

Mrs. STEELE: That is possible. I believe that after later closing hours have been introduced fewer people will use city hotels than use them at present. I believe men will realize that they can go home from work, clean up, relax a little, and then go back to the hotel in the evening, perhaps with their wives, to enjoy a couple of drinks in comfort. This will mean less drinking in city hotels. It will apply, too, because of the number of migrants in Australia who come from the United Kingdom and other European countries where they have been used to being able to go into a public house at any time to drink in a leisurely fashion. They are not used to having to get so many drinks poured out and ranged on the bar counter before the time comes when they must down them.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The six o'clock swill!

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, and I am sure that, when hotels stay open later (and I am pretty sure that provision will be passed), we will see the disappearance in city hotels of the situation I have described and drinking will be undertaken more leisurely and in a more comfortable environment in the suburbs.

As members know, I came to this State from Western Australia a long time ago. However, for as long as I can remember the hotels in Western Australia opened until 9 p.m. Throughout the Second World War the hotels closed at 9 p.m., and 10 p.m. closing has been introduced since then. I cannot remember seeing motor cars lined up in front of hotels in Western Australia, although, of course, not as many cars were about then. Nevertheless, I did not see crowded hotels and I was not aware of the horrible six o'clock swill that has been obvious for many years in South Australia. From experience, this will be the same kind of situation in South Australia when 10 p.m. closing is introduced.

Mr. Hughes: I thought that a few minutes ago you were criticizing the Government for introducing this type of legislation in the last 12 months.

Mrs. STEELE: I did not say that. I am speaking of the legislation before the House. I did not criticize the Government for introducing T.A.B. I said the Government had introduced it, but I did not criticize it, although I could have, I suppose.

Mr. Hughes: Wait until you read what you said in *Hansard*.

Mrs. STEELE: The honourable member should listen more closely. I did not utter one word of criticism against the social legislation of the Government. As lawmakers responsible for introducing this kind of legislation in South Australia, we must ensure that not only 10 p.m. closing but other reforms are rigidly policed, because these reforms will make it easier for people to have access to drinking facilities.

[*Sitting suspended from* 12.57 *to* 2 *p.m.*]

Mrs. STEELE: Much evidence was submitted to the Royal Commission concerning minors. I believe that Parliament has a considerable responsibility to young people as a result of the increasing temptations that are being placed before them. Indeed, the Commissioner points out that in recent years young people have been faced with many added temptations. These temptations take many

forms, but I refer particularly to the entertainment provided at hotels, to which young people are encouraged to go. One of the Commissioner's observations concerns evidence to the effect that there should be some responsibility on the minors themselves regarding the supply of liquor in hotels. I have much sympathy for the hotelkeeper in one respect, because it is difficult these days to tell what age a young man or woman may be; in fact, it is sometimes difficult to tell whether a person is a young man or young woman.

Recently, as guest speaker at a school break-up, I referred to the fact that in front of me I saw school girls seated in the hall looking very demure and very much their own age in school uniforms, whereas, the next day out on the street or at the beach, they would look completely different, making it difficult for one to determine their actual age. A licensee or manager of licensed premises is obligated to ensure that people to whom liquor is supplied in his establishment are over 21 years. The member for Flinders pointed to the increased delinquency that is taking place today and to the contribution towards that state of affairs that the relaxation of liquor laws, particularly as they apply to young people, may make. I believe that the parents should bear much of the responsibility in this matter. They must make themselves fully aware of the attractions offered to young people in these rather free and easy times. It is also their duty to attempt to prepare their children for the sort of temptations they may face when they leave school and attend the various attractions that are provided for them.

I agree with the Commissioner's statement that young people often do not know how to drink. The Commissioner said he thought that it was up to the parents to do their part in preparing the children to drink properly and in moderation, and that the provision of alcohol in the home might slowly educate young people to consume it moderately: in particular, those young people likely to yield to this sort of temptation later. When considering legislation that will provide an easy access to alcohol we must realize that we have the responsibility of ensuring that young people are not confronted with too many temptations.

I am reminded of a pleasant and exciting experience last year when, through the kindness and courtesy of the Government, I met Madame Pandit, that brilliant and wise Indian stateswoman, one-time President of the United Nations, when she visited Adelaide as part of an Australia-wide visit, and was the guest of the Australian External Affairs Department. I was asked to a Ministerial luncheon given in her honour and, when asked whether she would care for wine, she said, "Most certainly. I have a high appreciation of Australian wines and never lose an opportunity to sample them." She drank riesling from the district of the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner). I remember asking her about young people in India and whether her country was faced with the problem of delinquency and, if it were, what were some of the causes. She replied, "Are you aware that India is a dry country; that prohibition applies in India?" Then, she added, "More's the pity, because I think it is a grave mistake that prohibition has been introduced in India and that our young people, many of whom have been introduced to alcohol on visits to other countries, are denied the opportunity to consume it in their own country, and often obtain alcohol by illegal means," adding, "Forbidden fruit is sweet." She said also that it was the responsibility of parents to see that their teenage children drank under good conditions, in their own homes, and learned something about the effects involved.

Concerning the cellar-door trade, I believe that, if small vignerons were deprived of the opportunity to retail some of their products, an interesting and, to many, a pleasurable avenue for buying wines would be closed. One previous speaker said that many people from other States enjoyed the privilege of buying wine in South Australia at the cellar door. Bearing in mind that South Australia produces about 80 per cent of the total wine produced in Australia, it would be a great blow to the vignerons and to South Australian winemaking districts generally if this opportunity were denied them. When I heard from the member for Burra that many winemakers today paid exactly the same fees as those paid by hotelkeepers on the same basis to have this outlet, I realized how great a pity it would be if the people concerned were prevented from selling wine in this way.

Many speakers have referred to Sunday trading which, of course, is not provided for in the Bill. Personally, however, I would be sorry to see hotels opened on Sundays. If we give extended trading hours, I consider that that should be sufficient. I do not think there is any need for hotels to open on Sundays. It was made legal in Western Australia some years ago for hotels beyond a 25-mile radius of the city to open their bars between 12 noon and 1 p.m. and between 6 and 7 p.m.

As a result, hundreds of cars drove from the metropolitan area and swamped seaside resorts and other places where hotels were open. This ruined the local scene for the local inhabitants. I think that such a provision would be a mistake. This is one aspect of this legislation which is highly controversial and upon which many people have expressed varying opinions. The last point I raise refers to barmaids, another aspect on which the Government does not intend to follow the Commissioner's recommendations. I was interested to read again what the Attorney-General had to say about this when he was giving his second reading explanation.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a classic!

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. He spoke of the right of any member of this House to speak and vote freely on this question, and went on to say:

It is a free vote except that every member of the Labor Party is bound by a pledge that he has signed. The Labor Party has a policy, and before the Commission was appointed it was well known to those who bothered to read the policy (and I understand that it was bedside reading for honourable members opposite; they all rushed down and paid their 50c to obtain a copy) that the policy contained specific proposals, instead of things like "home sweet home" and "dog is man's best friend", which represent the policy of honourable members opposite.

This was generous of the Attorney-General! I was one who did not rush down and pay 50c for a copy of it: it was given to me. I read the local policy of the A.L.P. and the brochure put out by the Federal A.L.P. and nowhere could I find in it that this was the policy. I should be interested if the Attorney-General or any other Government member would show me where this policy is stated.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a motion passed at the last convention after the Commission was appointed.

Mrs. STEELE: It is misleading and I wasted a lot of time looking to see whether this was contained in the policy of the A.L.P.

Mr. Clark: You didn't have to. You should have believed him.

Mrs. STEELE: I was curious when I saw this. It is not my idea of bedside reading, but now and again I check something that members opposite say. I understand that it is a pledge enforced on members of the Labor Party at the request of the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union. I am intrigued: I understood the policy of the Labor Party was one man one job. I realized, because of the length of times hotels would be open once trading hours were extended to 10 p.m., that some men would be seeking part-time occupations. How does the Government reconcile this with its policy of one man one job? I cannot understand why women should not be employed as barmaids. I have even heard people say that since women have been elected to this Parliament the tone of the place has improved!

Mr. Millhouse: There's no doubt about that.

Mrs. STEELE: So the same thing could apply to barmaids. Where women have been employed as bartenders the atmosphere and the environment has been very much improved. Members opposite are not allowed to say whether or not they agree to this proposition of women being employed in hotel bars. I think that this is the only State in the Commonwealth where women are not employed in hotel bars. Western Australia has had barmaids for many years, yet I have never heard of anyone complaining that women should not do this kind of work or that it is improper for them to work in bars where they may be subjected to all sorts of raucous and coarse remarks. I think their presence has an uplifting effect. In the United Kingdom barmaids are part and parcel of the English pub system and nobody thinks anything of it. If any member of this House watched *Coronation Street* on television, he would know that a barmaid played one of the leading characters.

The standard of hotels in this State has been improved considerably because of the type of hotel and motel built here recently. The great attraction and virtue of motels is that the travelling public with families, perhaps doing an interstate trip or coming into the city from a country town, can go to a motel by choice rather than to a hotel where, perhaps, the family would be disturbed by bar trade and things of that nature. It is all right for a motel to have a good restaurant and wine licence. Many of them provide a first-class meal, there is a very good wine service in many instances, and they are not terribly expensive. However, if people want to drink they should go to a hotel and book in, or, if they want a drink when they arrive at a motel, make their way to the hotel to get it. In my opinion, it would be a pity, unless the motel was isolated, for it to have a full liquor licence. In conclusion, I reiterate that this Parliament has seen the entry of radical social changes in South Australia, and we have a definite responsibility to see that their introduction does not have an adverse effect on any section of the community.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill and commend the Government for introducing it. The Royal Commissioner, after a lengthy investigation, prepared a fine report on the contentious subject of liquor sales, the extension of hours, and all other aspects of the liquor trade in this State. This comprehensive review gave the people of this State the opportunity to say what they required and what they opposed. The Leader of the Opposition claims that we delayed the introduction of 10 p.m. closing by refusing his private member's motion last year, but he was looking at only one aspect of the whole question. He would by his motion have continued piecemeal alterations to the Licensing Act, which had been the policy of the previous Government for many years. With other members of this House, I have had correspondence from club and hotel interests, wine and spirit merchants and various church groups, some in my district and also the headquarters of the various church organizations. These views have helped me to make up my mind how I shall approach this matter. To put the member for Burnside's mind at rest on how I stand on two points that she raised, I say I am personally opposed to Sunday trading and to the employment of barmaids in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you really against them or are you against them just because your Party tells you?

Mr. CURREN: My Party does not tell me in this matter what I am to do.

Mr. Millhouse: That is contrary to what the Attorney-General said.

Mr. CURREN: I thought the member for Mitcham was intelligent enough to be able to understand me when I said I personally was opposed to those two things. Has that sunk in? The introduction of 10 p.m. closing will be greatly appreciated by country people, particularly in the summer months at harvest time. They will not have to rush madly into the hotel or club to satisfy their drinking needs. I shall refer to several points in the Bill, one being club licences. In this respect, I am well aware of the feelings of the members of the three clubs in my district, and I do not need the advice of the member for Light about what my constituents require.

I have had discussions with the Attorney-General about the licensed clubs losing their off-licence sales. It is not clearly defined in the Royal Commissioner's report or in the Bill. There is just the reference to club licences. There should be various gradings of such licence. The clubs in my district are operating under the same licensing conditions and trading hours as the hotels, and they are all well conducted and in strict conformity with the present laws of the State. They are well run and strictly controlled by the committee, and any unruliness is controlled by the suspension or removal of the offending member from the premises.

I have also had discussions with the officials of the co-operative wineries in my district. They express concern about cellar-door sales being affected. As a result of discussions that I had with the Attorney-General, I was assured that it was not intended that the system now in operation should be interrupted. The Chairman of the Co-operative Wineries Association put the views of that association, that the *status quo* should be maintained, which is a two-gallon licence under the distiller's-storekeeper's licence. The other matter to which I wish to refer is the ability of hotel guests to entertain friends in the hotel. This is of particular importance to my district. We have fine community hotels: I believe they are the best group of hotels in any country district in Australia. It is to the advantage of not only the hotel but also the guests and the local industries that guests in the hotel have this right to entertain local people. We have many oversea visitors to our hotels and the privilege or right of entertaining local business men is greatly appreciated and necessary for the conduct of business in that area.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I indicate my support for the second reading of this Bill because it contains merit and is worthy of being supported to the Committee stage, where I understand the Attorney-General will have amendments for the Committee to consider. Since this Bill was introduced by the Attorney-General, we have had some good speeches, varying in content and interest. For instance, we had a light-hearted speech from the member for Enfield and an erudite speech from the member for Angas. These varying views are a good thing for a Bill of this nature, because it will ultimately affect almost all people in South Australia at some time during their lives. It is of such importance that, although we have not so far got all the amendments that will come to this Chamber, general remarks are merited at the second reading stage. It is difficult to frame one's comments other than on a general basis, because we do not know at this stage what the amendments will be. They could easily affect major parts of the Bill as drafted. The Commissioner,

having gone thoroughly into all aspects of his terms of reference, produced a voluminous and detailed report for the benefit of members of Parliament and of the public who are interested in this subject. He seems to have unearthed many local customs and habits on his way.

He deals exhaustively with methods of trading and drinking and what a civilized approach to all questions of drinking should be. He discusses licences, prices and conditions of selling including a very important aspect—the new type of club licence. He also refers to abuses of the present system and the evils emanating therefrom. The Commissioner presented his report to the Government with his various recommendations following extensive and exhaustive inquiries into the whole question under his terms of reference. From the appendices attached to the report members can see the host of witnesses that came before him. Therefore, it was a fairly comprehensive inquiry. The Commissioner then presented his report containing recommendations to the Government as he thought they should be presented to Parliament. However, this Bill does not embody the whole of the Commissioner's recommendations, only part of them. Certain important exclusions have been made, some portions of the Commissioner's recommendations having been expunged altogether. The point is that, whether or not we agree to the recommendations, the Government and the taxpayers have paid much money for a comprehensive inquiry. As this report has been obtained at considerable expense, surely members and the public are entitled to have all the recommendations presented to this place in the form of a Bill. The House should vote on all of them and not on only some of them. Then we would be able to decide the final form this legislation should take.

More important, members of this House should be able to express their views on the extremely controversial matters in the report, such as Sunday trading in hotels, employment of barmaids, and so on. Of course, the recommendations included in the Bill concern what the Labor Government wants the people of South Australia to have: they are what the Government thinks are good for us. Members in this place will have no say on the others. I believe the thinking of the Labor Party is exposed, for the Government had said through its spokesman, the Attorney-General, and through the Premier (outside the House before the Bill was introduced) that a free vote according to members' consciences would be exercised on this matter. The Government said that members would be able to vote without obligation to their Party. Of course, the position is that members can now vote only on selected portions of the recommendations. Government members are free to vote on some parts, not on all of them. Of course, Opposition members are free to vote whichever way they like, but Labor members are only partly free.

Did the Government really fear public censure if it included all the recommendations? Members in this place have differing views on these matters, as we have heard. I might not support Sunday trading at this time but at least I would appreciate an opportunity to cast my vote here, and thus express my opinion. On the one hand, the Government has not included the recommendation about Sunday trading, but, on the other hand, it has recommended opening clubs on Sunday. Why should this special treatment be afforded to clubs? Why was the recommendation relating to hotel trading on Sunday not included in the Bill and the recommendation for club facilities included? The whole recommendation dealing with Sunday trading should have been included in the Bill and then we could have voted on it according to our views. However, we have been offered certain views according to the Labor Party, and we will not have a free vote.

Also, we find that many *bona fide* clubs that have been established for many years (some since the last century) are to be brought back to the same level as some clubs which have not been established long and which for years have been operating illegally. There is no reward for virtue in this case. Although this matter can be dealt with in Committee, it is another example of the Government's inconsistency in this regard. By this action, the Government has found itself in something of a dilemma of its own making. On page 6 of his report, the Commissioner says:

> Generally speaking the several recommendations which I make for amendments to the law are so inter-locked and inter-dependent that it would be impossible to treat each recommendation separately, or to amend or reject one without thereby affecting or even reversing another or a whole series of others.

The Bill does not contain two major recommendations included in the report, and this is completely contrary to what the Commissioner recommended. Both inside and outside this House the Government has said that members are completely free to vote as they wish on this measure. However, some members are not free to vote on the matter of barmaids. The

Commissioner's recommendation on barmaids has not been included in the Bill because of Party politics. The Attorney-General has stated plainly that this is so.

Mr. Millhouse: He could not have made it clearer.

Mr. COUMBE: True; he is extremely lucid on occasions and this was one of his best moments in that regard. The matter of barmaids has not been included in the Bill. How can we interpret this action? The policy-making side of the Labor Party at the Trades Hall has said there shall be no barmaids in South Australia. Therefore, no barmaids will be provided for in the Bill. We are not living in the Victorian era. It is hoped that this report will bring civilization into some of our archaic drinking habits. The Labor Party is not free to vote in this House about the employment of barmaids, because the Trades Hall people have said, "You are not going to vote upon it. You are not going to bring it in. We here in the Labor Party have decided that it cannot go on and that is how the Bill will go into Parliament." That is the way in which the Attorney, in obeying his instructions, has introduced the Bill. Regardless of how the people of South Australia feel, there are to be no barmaids. The Commissioner touches on the employment of barmaids or bar tenders and examines the economic effect on the community and on their families. He is outspoken when he reports at page 27:

I can see no reason for the continuation of the prohibition of the employment of females in public bars. There is undoubtedly scope for some married women to obtain evening employment in bars if trading hours are continued to 10 p.m. and in the course of carrying out that employment to have inadequate provision for the care of young children or to cause a virtual separation from their husbands who are absent during normal working hours, the wives being absent during the evenings. This kind of employment, however, is only one of the evening employments open to married women and to prohibit the employment of barmaids merely to reduce the opportunities for some women to neglect their husbands and families (albeit for the worthy motive of providing more funds) is too remote a consideration. Other arguments against barmaids such as that bars are no places for a woman, or that the bar should be an all male employment preserve are clearly untenable in this day and age.

The impartial Commissioner says that, in addition to taking evidence in Adelaide, he travelled extensively throughout Australia and that he went to Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. Further, he recalls observations that he had made on a recent trip to Europe and other places overseas. This view expressed by the Commissioner shows how archaic is the attitude of the Australian Labor Party on this and other matters.

Mr. Langley: Ha!

Mr. COUMBE: Honourable members may laugh, but this was reflected most pointedly at the last Commonwealth election, when the vote against the Labor Party was twice as high in South Australia as it was in any other State. I emphasize that this is the only State that does not provide for the employment of barmaids.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What happened when your Party was in office?

Mr. COUMBE: We may do something now.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: After 27 years of opportunity!

Mr. COUMBE: The Attorney said that he could not introduce a Bill providing for barmaids following the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner. Either the Attorney will not have a bar of it or he is not allowed to deal with it. This is strange in a Party that fosters the cause of equal pay and equal opportunity for the sexes. I wonder what honourable members' colleagues in the other States think of their attitude. I personally believe that several members of the Government Party privately support the employment of barmaids in hotels. I do not know whether the Attorney-General is one of them, but if there were to be a free vote on this Bill, not a hypocritical sham, we might get some surprises.

I shall now deal with other parts of the Bill. Most members of the public are concerned with the clause providing for 10 p.m. closing and the interest of many of them in the measure will probably stop at that point. A greater number of well informed people will consider the other features of the Bill. The Commissioner did say that it might be possible to introduce this section of the recommendations before the other sections were introduced. Of course, 10 p.m. closing is only one part of the Bill and I consider that other parts are equally important if we are to bring our drinking laws into some degree of uniformity and civilization, although those other provisions may affect fewer people.

The underlying principle in the Commissioner's recommendation is important. He says that, because there are today so many abuses of the licensing laws, so many loopholes, and so many people who are obviously (and, in many cases, quite naturally) flouting the provisions of the existing law, there should be provided a varying number of types of licence

providing extended hours and different facilities and conditions, and that beyond those matters there should be no traffic at all. If any offence were committed in relation to the new hours and conditions, the police would be expected to deal rigidly with the breaches. In other words, there would be control of drinking by fixing sensible hours and decent conditions. That is a fairly sound premise on which the Bill is founded.

The principle of acceptable hours and facilities runs right through the report and is provided for in various parts of the Bill. Those acceptable hours and facilities are to be accompanied by greater supervision of granting of licences and much stricter policing of licensed premises and of offences. The Bill gives effect to the Commissioner's recommendation about the setting up of a new licensing court and I think all members will agree that the present system of local option polls leaves much to be desired. I know of some peculiar results of a local option poll in my district. We shall have an experienced body to handle all types of inquiry, particularly the hearing of applications and the issue and control of licences. The tribunal is to be of a high calibre, comprising a judge and magistrates.

The court will have wide powers about the conditions under which drink will be consumed or sold and, in some cases, about who will have a licence, as in the case of clubs. We shall now have 10 different classifications of licence. Perhaps some of them are flimsy, but there are some interesting innovations. One of the most interesting is the tavern licence that it is suggested may well be introduced in certain circumstances. If this is introduced, great care should be taken in deciding where taverns are established. We are aware of the position in Sydney and Melbourne, where trade in many city hotels has decreased but has increased in suburban hotels. Older hotels in the city of Adelaide could be developed as taverns, but I object to new taverns being set up in the city. Many older hotels cannot provide accommodation or a meal, but the licensee will probably welcome the idea of setting up a tavern. I am worried about the facility to consume liquor at a cabaret until 3 a.m. on a Sunday.

Mr. Nankivell: The Commissioner recommended 2 a.m.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not accept this provision. Clubs have special problems because requirements, facilities, and hours vary. The Commissioner has been realistic in his attitude to motel and restaurant licences. The motel is a fairly recent innovation and, as there seems to be an increasing request for this type of accommodation, the number of motels is increasing. The Commissioner has recommended that if a motel applies for a licence it should be issued on a similar basis to that of a hotel, but with restricted facilities. From all the information given in the report, obviously one organization will benefit—the brewery. Some hotels are owned by breweries, some are freehold, and others are owned by companies. Some hotels will suffer if the hours are extended, while others will benefit. The hotelier or the company owning the hotel will have problems, as the new licensing court will have problems. I hope that from the large volume of evidence presented in the report a better system of licensing will be evolved in South Australia. It should be a system expressing an adult attitude to drinking.

I do not advocate the increased consumption of liquor, but people wish to drink and they should enjoy these facilities in an adult manner. Any abuse of the system should be stopped and the new facilities should be policed more rigidly than facilities have been in the past. Reasonable conditions will be provided, and the system should be honoured and respected more than it is now. Today's conditions are honoured in the breach, and many leading citizens break our present licensing laws. It must be a good law, enforceable and honoured, yet at the same time policed more adequately and effectively than the law is policed at present. As a result of this enforcement many of the more undesirable features and abuses may be controlled. I support the second reading, because the Bill has merit and so that the Attorney-General's foreshadowed amendments can be considered in Committee.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I, too, agree in principle with the report of the Royal Commissioner. The Government has not provided for two recommendations of the Commissioner: one for reasons of policy, as has been completely explained by the member for Enfield. The other recommendation relates to Sunday trading, which is a matter exercising the minds of many people today. Representations have been made to me by organizations and by people concerning this aspect. I do not subscribe to Sunday trading, and I assure the House that I will not support any further extension of drinking facilities such as the opening of hotels, beer gardens or lounges on Sundays. I believe adequate drinking facilities are already available, and I will not agree to anything beyond what is now taking place.

Facilities for Sunday drinking at present exist in certain clubs and sporting organizations scattered throughout the country areas. We know that many of these sporting organizations have been providing drinking facilities for their members at various times, and that all this has been going on under the lap. Members of those clubs have been enjoying these facilities. However, I believe that clause 61 will legalize these activities and impose certain conditions and obligations on those clubs that apply for permits for the sale and consumption of liquor on their premises on such days and during such times as the court may decide, having regard to a club's practice during the past two years.

As the Attorney-General has said, this Bill is a Committee Bill, and I understand that many members have indicated that amendments will be moved by them in Committee. I have discussed some amendments with various members, and I will be interested to look at some of them when they are put on file during the recess. I indicate now that I intend to move an amendment to reduce certain fees in relation to sporting club licences.

I believe that the findings of the Royal Commission have given a very clear picture of what transpires in other Australian States, and in my opinion the measures proposed in principle in the Bill will do what the Commission has recommended and will bring this State into line with other States. I was greatly interested in certain remarks made by the member for Torrens, who said we were not living in the Victorian era. I remind him that we were living in the Playford era for about 25 years, and I do not think there was much difference. Also, it was said that the Attorney-General had received certain instructions on this Bill. I believe that members of the Opposition in this Chamber have, fairly consistently over the past 25 years, received their instructions on T.A.B., on lotteries, and on drinking.

Mr. Heaslip: You don't know much about it.

Mr. BURDON: I know enough to know that these various measures have been introduced since the Labor Government came into office. The member for Rocky River cannot deny that none of these things was introduced during the previous 25 years.

Mr. Heaslip: We get no instructions.

Mr. BURDON: I do not think it is necessary to go into that because we are all pretty well aware of what takes place; when a member opposite gets his instructions and he bucks them, he gets his walking ticket. We have different State laws in Australia, and in almost every Act we find something different as between the States. In explanation, we are told that there are certain circumstances which require that we be different from people who live on the other side of an imaginary line. This is unfortunate, because it causes much confusion amongst people and, after all, we are all Australians. However, under the present Government probably more social legislation and other reforms are being put into effect than were introduced in this State in a period of 30 years. I believe the people of this State generally agree that social legislation in this State has far too long been left in the background.

One aspect of the new Bill (and I agree with it) is that local option polls will no longer be a part of the law, but that this method will be replaced by a completely new and permanent licensing court. I have always believed that the present provisions represent an unwieldly piece of machinery in the granting of licences. I believe that a completely new and permanent licensing court will be a step in the right direction in determining the future granting of licences.

For a long time a considerable amount of opinion has been expressed throughout this State in favour of the proposal for 10 p.m. closing, although I am well aware that there are people in certain organizations, including hotelkeepers, who are not enthusiastic about the extension of drinking hours, and I respect the views of those people. However, as I have seen in most of the other Australian States during the last few years the benefits that have accrued from 10 p.m. closing, I firmly believe that this extension of hours will not result in any increase in the consumption of liquor and that it will be a more sensible approach to drinking habits.

South Australia is known throughout Australia today as the State of the six o'clock swill. Victoria was the last State to introduce extended drinking hours, and while it is too early to conclusively judge the effects in that State I believe that it has resulted in an overall reduction in vehicle accidents there, compared with the figure when 6 p.m. closing operated in that State. If that is so, then I believe the extension of trading hours should be commended on that ground alone.

It has been recommended that we have a breathalyser test based on a .08 per cent blood alcohol content. Although the report of the Royal Commission states that this could be used for a testing period of 12 months or

two years, in my opinion we could successfully follow the Victorian figure of .05 per cent. I believe this would be a step in the right direction. I trust that out of this Bill will come a liquor control Act that will be respected by all sections of the community. This has not been the case with the present Act. I support the second reading, and look forward to several amendments which I understand will be on file when the Bill reaches Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): Most members who have addressed themselves to this Bill have advocated an extension of drinking facilities in this State. Most have commented on the Royal Commissioner's report, which is undoubtedly based upon a great liberalization of the drinking laws under which we live. Although I do not wish to criticize the report of the Royal Commissioner, because he is an eminent gentleman who has given much time and sincere consideration to this matter, I do not understand the policy contained in that report. On one page the Commissioner says that alcohol is essentially a potentially dangerous commodity; on another page he says that ample avenues exist for the sale of drink in South Australia. The Commissioner then proceeds to advocate an extension of facilities and because of that I cannot understand his attitude in view of his previous two comments.

The second point I wish to make is that most members have claimed that legislation is ardently wanted by the public, but I can speak only from my experience. Since the Royal Commissioner's report has been made available (and it has received some publicity) I have not received even one letter supporting in its entirety this Bill or the report of the Royal Commissioner, whereas I have received many letters from important organizations complaining about, and opposing, certain features of the report. I assume, judging by that avenue of expression (and I know it is only one avenue, while the contrary view is given much publicity), that many people do not think an extension of hours is warranted. I do not believe that a case has been made out on the basis of great public demand.

The Government has not been given a mandate to proceed with this matter; it certainly was not mentioned prior to the last election. At that time, if such a topic arose for discussion, we were told that it was a social matter and that every member would vote according to his conscience. In other words, no policy existed whereby the Government was to introduce this legislation. I do not believe that the Government considers that it has a mandate, nor do I believe it really considers that pressure is being exerted by the public for these changes. The Attorney-General has made a number of conflicting remarks on this legislation, but essentially he claims, with one or two reservations, that the members of the Government are still free to vote and take such action as they believe should be taken on this matter. That, in itself, is a complete denial of any suggestion of a mandate.

The Bill in certain respects is supported by the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but not entirely, as was pointed out in a most able speech by the member for Mitcham. Some important reservations were made in the Bill in the light of the report. I do not believe that, if he were asked, "Does this Bill give effect to your report?" the Royal Commissioner would say that it did. Although it is a problem, each member will have to approach it with some diffidence as to how far the law and retrictions can be exercised without defeating this Bill. The problem is not easy.

It is interesting to notice that over the years there have been occasions when a licensing Bill has included substantial alterations and almost invariably, after such a period when a Bill has given an expansion of services, a Bill has been introduced later providing for restrictions. For instance, a Bill proposing certain restrictions was presented in 1908. The member for Enfield quoted from *Hansard* some clauses discussed in the debate. Another period of restriction began in 1915, when the present 6 p.m. closing came into operation. I suggest that the enthusiasts supporting this Bill will in a few years' time lose some of their enthusiasm when they see the result of the Bill. It will have a social impact, and I believe when the result is seen by the community many people will say, "I supported the Bill, but with many reservations."

As some of the history of this legislation has been given, I will quote from the debate of 1908 referred to by the member for Enfield. It is the same debate from which he quoted in jovial fashion last evening, mainly as a matter of entertainment for other honourable members. I will quote from the speech of the Treasurer who introduced that Bill, in order to show the feeling that existed on the question at that time. The report of the Treasurer's speech states:

Without resorting to harrowing details of individual life or experience, who was there who had not seen either some relative or friend become a victim to the blighting influence of drink? Who had not known some family in

which the brightest member had been wrecked and destroyed? The altars of God, the halls of legislatures, the bench and the bar had all suffered by having some of their brightest ornaments dimmed and broken by falls due to drink.

Later, the report of that speech states:

Mr. Justice Hodges was a great ornament to the Victorian Bench and recently he said: "After close upon 19 years' experience in the Criminal and the Divorce Court, I can repeat what I said publicly some years ago —that drink is directly or indirectly responsible for more crime, more sin, more domestic misery than all other causes put together. It it is appalling to note the number of crimes that are traceable to drink, and still more awful to sit in a Divorce Court and hear detailed squalor, poverty, domestic misery, the utter destruction of home life that results from indulgence to excess in intoxicating drink."

This may not be as apposite today, but it is just as apposite as the quotations given by the member for Enfield last night. I say without fear of contradiction that there is no country in the world where there has been an excess of alcoholism that has not experienced damage to its social structure. Incidentally, for the Attorney-General's benefit, I quote from that same speech a remark concerning Mr. Disraeli. I hope that the Attorney-General will pardon me if he is the author of this Bill, but I should like to read this piece to him:

For he's a jolly good fellow;
Whatever the Radicals think—
For he's shortened the hours of labour,
And he's lengthened the hours for drink.

I believe any drastic alterations made to encourage the consumption of alcohol are not in the best economic interests of the community, and they are certainly not in the best interests of the home life of the community. I oppose the Bill without qualification.

I do not believe grounds have been established entitling the Government to proceed with this Bill. I have sometimes been curious to know the motive behind the appointment of the Royal Commission: it was not a feature of the last election campaign. Also, I am curious to know why it was known fairly publicly from the start that a strong drive would be made to have two things accomplished by the legislation: one was the breaking down of 6 p.m. closing, and the other was the breaking down of the local option system. I do not know the answers to these questions.

I believe that this Bill has been hurriedly prepared; I do not blame the Parliamentary Draftsman concerned, because I know what a colossal task it was in the limited time available. The Bill is ill considered and it has not even been corrected since it came off the typewriter. In many instances it does not make sense; many of its provisions are so ridiculous that they are obviously serious misprints of a nature that could not exist if proper consideration had been given to the legislation. I am informed that the provisions for the transitory period after the passing of the Bill until the new authority becomes effective are inoperable. I learned this from an eminent lawyer. I assure the Attorney-General that this is not one of my own bush-lawyer opinions: it is an opinion officially held by important people in the liquor trade. This transitory period is something that the Attorney-General might consider when he moves amendments. At least, there is a great doubt whether, if this Bill were passed tomorrow and put into operation, it would not mean that many licences would go out of existence for a period.

One part of the Bill refers to two subclauses, but when one looks for them one finds that they do not exist. How can the Attorney-General say that this is a proper measure with which to prolong a sitting that has already lasted 25½ hours? Let me demonstrate the elementary mistakes in this Bill: I do not pretend to understand it, though I have read it. What is more, I defy anyone who was not closely associated with the licensing bench, or with the Act before this Bill was drafted, to understand its implications. I will quote an example of the sort of thing I have in mind, and this is not the only instance: other examples occur throughout the Bill. Clause 3 (3) states:

Except as provided by this Act every licence, registration of a barmaid, certificate, register, approval permit, permission, order, conviction granted, issued, given, made, or passed under the repealed Acts shall continue in existence and be of the same force and effect and have the same operation and effects as they respectively would have had if such Acts had not been repealed: Provided that within three months after the commencement of this Act the holder of a publican's licence may apply to the court pursuant to section 15 of this Act for the restriction of his licence to shorter hours . . .

I shall now check on what clause 15 provides regarding shorter hours. In clause 15 we find this astounding statement:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 of the National Pleasure Resorts Act, 1914-1960, but subject to the provisions of this Act, a publican's licence may be granted to the lessee of the chalet at the Wilpena National Pleasure Resort.

That is obviously a misprint; obviously there is another section elsewhere. I could give numerous examples of this type of thing occurring throughout the Bill. It clearly indicates that, as recommended by the Royal Commission, the matter should have been dealt with in two halves (if dealt with at all), and that all of the main amendments should have been prepared in time for them to be considered adequately. The question of the registration of barmaids raises a rather interesting point for, as far as I recall, the employment of barmaids was officially abolished in 1908; but a barmaid who had served in a bar before 1908 had the right to maintain her registration. If there is a living practical example of this, I should say the lady concerned would be well on the wrong side of 80 years. I point out that there is obscurity concerning whether a licence current at that time would be carried on over the intervening period, or not. Clause 11 states:

Except as allowed elsewhere in this Act, no person shall directly or indirectly sell or permit to be sold within the State, any liquor without being licensed so to do under this Act.

Taking the two clauses together, I think the composite interpretation would be open to argument. The supporters of the Bill have been trying to force the second reading through merely by wearing members down. If I had been 20 years younger than I am, I would have taken some wearing down on this topic. What we have experienced today is (I can say this without fear of contradiction) a travesty of Parliamentary procedure. We could sit next week, and the Attorney-General knows that. The control of the sittings of the House is completely in the Government's hands and, indeed, the Attorney-General also knows that. He has already indicated that amendments must be moved; indeed, amendments will be necessary concerning each of the examples I have given.

What does the Minister accomplish by forcing the second reading through? He accomplishes nothing. If a member wished to make a second reading speech on the Bill when Parliament next met (if the Government proceeded with the measure, although I understand that the Bill is not nearly as popular now as it was when we started on it), he could do so on just about every clause of the Bill. It is no use wielding a big stick in an effort to push the measure through, because I can tell the Attorney-General that that does not pay dividends in the long run, where Parliamentary practice is concerned.

The extension of liquor trading hours will undoubtedly lead to an increase in the consumption of alcohol. There is clear evidence of that. The member for Wallaroo gave evidence on this matter that cannot be denied. People can go to Victoria and say that extended hours there have not led to an increase in consumption, but the evidence is positive. An article referred to by the member for Wallaroo, appearing under the name of Mr. Baillieu and headed clearly "Late Closing Lifts Victorian Hotel Sales", states:

Carlton Breweries United Limited had improved over all sales since the introduction of 10 o'clock closing, the Chairman (Mr. Baillieu) said at the annual meeting today.

That, indeed, is conclusive evidence. Why would there be any pressure for extended hours if it did not lead to an increase in the consumption of alcohol? Although I hope that it is not a motive for introducing the Bill, the increase will also lead to increased revenue to be collected by the Treasurer, because the Treasury receives a percentage on all sales. Unfortunately, we have seen that as the motive for the introduction in this place of other social legislation. I hope the Government is not resorting to a policy of encouraging the consumption of alcohol for the purpose of getting additional revenue. I do not believe that is the case, but this point will arise, and the Treasury will benefit materially from the fact that the public of South Australia will spend less on household items, food, children's clothing and furniture and more on alcohol. They cannot spend it twice. If they spend it on alcohol, inevitably they will not be spending it on other things. The experience of other States will no doubt be our experience: that the small grocer and small businessman will feel the effects of this.

Other social legislation, too, that we have already passed will produce similar results. For those reasons, I do not believe that the facilities proposed here are desirable. Incidentally, the 6 p.m. closing now to be abolished was introduced as a result of a direct vote of the people of South Australia. It is interesting to note that the Party that has always claimed to be close to the people and to want to give effect to the will of the people is the Party that yesterday consulted the people about a lottery. So there is a precedent for consulting people about drinking hours, not only here but in other States.

Mr. Ryan: Half a century ago, though!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Then why doesn't the honourable member bring it

up to date and try it now? If he is so confident, why doesn't he do that?

Mr. Ryan: When was that referendum held?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I admit that it was held in 1915. Nevertheless, I am speaking of the method rather than the result. If the honourable member likes, I will mention the figures presently. The method of determining an issue like this in this State until now has been by consulting the people. While the Government yesterday consulted the people regarding a lottery, in this instance the people were not consulted.

I will tell members why: the people were not consulted because they would not have supported it. Many times when I have had discussions with representatives of the Hotels Association about these things (I was a member of the previous Government, although the Attorney-General may not remember it) and the question whether they could be decided by a vote of the people arose, the representatives of the association were always adamant that nothing was further from their thoughts, the reason being that, while most menfolk might vote for this, most women undoubtedly would not. That is why there is no enthusiasm on the part of the Government for this method of settling the matter, and that is why the Royal Commission was established, to take at least some of the responsibility from the shoulders of members. We can at least say, when we go to our constituents, "Of course, we followed the recommendation of the Royal Commissioner in this respect. The Royal Commissioner went into this and he reported an absolute majority in favour of it." However, that does not alter the fact that the last time this matter was put to the people and 10 p.m. closing was included in it, out of 178,203 effective votes, 1,966 were for 10 p.m. closing. The vast majority, of course, voted for 6 p.m. closing, and they had had experience of 11 p.m. closing. They were invited to vote for 6 p.m., 7 p.m., 8 p.m., 9 p.m., 10 p.m., or 11 p.m., and 6 p.m. received an overall majority of votes, the next biggest vote being for 11 p.m.

My experience is that for some people no hour is late enough. I remember when we used to have liquor supplied with meals up to 8 p.m. The Hotels Association asked for an extension to 9 p.m. It was submitted in a Bill to the House, the House approved it, and 9 p.m. became the official time. In no time came the request for an extension. If I remember rightly, the next extension was for 10 p.m. Then it was pointed out that it was most embarrassing to snatch away a glass from a person who was drinking, and the request was to make it 11 p.m. Then, while 11 p.m. was still being considered, the snatching away of the glass was again considered, and we had to have half an hour in which the drinks supplied at 11 p.m. could be consumed. I think the official time at the moment is 11.30 p.m.

The Royal Commissioner already reports that there appears to be at least a section of the community that thinks this is far too early. Do not let us delude ourselves into thinking that 10 p.m. provides 15 minutes for the liquor already served to be consumed. Do not let us think that this is the end of the road: it is only a step forward. The Attorney-General knows that this is not the end of the road: it is probably as far as it is politically expedient to go at this moment. There is much political expediency in this Bill. The member for Mitcham pointed out some of it. I want to see drastic amendments to this Bill before it will get support from me on the third reading. I do not know what the Attorney-General intends to do. He said that he was considering many representations made to him, but I do not know their substance. Therefore I do not want to mislead him into thinking that some minor amendment will satisfy me, because it will not.

Serving in bars by women has been discussed. I have had only a little experience of this in Melbourne, but when visiting other States I had an opportunity in Brisbane and Sydney, after 6 p.m., to see whether I could find a reason for the objection to barmaids in South Australia. From that experience, I believe women have a restraining influence on the conduct in the bar and undoubtedly give courteous and efficient service to their customers. I can therefore see no reason for the exclusion of barmaids in South Australia. I am not criticizing the service given by barmen; indeed, I cannot remember when I was last served by a barman. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General suggested that I might be prepared to sponsor an amendment to provide for barmaids in South Australian hotels. Let me tell him that before he ever mentioned the matter I had consulted Dr. Wynes and asked him to prepare an amendment.

He told me that all I had to do was to vote against the clause that excludes barmaids and that this course would provide for them automatically. However, I told him I did not want to use that method, which might go unnoticed, but that I should like to do it in positive terms so that everyone would see what we were

voting for. Therefore, if no-one gets in before me (if the Attorney does not have an amendment himself, for instance), I shall be pleased to remove what I believe is an unjust discrimination against the employment of women in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is fine! I am just wondering why it is so late, but it is better late than never.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Attorney would like to have some explanation of that I can give it to him. As a member of the previous Government, over the years I introduced many amendments to the Licensing Act. If my memory is correct, on the last occasion I introduced amendments to the Licensing Act no division was held on any of the provisions introduced. Opposition and Government members of that time supported the provisions. Not only were these provisions supported, but members were not deluged with correspondence against them as they have been in this case.

Mr. Hughes: Was that for the extension of trading hours?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

Mr. Hughes: Then I could not have been here.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We extended hours for liquor with meals.

Mr. Hughes: I must have voted against that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not remember, although I remember the honourable member speaking yesterday—he almost broke my hearing aid! The previous Government accepted suggestions for amendments to the Act and examined them. If no suggestion for an amendment was made, obviously no examination was made. Therefore, the answer to the Attorney's point is that no request was made to provide for barmaids and this provision was therefore not considered; had there been a request, it would have been considered.

I oppose the Bill in its present form and I will probably oppose it in its amended form. The Government has no mandate for introducing it: certainly the matter was not raised prior to the last election. I believe the Government is not acting in the best interests of the people of South Australia in introducing the Bill. If amendments and improvements are to be made to the Licensing Act, I should prefer them to be taken a little more slowly so that we could be a little surer, instead of our trying to do what the Attorney-General said was the impossible—and it is impossible. In these circumstances I do not support the Bill.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): In spite of the gloomy predictions by the member for Gumeracha about the effect of the Bill if carried in its present form, I still support the second reading. With other speakers, I indicate that in the Committee stage I may support some of the amendments.

Mr. Millhouse: Which amendments?

Mrs. BYRNE: We shall see when the time comes: we do not know what the amendments will be. Regarding the major contentious social change contained in the Bill (10 p.m. trading) I believe that on major social changes such as this I should vote according to the wishes of most of the people in the district I represent. As I am convinced that most of the people in Barossa want an extension of trading hours, I intend to vote accordingly. Undoubtedly members will be aware that in the outer suburban section of the Barossa District (in Modbury, Tea Tree Gully and Highbury) there are many migrants. They have expressed to me a desire for an extension of liquor trading hours, certainly not to enable them to drink excessively but purely because of the social life this will bring. They tell me that at present they are lonely and an extension of trading hours will give them the opportunity to mix with other people and get to know them. Also, these people are accustomed to this way of life which they enjoyed in the countries from which they came, and I can see no reason why they should be denied such facilities here.

The member for Wallaroo said he had received many letters and petitions from constituents in his district who had expressed opposition to the provisions contained in the Bill. I have received only one such letter and no petitions although, of course, with other members, I have received submissions from various organizations. I think we all agree that, in regard to local option polls, the method of voting about the grant or otherwise of licences was unrealistic, as it embraced only one subdivision. Within the last two years a local option poll was held in my district regarding the granting of a licence for a new hotel at Holden Hill. The subdivision embraced was Highbury, in which area I reside. Naturally, all the people in the outer suburban section, such as Tea Tree Gully, Highbury and Modbury, as well as Holden Hill, were given the

opportunity to vote but, in addition, the poll covered such towns as Kersbrook, Chain of Ponds, Williamstown, Lyndoch, Sandy Creek and Golden Grove. I am sure it will be appreciated by all honourable members that the people in these latter towns had no interest in whether a hotel was licensed at Holden Hill. These people would probably never use any hotel erected there. That poll was accompanied by the usual canvassing by opposing factions and interests.

Already in this debate reference has been made to wineries and their trade at cellar doors. Although I have never visited any of the wineries in the Barossa District, last week I visited, by invitation, three wineries in the neighbouring District of Angas.

Mr. Freebairn: Did you sample the products?

Mrs. BYRNE: No. It is well known that I do not drink the products, and I did not sample them on that occasion. My attention was drawn to the matter of sale of liquor at cellar doors to growers, visitors and employees. At one winery these sales represented less than 5 per cent of the total sales. The remainder of that winery's sales were to the hotel trade. Another winery sold about 98 per cent of its products at the cellar door. That winery supplied liquor to two local hotels but depended almost entirely on the cellar-door trade. It is imperative, in the interests of these wineries, that cellar-door sales be provided for in the Bill.

Mr. Clark: The smaller wineries in particular do nearly all their business at the cellar door.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. I understand that sales are made at cellar door by holders of wine-makers' licences at a price between the wholesale and the retail prices. Although I have been assured that this Bill does not interfere with the existing practice, I think it would be in the interests of everyone, particularly the wineries, to amend the Bill in respect of this matter. We know that clause 14 provides for ten classes of licence. Nevertheless, there is confusion or misunderstanding in the minds of the winery operators and people who are at present obtaining liquor in this way.

At present two gallons is the minimum quantity of liquor that can be sold at cellar door and some wineries have suggested that the provision regarding this quantity should be retained. I suggest that this matter be more closely examined in Committee. I am pleased that clause 18 (1) provides for the granting, on application, of a special licence for the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival. I support the second reading.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I do not intend to delay the House, but this Bill affects the social and economic life of many sections of the community and it is only right that I should speak about how the people in the Ridley District regard the Bill. The report of the Royal Commissioner is a good one and I welcomed the opportunity given to all sections of the community to express their views about the alteration of the licensing laws. A report of this kind was needed in the interests of the whole community. I understand that there was no restriction about the evidence that could be given. The Commissioner, a very able man, made recommendations for the guidance of Parliament after he had weighed all the submissions made. It behoves us all to study the report closely.

Members of Parliament should reflect the views of the people, particularly the people in their own districts. This is a Committee Bill and many comments will be made about the clauses. I do not agree with some of the provisions drafted by the Attorney-General. I, like the member for Gumeracha, find some of the clauses confusing. In addition, the misspelling of the word "without" in clause 11 is rather amusing. The letters "witout" are used, meaning that the wit is out. On some occasions when people have too much to drink the wit is out!

The member for Gumeracha has referred to clause 15 and I, too, was confused about it and thought that the reference was to some other Act. However, I decided that this matter would be dealt with in Committee. Generally, I favour the recommendations on 10 p.m. closing. I have gone to much trouble to ascertain the views of the people I represent and have examined closely the correspondence that all members have received from church and temperance organizations. My view must be in accordance with the desire of most of the people of Ridley: they favour 10 p.m. closing.

I am not so happy about Sunday trading, but we shall be able to look at the amendments when they are brought down. Reference has been made by some members to the dangers of alcohol and of the over-indulgence of it. Those statements are probably true, but the difficulties are with us now, with 6 p.m. closing. What is to be done? Because the closing hour is changed from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. there will be no great alteration but, in fact, there will be a lessening of the effect because of the slower drinking. The danger of 6 p.m. closing is that too much liquor is taken too quickly:

it enters the bloodstream and has a greater effect on a person's stability than if it were consumed up to 10 p.m. To a person fearful of the dangers of alcohol the answer is prohibition.

Mr. Casey: That would not work too well.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It would not work at all. If people are afraid of the social evils of liquor they should advocate prohibition. Is that what we want? If members believe in that they should state their views and be honest about it, but I do not believe that prohibition is the answer. People should be educated to handle alcohol. Over-indulgence is a danger, but over-smoking and over-driving are also dangerous. I see no harm in moderation in alcohol. This is a social question that should be handled in moderation, and if that were done there would be no dangers of the social evils that we hear so much about. I have seen liquor trading hours in many countries—Switzerland, Norway and the States of America, and I am satisfied that the extended hours on the Continent are to be recommended.

I have seen barmaids operating in every State of Australia and overseas, and I am satisfied that they have a good influence. Their employment should be encouraged because they restrict the use of bad language and promote good conduct in hotels. In my district the people are seriously concerned about the restriction on selling bottled liquor in clubs. Moorook, south of the river, is about 20 miles from Loxton. It has a local club but not a hotel. The club serves as a social centre for this thriving fruitgrowing area: it is well patronized at 5 p.m., when the local population has a beer or two, after which a bottle is taken home to be drunk after dinner. If they could not take a bottle of beer home from the club they would have to travel 20 miles to the nearest hotel at Loxton.

Lyrup is in the same position: it would be about 20 miles from the nearest hotel at Paringa and a little farther from Loxton. It has no club yet, but the local people have agitated for one. Everything is ready and they are waiting for a poll to be taken to obtain a licence. When the previous poll was taken in the subdivision of Ridley it favoured increased licences, but others applied and obtained a licence. No licences are now available and the Lyrup people have to wait until the next poll. Lyrup is at the top end of the district, across the river from Berri and Renmark, but people at Karoonda, 60 miles away, are permitted to vote on the question of whether a club can be established at Lyrup. This is a ridiculous situation.

I agree with the Commissioner's suggestion to alter memorials so that an application can be made to the new licensing court to grant or refuse a licence where evidence is taken. People at Lyrup overwhelmingly favour having a community club licence. All clubs and most of the hotels in my district are community-owned and profits can be used to construct swimming pools and other amenities. The question of cellar-door sales affects my district. I have discussed the position with the manager of the Loxton distillery, which is a co-operative, and representatives of the industry and the growers consider that present conditions should remain. I stand for the growers in the industry, and I shall reflect their views when the time comes. This is a Committee Bill and many amendments will be moved. I shall consider each one and, if it does not measure up to my requirements, I shall probably move a further amendment in its place. I think some of the clauses in the Bill could be redrafted. I know that a lapsed Bill can be restored to the Notice Paper on the suspension of the appropriate Standing Orders, but it must be the same Bill, and in my view this might not be the same Bill because we shall have to amend some of the clauses. I think we should have a good look at the Standing Orders that govern this matter.

I believe there will be many speeches in Committee, and as I do not wish to delay the House at this stage I shall conclude my remarks. I think everyone knows where I stand. The views I have expressed on this Bill are those of the overwhelming majority of the people who live in the District of Ridley.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): It will be known by everyone in this Chamber that the person responsible for raising this licensing question was the member for Gouger. Following that, the Government had a look at the matter, thought it was a pretty hot potato, so decided to pass the matter on to a Royal Commission. I should like to describe that procedure in language that I think everyone understands. This Bill was conceived in haste and prematurely born with malformations. The malformations have been disclosed by my friend, the member for Gumeracha, and the speed of birth and preparation has

been disclosed by another of my friends, the member for Mitcham. I do not want to traverse that ground.

This is not the first example of malformation this House has had from the Attorney-General, because often no sooner is something born than it starts to sprout amendments. We have had instances in which the amendments have been more voluminous than the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: We had one this morning, didn't we?

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think I need specifically mention any one example, because there have been a number of examples of what I am now describing. Whenever we have a ticklish topic to deal with the Government passes the buck to someone else so that that person can take it on the chin. The Government pursued this policy in the present case because it wanted to avoid any possible odour that might attach to the introduction of the measure. Some Government members are over-confident of the result of references to the people by way of referendum, but I am never so confident about the result. Some people (when they are sufficiently confident of the result) think it is better to consult the people, so they pass the buck rather than put it on the shoulders of a Royal Commission. However, it was the latter course that was taken in this case.

This effort is not in keeping with the Attorney-General's usual adroitness in handling measures in this Chamber. I give him some marks for his adroit handling of ticklish problems in this place, but I do not classify this as his *magnum opus* by any means. The Attorney attempted to suspend Standing Orders with a view to having the House sit while a conference was taking place between the two Houses on another matter; the Attorney himself was one of the managers at that conference. He did that so that the debate on this Bill could proceed in his absence. As the member for Mitcham (I think it was) said, the Attorney's move at least lacked courtesy. Also, in my view it showed a lack of a proper understanding of Parliamentary practice, which the Attorney should know. After all, do we waste our time in speaking to measures brought before us? Is it the attitude of this Government that anything said in debate can be quietly cast aside and that the Government will go along the road as planned, without reference to anything said in debate in the Chamber? That appeared to be the Attorney's approach in this matter yesterday.

It is obvious to some of us that Opposition amendments to Government measures receive very short shrift; if we get a crumb now and again we are very fortunate. For the main part, the Government says, "This is our policy, this is our line, and you will take it." I do not know whether this, too, is evidence of a lack of understanding of the way the Parliamentary system has grown up in English-speaking communities. I am sure that the Parliamentary system has not grown up that way. Also, I am sure that the Government headed by Sir Thomas Playford never adopted such a course throughout the whole of its period of office. What was attempted yesterday was a denial of the true spirit of democracy, and I deplore it.

Obviously, this Bill is a Committee Bill and we will have many amendments to it. As suggested by the member for Gumeracha, there will be early amendments to correct verbiage in the Bill, apart from the printing and drafting mistakes which anyone could forgive in view of the speed with which the legislation was prepared; I do not classify that as a very vital matter. However, I do criticize references in clauses to other clauses that, in fact, do not exist. That is a major "blue" and one that would not normally occur in a Bill that was properly surveyed before being presented. However, we are getting accustomed to that.

This Bill, like the curate's egg, is good in parts, and it remains to be seen how much we can improve it. Our friends who support the Government allege that they are free agents and that they can vote according to their consciences in the matter. No doubt we shall discover that as time goes by. We have already discovered one facet in respect of which Government members are bound, although the member for Chaffey (I think it was) alleged that he was not bound. The honourable member is fortunate in that his conscience happens to agree with the ruling, and that is very handy! I wonder whether that will set the pattern for other Government members. I do not oppose the second reading but will follow with some interest developments in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I am grateful to the members who have spoken on this measure and who have given some attention to it. I expect that we will have some detailed debating in the Committee

stages which will be undertaken shortly after Parliament meets again. I can then deal with matters raised by members on certain clauses. I wish at this stage only to reply to some of the remarks made by members opposite in criticism of what has been done by the Government in this matter. The Government has introduced the measure at the earliest possible moment in an endeavour to ensure that the comprehensive proposals of the Royal Commissioner are carried into effect as soon as possible. Much work was undertaken to bring the measure before Parliament. I freely admit there were some printing errors and a few drafting errors in certain clauses. However, I can point to a myriad of measures introduced by the previous Government that were in similar condition.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet you can't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I can.

Mr. Millhouse: Let's have some.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will receive a list in due course, if that is what he wishes.

Mr. Millhouse: What about backing up what you say!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I intend to do so. Honourable members opposite at one moment have seen fit to claim that we were delaying this measure for electoral purposes, but the next moment have accused us of rushing the measure through. They have been consistent about the Bill only in being inconsistent. Not only are they at sixes and sevens, one against the other, in their attitude to the measure: they have tried to make as many political points as they can, although those points are contradictory. The Leader of the Opposition started off when he learned, as members opposite well knew, that we were about to appoint a Royal Commission.

The matter was being widely discussed among members of the Australian Hotels Association. The various bodies in South Australia that needed to be consulted about the terms of the Royal Commission well knew that one was to be appointed. That was long before any member of this House said anything about the issue. The appointment of the Commission followed the decision of the Full Court in South Australia, which decision has been quoted in this debate, and which showed that the licensing system in South Australia was unworkable. The member for Gouger, before he became Leader of the Opposition, thinking that he would get on the band waggon and get some kudos, gave notice of a measure to introduce 10 p.m. closing. That proposal concerned a straightout increase in hotel hours, which, on the Royal Commissioner's report, would have put into difficulties most hotelkeepers in this State. However, the appointment of the Royal Commission was bitterly attacked by members opposite as a gross waste of time and public money. They said it was shocking and disgraceful for the Government to carry on in this way. The Royal Commissioner held the inquiry with expedition and effect, and brought in his report in double-quick time. Members opposite then said, "This is very good," but now, one after another, they have said that the Royal Commission—

Mr. McAnaney: I didn't say that; I haven't even read the report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not surprised at that, because that is consistent with the honourable member's general attitude on matters that come before the House.

Mr. McAnaney: That isn't true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is. The honourable member has had the report for a considerable time and has seen fit to deliver himself of some words on this measure without studying the background material.

Mr. McAnaney: I didn't have it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been on his file for some time. A number of other members opposite have said what a good and effective job the Commissioner did, and that includes the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader says, "Despite the things I said about this whole process originally, it is all my own handiwork; I provoked this whole thing." I do not know whom he thinks he is kidding—

Mr. Ryan: He's a pretty good dreamer!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is kidding himself and no-one else. This Government has found the administration of the Licensing Act to be in a hopeless mess. Members opposite, who were members of the Government in office for 30 years, had every opportunity to initiate a comprehensive review of the licensing system in this State, but never did so. They could even have moved for a change in the barmaid system, but did not do that. We have seen on this occasion many crocodile tears shed about the rights of barmaids. This is something new for members opposite! Ever since 1908 the provision has been there, and absolutely nothing was done about it while the previous Government was in office.

Members opposite, who when in Government had a majority not only in this House but also in another place, did nothing. They have

tried throughout, both in the House and outside, to have their cake and eat it too. When we have asked members opposite simply to get on with the job and to proceed with the second reading debate, they have protested and said that we should come back next week. If we did so, we would be faced with exactly the same spectacle. The Government introduced another comprehensive measure during this session, namely, the Planning and Development Bill. It took 13 months to get it to the stage where, on the last night of this session, we had to attend a conference with members of the Legislative Council, because of the attitude to that measure of members opposite, both in this place and in another place.

Mr. Millhouse: The Government is in charge of this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, not as far as Legislative Council business is concerned, and members well know it.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, but the Licensing Bill was introduced in this House, and you are in charge of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Bill was introduced as early as possible after we resumed this part of the session, and opportunities have been taken at every stage, where we could get time, for members to debate the Bill. From the conduct of members opposite in debating Bills in this place, we knew what to expect. In consequence, we have had to say to members, "The job has to be done." The people of this State want this measure, and it was not proper for members opposite to demand that we bring in the legislation at the earliest possible stage, and then to do everything they could to delay its implementation.

Mr. Millhouse: That is not accurate. Why didn't you bring it on earlier? It's been on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Every opportunity to get debating time has been taken. Members opposite know that there have been urgent measures during this period, including some held over from last session because of the attitude of members on the other side in another place. The Government has got through more measures than any previous Government did and we have done it despite the lack of co-operation from members opposite. The very real benefits to the people of this State resulting from the initiative taken by this Government in reform will stand this Government in good stead. Under the previous Government there is no period that can be pointed to as an era of effective reform for the people of this State comparable with the two years during which we have been in office. I do not apologize to members opposite for the actions of the Government on this measure. We have been trying to get the job done effectively and at the earliest possible moment.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

Kingston Bridge,

Kangaroo Creek Reservoir,

Happy Valley Water Supply and Sewerage System.

Ordered that reports be printed.

CITRUS INDUSTRY REGULATIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That the regulations under the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, concerning duties relating to transport of citrus fruit, made on October 13, 1966, and laid on the table of this House on October 18, 1966, be disallowed.

For reasons best known to himself, the Premier has told me that I have only five minutes on this motion and my other one, so I have little time. May I briefly explain the reasons for it? My attention was drawn to the defects in these regulations by a letter in the *Advertiser* from Mr. G. L. Howie, of Gladys Street, Clarence Gardens, pointing out that under the regulations as they stood, if a person carried a bag of oranges, or even one orange, from one house to a house in the next street, he would be committing an offence. This was denied in the newspaper the next day by the Secretary of the Citrus Organization Committee, but when I checked on the matter I found that what Mr. Howie had said was correct, because the wording of the regulations was that any person who carried citrus fruit without a licence was guilty of an offence. Therefore, the exemption to a grower under the Act did not apply.

I thereupon gave notice of this motion. I am glad to say that since then the committee, after discussions between the Secretary and me, has seen the accuracy of what I have said, and now amending regulations have been laid on the table to cure not only this but another defect in the regulations: that no penalty had been provided for a breach. Therefore,

it is not necessary for me to proceed with this motion for disallowance. My last point is that it is errors of this nature in regulations drawn on the instructions of the committee that do, to an extent, shake one's confidence in all its activities. If it cannot get things like this right, one wonders about its other undertakings. It is not necessary for me to go on with this motion, for the reasons I have given.

Motion negatived.

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

That in the opinion of this House the work of the Premier's Department in attracting new industries to this State has been ineffective, and that as a matter of urgency, and with a view to providing more energetic and vigorous promotion of industrial expansion and the exploitation of the natural resources of the State, a Department of Development, to be the sole responsibility of a Minister, be set up without delay,

which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "State" first occurring and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and promoting the expansion of existing industry is worthy of approbation".

(Continued from September 21. Page 1755.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This motion was first moved in this House by me on behalf of the Opposition seven months ago. We were so concerned about what was being done at that time to introduce new industries to and expand industrial activities in this State that we moved this motion to see whether something could be done about the situation. We recommended to the House that a Department of Development be set up to undertake this work, such a department existing in every other State in Australia and within the Commonwealth Government. That was the main reason for moving this motion. It was strongly supported by this side of the House and opposed by the Premier and the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). I hope that a Department of Development will be set up in this State to undertake this work and that the new Premier, whoever he may be, will have different views from those expressed by the present Premier when replying to this debate last year.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes (teller), Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, Ryan, and Walsh.

Noes (12).—Messrs. Coumbe (teller), Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

OMBUDSMAN.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing in this State the office of Ombudsman.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1892.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I was disappointed with the support I received for this motion for an inquiry into whether we should have an ombudsman in South Australia. I believe only two lines of argument were used against it. First, the Attorney-General said he would not have it at any price, but gave no reasons. The second line of argument used by many of those who spoke (and may I thank all those who took part in the debate, even the Attorney, whatever the attitude he took) was that this was a job for members of Parliament and that when members of Parliament were doing their job properly there was no need for an ombudsman. From time to time in this House we have seen examples which show that, in many circumstances, a member of Parliament is almost impotent even when the House is sitting; of course, his position is the weaker when the House is out of session.

I wish to refer to one matter that has come before the House repeatedly in Question Time in the last few weeks: the case of John Murrie. I think I need do no more than point to the intransigence of the Minister of Education in order to refute the argument of those who said that, in all circumstances, a member of Parliament could always do the job on behalf of a person who might be aggrieved. I do not think I need say anything more. The actions of the Minister of Education and of the Government in this matter were eloquent enough refutation of that argument.

Motion negatived.

PROROGATION.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, April 18, at 2 p.m.

I place on record my appreciation of the assistance the Government has received in passing the legislation with which the House has

dealt in the two parts of this session. I agree to some extent with the remarks of my colleague, the Attorney-General, that discussions on some matters were a little drawn out. However, I am one of those people who try to extend good fellowship; I like to work in harmony. A good example of co-operation was seen this afternoon when, as a result of a hurried discussion I had with the members for Torrens and Mitcham, an agreement was arrived at that was not exceeded by either member. As the Attorney-General said, much legislation has been passed. The Government has genuinely attempted to place before Parliament what it believes is in the interest of the people of the State. We have tried to make our approach positive in relation to the legislation.

The Clerk of the House (Mr. Combe) and his staff are associated with the good working of this Parliament. I think all members will agree with me when I say how pleased we are to be able to work in co-operation with Mr. Combe and his staff. I refer also to the *Hansard* staff, who are most obliging. They do a very good job and I am sure that members generally are satisfied with their efforts.

Mr. Jennings: And grateful.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: That is so, particularly as far as some Government members are concerned: I shall not reflect on the Opposition members on this occasion. If I may say so, I am sure that some of the speeches made by the member for Enfield are improved by the *Hansard* staff. The catering staff has done an excellent job. It has been necessary to recall one of the top management in catering, Miss Bottomley, to assist in the refreshment room. Miss Bottomley and her staff have done a splendid job. The cleaners in the House, whose work is carried out under contract, perform their duties very well.

I think that all members appreciate the splendid work carried out by officers of the Public Service in preparing information and making necessary inquiries to enable Ministers to reply to questions. I, as one who knows the work involved, pay a tribute to those officers. I should not be discharging my responsibilities if I did not refer to the Government Printer and his staff, whose task is not easy, particularly because of the rush of work. At times, members have complained that Bills have not been printed in sufficient time. However, considering the competition in the printing trade today, we are fortunate in having a Government Printer who is able to get through the volume of printing work required by Parliament. On behalf of the Government and members generally, I pay a tribute to all those whom I have mentioned.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure no member will disagree with the Premier's motion. This is a desirable stage: I think we have reached the end of disagreeing with one another. I join the Premier in expressing appreciation to those engaged in the somewhat complex administration and workings of this House. They have assisted us greatly during the session and are extremely helpful. I support the Premier's remarks about the various officers and staffs, and I know that he did not deliberately omit mention of the Parliamentary Draftsman, who gives a high standard of service to members on both sides of the House.

This is the last session in which the present Premier will lead the Government in the House and, on behalf of the Opposition, I thank him sincerely for having adopted the attitude he has displayed in the House. I also thank him for the courtesies he has extended to the Opposition. He, like any other leader of a Government, has been angry with the Opposition at times. However, he has never carried the feeling of the moment over until the following day, and we have appreciated that. We are not saying goodbye to him, because he will still be here, but these are the last few minutes during which he will lead the Government in the House, and we wish him well in his future activities.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL: I hope that the health of Mr. Speaker, for whom you, Sir, are deputizing, will improve to enable him to be present in the next session. Indeed, I hope that no circumstances will prevent any of us from being here on that occasion. I have pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): Naturally, I support the motion. My main reason for speaking is the retirement from office of the present Premier. An occasion such as this does not occur often, because usually when Parliament is prorogued the Premier continues in office next session. However, the present Premier will step down from the highest political office in this State, and we record our gratitude and appreciation for the work he has done for South Australia and its people. His task has not been easy, and I think even Opposition members agree that in the circumstances he has done a tremendous job on behalf of the State.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I thank the Leader for reminding me about my failure to mention the Parliamentary Draftsman, whose splendid services are appreciated. I thank Mr. Speaker and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Your task is not easy. This House needs a capable Chairman and you, Sir, have done well. During this current session the Sergeant-at-Arms has not been called upon, and this indicates how well you have exercised control.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thank the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and honourable members for their kind remarks. I sincerely appreciate the assistance given me whilst I have been occupying this position during the absence, because of illness, of the Speaker. If members had so desired, they could have made my task difficult, but I have really enjoyed the last few weeks. I realize that, instead of making my task difficult, members have displayed a spirit of helpfulness and co-operation, and I deeply appreciate their action. My position would have been more difficult had it not been for the valuable assistance I have received from the Clerks, and I deeply appreciate what they have done. The report I received earlier this week was that the Speaker was making satisfactory progress and hoped to make a complete recovery soon. I am sure all members hope that, when the last session of this Parliament commences later this year, the Speaker will be in his usual position.

Motion carried.

At 5.12 p.m. on Thursday, March 23, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 18, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of the National Anthem.