HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 26, 1967

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

TOURIST ACTIVITIES

Mr. HALL: I understand that the Minister of Immigration this morning announced that the Government would support, by way of guarantee, certain tourist activities in country areas. Can the Minister say what conditions and qualifications must be observed by individuals or organizations wishing to take advantage of this offer, and how the guarantees will be executed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The guarantees will be dealt with under the Industries Development Act. Applicants for guarantees under this provision will be required to prove that the proposal is clearly in the interests of the public in the town concerned (and this applies only to country areas, of course) and that they have not been able to obtain finance from any other source. Also, they will be required to subscribe part of the cost of development, and the Industries Development Committee will examine each application before approving the proposal. Already two people are interested in this matter, and I hope that, by extending the provisions of the Industries Development Act to activities associated with the tourist industry, we shall be able to develop facilities that will further this industry in country districts where otherwise there would be no possibility of establishing other than primary industry. I hope that we shall be able to provide assistance by this policy change and that this will lead to the growth of this industry in country areas.

COPPER

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain, through the Minister of Mines, a report from the Western Mining Corporation about the corporation's investigations as to the location of copper in the Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta area, and particularly whether worthwhile deposits have been located?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

STONEFIELD WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Several farmers in the Stonefield area of my district are in a desperate position because of the lack of water. For many years they have been

able to obtain water supplies for stock from the Warren reservoir, the water from which is reticulated to Stonefield *via* Neales Flat. For some time these people have had to cart water and until last week they could obtain water from the standpipe situated on the highway close to the Stonefield school. However, late last week the standpipe was closed, and now they cannot obtain water from it. Will the Minister of Works urgently investigate whether water can be made available immediately from this source?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Not only am I surprised but I am disappointed to hear the honourable member's comments, although I do not say they are not true. I will immediately investigate this matter and if a good reason does not exist why the standpipe has been closed I will ask questions. I hope there is a good reason but, in any case, I will try to have the service restored immediately.

MANSFIELD PARK POLICE STATION

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently, several representations were made to me about establishing a police station at Mansfield Park, a district that is now thickly populated but not served by a police station in the area. Will the Premier, as Attorney-General, investigate this matter and inform me of the result?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall discuss this matter with the Chief Secretary and obtain a report for the honourable member.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On July 11, when I asked the Minister of Works whether he could say when the Engineering and Water Supply Department would require power for various pumping stations in the Lock, Rudall, and Kimba area, he said that the Government had submitted a case to the Commonwealth Government under its $50,000,000 assistance scheme for rural water supplies, that negotiations were continuing and that he hoped to obtain assistance. He also said that, when this matter had been resolved, a clearer picture of the department's power requirements would be available. As residents of the area have now inquired again of the member for Eyre when they may be served from the proposed breakdown station at Rudall, has the Minister anything to add to his reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The facts have not changed greatly since I gave my original reply to the honourable member. I had hoped ere this to receive more information from the negotiations with the Commonwealth

Government because I intend at the weekend to visit Kimba to discuss with local residents the area's water supply. I assure the honourable member that I will take up this matter not only with the Engineering and Water Supply Department but also with the Electricity Trust to see whether a variation can be made. As the honourable member will appreciate, the supply of electricity, I think, depends entirely on the Polda-Lock-Kimba water scheme.

LAURA-APPILA ROAD

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on July 18 about the possible effect of the amendment to the Morphett Street Bridge Act on the priority allocated to country roads, in particular the Laura-Appila road and the Murray Town to Booleroo Centre road?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Roads reports that any reduction in the amount of funds available for road construction must naturally have an effect on the programme of construction. Any diversion of funds for a specific project will not materially affect the advance planning of the Highways Department. Another example of diversion of funds arose from the decision of the Government to press ahead as rapidly as possible with the new bridge at Port Augusta. The planning of a programme of works must be flexible to cover such contingencies. My colleague states that the overall relative priorities should not be significantly altered. At this stage there is no alteration to the plan to start sealing the Laura-Appila road and the Murray Town to Booleroo Centre road during 1968-69.

TRADE DIRECTORY

Mr. LAWN: I have been handed an account that was received by a small South Australian firm from an organization under the name of the Australasian Trade and Business Directory. Appearing on the account are post office box numbers for Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales. It seems that the Australasian Trade and Business Directory picks out from the telephone directory the names of South Australian firms, and indicates that an advertisement has been inserted in the organization's journal on behalf of the South Australian firms. The account states:

Please type or print alterations—

that is, alterations to the proposed advertisement in the journal—

Otherwise, it is proposed your entry will appear as above in the 1967 A.T.B. Directory under the following classifications—

The classifications are then set out. Although the account to which I refer is for $6.95, it is indicated that, if the account is paid within 14 days, the South Australian firm concerned will be obliged to pay only $5.95. Will the Premier, as Attorney-General, say whether the rendering of such accounts and the insertion of these advertisements are legal; whether the people receiving the accounts are obliged to pay; and whether anything can be done to stop this practice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The making of a contract of advertisement is like any other contract: there must be an offer, an acceptance, and valuable consideration passing, which does not appear to occur in these cases. This concern, which seems to be centred in Victoria, sends out a series of accounts as a sheer bluff in order to try to get business concerns in South Australia to pay amounts for which they are not liable. Probably no breach of the law is committed, although it is getting pretty close to the bone. I have had protests from many concerns in South Australia about this matter. Legitimate business directory organizations are naturally concerned lest they be confused with this show of shysters, for there is no other word for people like these. I have asked the Victorian police to undertake investigations in that State about this concern, but I warn South Australians receiving such accounts to ignore them.

LEIGH CREEK CANTEEN

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to the fact that for the first time, I think, returns of sales of liquor to the Leigh Creek coalfield canteen are required by the Licensing Court as an aid to the fixing of a licensing fee. I understand that in the past the canteen at Leigh Creek has not paid any such fee. I ask the Premier whether this requirement means that there is to be a change and whether, in future, the Leigh Creek coalfield canteen is to pay a licence fee, as do hotels and other such establishments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the intention of the Licensing Bill that retail outlets, including the Leigh Creek coalfield canteen, shall pay on the normal turnover.

MID-NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Minister of Lands has a reply from his colleague to my recent question regarding roads in the Mid North.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that tentative provision has been included in the Highways Department's five-year advance programme to commence construction and sealing of the Hallett-Jamestown Main Road No. 143 in 1968-69 and to continue progressively each year until completed. There are, however, no firm arrangements to undertake any work in the immediate future on the Whyte Yarcowie to Jamestown Main Road No. 337. Consideration is at present being given to inclusion of this road on the advance programme at the end of the five-year period. Whether it can be included will depend on its relative priority and the anticipated funds available over the next five years.

POOCHERA RAILWAY STATION

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Several of my constituents at Poochera have requested that electric lighting be supplied to the railway station here. The stationmaster is at present using old-fashioned hurricane and kerosene lights. He has a wife and a young family and, when he has to get up in the middle of the night, it is rather inconvenient for him and his family to have to use only a hurricane lamp or torch. Both the Education Department and the Police Department have seen fit to install electric lighting for the use of their respective officers at Poochera, and the residents think it is high time that the stationmaster also should be supplied with electricity. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport take up this request with his colleague?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am indeed sorry that an employee of the Railways Department should have to run around at night with a torch (for what purpose I do not know). However, I shall take up the matter with my colleague, hoping that the department will see fit to provide electricity for the use of the stationmaster.

IRRIGATION

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last Thursday about water storages in Murray River areas under the control of the River Murray Commission, and about the likely release of water from those storages during August?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The reply I have also deals with a similar question asked yesterday by the member for Stirling. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that the whole question of storage in the Murray River system is under constant and careful surveillance of the River Murray Commission which controls the operation of the whole river system. The present storage is 484,000 acre feet in excess of that held at the same period last year. The combined storage of Hume reservoir and Lake Victoria is now 1,738,000 acre feet. A normal allotment of water under regulation is anticipated in South Australia, and this should provide the safeguard of satisfactory flow to maintain river quality. The release for August is, by the accepted allocation of the State's allotment, 94,000 acre feet of water.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, the report for which I asked last week about the progress made by the Torrens River Committee on the survey of the Torrens River, particularly with regard to the part that flows through the Walkerville and North Adelaide sections of my district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Local Government reports that steady progress is being made by the Torrens River Committee on many aspects of its terms of reference. The matter regarding the pollution of the Torrens River was referred by the Minister of Works to the Minister of Health, as he is responsible for the Torrens River Committee. Pollution of the river is primarily a public health question and one on which the Torrens River Committee is not qualified to comment, nor is it within its terms of reference.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of July 19 regarding plans of the Highways Department to make safer the intersection of the Main North-East Road and Grand Junction Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that plans for the construction of this intersection have now been finalized and work is well under way. Negotiations are about to commence with the District Council of Tea Tree Gully regarding street lighting, which will be necessary to ensure the safety of the intersection. Depending on the outcome of the negotiations, work is expected to be completed within two months.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In today's press appears the following report:

The Education Department would make available a foundation grant for libraries in all newly established schools, the Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) said yesterday . . . The grant would amount to $800 for a primary school, $1,000 for a secondary school and $100 for a one-teacher school.

Can the Minister of Education say whether the department will make a cash grant to each school or whether it will make a selection of books for each school up to the value of the grant?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member was good enough to tell me that he would be asking this question and I am pleased to be able to give him a complete reply. The selection of the books for the foundation grant for libraries in all newly-established schools will be made by the headmaster, in consultation with the Supervisor of School Libraries, and the books will be supplied by the Education Department. In the main, these books will be the basic books required in a school library and in this way the library will obtain more books for the money to be provided for each grant. It will also ensure that the books are available in the school library as soon as possible.

SIREX WASP

Mr. HURST: Towards the end of last month I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the Sirex wood wasp and suggested that it might be advisable to have appropriate drawings published in the newspapers. Can the Minister say whether his department has any illustrative drawings suitable for such publication and, if it has, whether the drawings will be made available to Messenger Press Proprietary Limited, which is prepared to publicize them in the Port Adelaide district so that waterside workers and other employees in industry will be conversant with this dangerous nuisance?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I express my appreciation of the keen interest that has been shown by the member for Semaphore in this matter. I am sure that he has the interests of the State at heart in desiring to draw attention to the need to be vigilant. I shall certainly take up the matter with the Woods and Forests Department, which has useful information on this, and see that the newspaper receives the information he has requested. I am sure that the statement made in the House will also be of interest.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: At a meeting at Murray Bridge the other evening concern was expressed, by way of interjection, that the growers did not control their own board, whereas about 10 days ago the Minister of Agriculture said in the House that the growers did have this control. The Act provides for the election of three producer members and two other members and provides also for a chairman, who is to have a deliberative and a casting vote. This means that in practice the chairman, who is not an egg producer, has a casting vote, and that he, not the producer representatives, can control the board in the event of a difference of opinion. Can the Minister comment on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I stand by my statement in the House that I considered that the producers had sufficient voting strength on the Egg Board to control this industry. The fact that, to my knowledge, there has never been a need for the chairman to exercise either of the votes to which he is entitled bears out that the discussion takes place on the floor of the meeting, where there are three producer members to two others. When I was referring to this matter the other day in answer to a question asked by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), I said I should be pleased to consider any representation from a recognized organization. From my observation, it was evident that the noisy element was in the minority at the meeting the member for Stirling attended. I consider that the whole situation is well accepted. Genuine suggestions have been made about ways by which improvements could be effected and these suggestions will be noted. The motion carried at the Saddleworth meeting has not been conveyed to me by any representative organization and I have the word of the member for Light that this would be possible. Certainly it will be looked at.

PAVING

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works say when work will be started to improve the poor condition of the paving at the Unley police station, one of the main district stations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the interest shown by the honourable member, I took this matter up with the Director of the Public Buildings Department, who has stated that funds have been approved and that

at present a survey of the yard is being conducted to determine levels. This should be completed by August 4. The matter will then be investigated as to the most expedient manner in which the work should be carried out, that is, either by public tender or departmental labour.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For some years I have been concerned about the quality of the workmanship in school paving. For example, at Lameroo the work was virtually condemned, but the contractor could not be brought back as the work was so close to meeting the standards laid down by the Public Buildings Department that it did not matter. I have noticed, when travelling around my district, that the general standard of paving work is not good. Indeed, it seems that paving must be resheeted every two years, or sooner. Consequently, soon after paving work is done at a school, a requisition for maintenance by way of resheeting is submitted. Will the Minister investigate this matter and consider whether it would be more desirable to demand a higher standard of workmanship in the first place, even at a greater cost, than to be faced with this maintenance in the form of repetitious resheeting almost as soon as the original work is completed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to say that this matter has been considered and that recent contracts have required a reasonably high standard of work. I was recently placed in the unfortunate position of having to refuse payment to a contractor because work was not done according to specification. The honourable member having raised the matter, I shall ascertain the present specifications, which I believe are sufficient to meet the heavy wear and tear on schoolyards.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recent reports indicate that a block of saline water is coming down the Murray River from another State. Questions having been asked whether this water is likely to affect the water being pumped into metropolitan reservoirs, has the Minister of Works information on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, this question was asked by an Opposition member but, after I had indicated that I had a satisfactory reply, he did not pursue the matter. If a member asks a question that causes concern to consumers he should allow the Minister the opportunity to provide an answer by asking a follow-up question, so that people may be relieved of their concern. The origin of the present block of saline water moving down the river has not been identified. The matter has been discussed with the Executive Engineer, River Murray Commission, and he has been able to plot its movement down the river from where it was first identified at Euston.

The River Murray Commission, in undertaking a study of river salinity, is seeking skilled and experienced consultants to help with the work, as it is realized that both the definition of problems of salinity as well as their cure can involve complex investigations and research. This matter has been studied by the commission and has caused the local Engineer for Water Supply some concern. Accordingly, we are contemplating employing a consultant to help solve the problem. The present movement of saline water reached Lock 9 last Wednesday, and steps have been taken to mix this with the large body of fresh water held in Lake Victoria to avoid trouble downstream. I assure honourable members that this water will cause no problem: it will not affect the Adelaide water supply.

QUESTIONS

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister of Works has gently slapped honourable members on the wrist for not following up their previous questions. As I have always adopted the practice of awaiting the Minister's indication that he has a reply, so that I shall not ask repetitive questions, will the Minister in future notify a member asking a question that a reply is available?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am glad that the honourable member has asked this question because, during the lunch adjournment, it has been my practice to place a copy of the reply on the desk in front of the member who has asked the question so that he will know that the reply is available. This I did yesterday.

CUMMINS SCHOOL RESIDENCE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the location of the new residence at the Cummins Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As land previously occupied by portable buildings has now become available, the Public Buildings Department has been asked to provide a site plan to enable the proposed headmaster's residence to be constructed on this part of

the school grounds. The Housing Trust has been requested to cancel arrangements to build the house on trust land. When a site plan has been prepared, it will be forwarded to the trust to enable construction arrangements to proceed.

LAND TAX

Mr. HALL: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about land tax assessments in the Virginia area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No evidence is apparent in the prices at which land is being sold in the general area of Virginia, Angle Vale and Two Wells, to indicate a fall in the value of land in the area since the 1965 land tax assessment was made. On the contrary, recent sales have indicated some increases in value above the 1965 level. In these circumstances, having regard to the definition of unimproved value in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1966, there is no justification for adjusting land tax assessed values in the area.

The water problems have been known for more than 11 years: in 1956 the Mines Department issued a report warning of the possible water limitations. Following the enactment of the Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1959-1966, and the making of regulations under that Act on January 19, 1967, subdivision and sales, at the above levels, of land in the area have continued, despite the introduction of control of the use of water from the underground basins. This real estate activity is as much influenced by the proximity of the land to the metropolitan area as it is by the availability of water for irrigation purposes. The former factor has had a considerable impact on land values in all localities within a radius of 17 to 25 miles of the city.

PENSIONERS' ALLOWANCES

Mr. HURST: I have been told that age pensioners are entitled to a supplementary allowance in cases of hardship. Some pensioners are repaying a housing loan as well as paying rates and taxes, and this results in weekly payments exceeding what they would have had to pay had they been paying normal rent. I understand that the Commonwealth Government does not recognize such payments when calculating the supplementary allowance. As there seems to be an anomaly, will the Minister of Social Welfare discuss this matter with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister to see whether the Commonwealth Government will take these payments into account so that these people may receive an additional allowance?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some people receiving Commonwealth social service benefits do not receive any rent allowance whatsoever, whereas others do. Whether the Commonwealth Government is prepared to help regarding capital repayments (and thus help a person gain a capital investment) is another question. I will ask the Premier to correspond with the Prime Minister on this matter.

FREE TEXTBOOKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I saw in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Minister of Education said that the system being used to provide free textbooks for primary schools had resulted in savings of $240,000 in the first year of operation, when compared with the cost of making a monetary grant, and that next year a saving of about $560,000 was expected. Will the Minister be kind enough to show the House how those sums are calculated?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The department is well aware of the ordinary retail price of books, and the calculations have been made bearing that in mind, and knowing what tenders were received for the books concerned. I do not think any more information is necessary in the circumstances. This is general information that can be obtained from anyone.

TOTALIZATOR FRACTIONS

Mr. BROOMHILL: At present fractions of 5c applying from totalizator dividends are put into a pool to enable investors to be returned at least their stake money on any winning investment. Does the Premier expect any change in that policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Prior to the introduction of the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting, the fractions ariseing from dividend payments in whole 5c sums from on-course totalizators were distributed by racing and trotting clubs to approved charities. Following representations, recent amendments provided that a first call upon these fractions should be available to guarantee that a winning bettor should in all circumstances receive in dividend at least his stake money. For this purpose it was provided that all fractions from on-course totalizators should be paid over by the clubs to the Treasury and any eventual surplus be distributed by the Government for hospital and charitable purposes.

It is now clear that the call upon these fractions to guarantee dividends will be less than earlier anticipated, and the Government has decided that it will permit the clubs to resume distribution to approved charities, as earlier applied. A statutory amendment to permit this in the future and to deal similarly with fractions accumulated over recent months will be submitted to Parliament.

GAS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about Mereenie gas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Mines reports that the Government has investigated the feasibility of obtaining natural gas from the Mereenie field, but the cost of a pipeline from this area (a distance by the most direct route to Adelaide of 928 miles) makes the economics of such a proposal quite unattractive at present. If oil were to be discovered in sufficient quantity, however, an outlet *via* a South Australian seaport could be practicable, but no studies of the economics of that proposition have been made so far by the department.

YORKEY CROSSING

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about a possible deviation at Yorkey crossing or at a site between the crossing and the township of Port Augusta?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Highways Department has investigated several alternative routes to be used by heavy loads obliged to detour *via* Yorkey crossing because of the load limitations imposed on the present inadequate Great Western bridge at Port Augusta. The alternatives included construction of a road crossing over the gulf closer to Port Augusta than Yorkey crossing, and the construction of a temporary bridge adjacent to the existing bridge. Each alternative was rejected, first, because the large expenditure on either was not economical for the relatively short time it would be used and, secondly, because the time involved in construction of either was so long that improvements to the Yorkey crossing road would be necessary in any case. Accordingly, improvements have been made to the Yorkey crossing road, and it is now in a reasonable condition to carry the vehicles that use it. The road will be maintained in this condition until a new bridge is constructed.

MONEY-LENDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been approached by a legal practitioner concerning the effect of the amendment to the Money-lenders Act that was passed by Parliament, I think, in 1966. Summarizing, two clients of this practitioner borrowed money (or entered into money-lenders' contracts) before the passing of the amendment. There was no provision in the contract for a right of early determination but, in fact, the money was repaid after the amendments came into operation. The practitioner's letter states:

> The finance company in question then calculated the rebate of interest in accordance with the amended provisions of section 30 (1) of the Act, and this resulted in the rebate of interest being substantially less than the amount which it otherwise would have been. It appears that the amendment to section 30 of the Act was not restricted in its application to money-lending contracts entered into after the coming into operation of the amendment, but is a retrospective enactment. It further appears that this enactment can in some circumstances result in a hardship to borrowers, and is thus out of keeping with the general policy of recent money-lending legislation.

There are two suggestions made for an alteration: first, to restrict the operation of the amendment to contracts entered into after the coming into operation of the amending Act; and, secondly, to give borrowers the right to claim the difference, if any, between the amount of the rebate of interest actually paid to them by money-lenders and the amount that would have been payable to them under the provisions previously in force. I do not know whether this matter has come to the Government's attention; if it has not, this will serve that purpose. In view of this anomaly in the amending Act, can the Attorney-General say whether it is intended to introduce legislation to amend the Money-lenders Act again in 1967 either for this or for any other purpose?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The effect of this amendment has caused the Government some concern. Most money-lending contracts, in fact, contained provisions for early determination. Where they contained those provisions, of course, the amendment had no effect whatever, although some money-lending organizations tried to obtain the new payment figure even though their existing contracts contained provisions for early settlement. However, in most of those cases (all, certainly, that have been referred to the Government) the position has been clarified because, clearly, the amendment provided that existing provisions for early determination

would retain their effect. I agree that there have been some contracts in which this has operated unfairly. If the Opposition is prepared to agree with the Government to amend the legislation as suggested by the honourable member then, certainly, early consideration will be given to introducing legislation to that effect.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for a Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts. Read a first time.

GAS

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should refer to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works for inquiry and report the following matters concerning the construction of the Gidgealpa-Moomba-Adelaide gas pipeline:

(*a*) the costs of construction of the direct easterly route and an alternative western route adjacent to Spencer Gulf;

(*b*). the potential for gas usage in the centres of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Peterborough and Clare; and

(*c*) the economic effect on the above centres and their ability to attract further industries if natural gas were available to them.

I do not intend to start a general debate on the whole subject of a gas supply for South Australia, because that has already been canvassed. However, it will be necessary to refer to previous debates. Although negotiations have taken place between the Government and the owners of the gas, a commission has been formed, and the Government has chosen a route, the Government can still change its decision if it sees fit to do so, as the construction of the pipeline has not yet commenced. Indeed, it looks as though it will not commence in the immediate future. If members opposite speak to this motion, they will probably accuse the Opposition of trying to make political capital: they are fond of making such charges.

Mr. Hughes: Of course, there is no politics in this, is there!

Mr. HALL: I am sure we will hear much from the member for Wallaroo about the political aspects of this motion, as it applies to his district. I assure him and all members that all Opposition members believe that all the pertinent matters regarding the supply of gas to the metropolitan area have not been fully investigated. We believe that the Government is acting without a full knowledge of the various factors involved. Because we consider that the ultimate benefit should be derived from natural gas we will speak to this motion today and during the following weeks.

True, South Australia must obtain the maximum benefit from its natural resources, because they are too few when compared with those in other States. For this reason careful consideration should be given to the selection of a route for the pipeline to the metropolitan area. Much debate has already taken place late last year and early this year regarding the route. Although the Government led us to believe that it would gather further information on this subject, it has not published any further facts or told the House anything more.

What is the position at Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Peterborough and Clare, the towns listed in the motion, the first four of which are on a possible alternative route. I refer to *Country Story*, a publication issued by the Provincial Press Association of South Australia which was received in the Parliamentary Library on July 15, 1965. It contains a foreword by the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh). Peterborough and Clare, two inland towns adjacent to the route chosen by the Government, are well known for their place in South Australia's history. Clare (including the Clare corporation area) is listed as having had a population in 1965 of 2,000. Its industries included five wineries, a dried fruit processing plant, a steel fabricating plant, a dairy produce factory, and an Electricity Trust office and workshop covering the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula areas.

Peterborough is listed as having a population of 3,690, its industries being the railway workshops, a meat export works, and various stock agents' businesses. Although I am not certain of the viability of the export meatworks in the town, I believe that, since this booklet was published, the export meatworks has closed down. However, essentially these two towns are inland centres. At present they appear to offer little scope by way of large-scale industries for the use of natural gas. However, they happen to be close to the direct route of the projected pipeline from Gidgealpa-Moomba to Adelaide.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What are their possibilities?

Mr. HALL: We should know that, and I have provided for consideration of this in my motion. If members can think of additional industries that may be suitable for those towns, then well and good. However, we must face the facts, and all that those towns have to offer at the moment are the things that I have already listed. The potential is that which normally exists in an inland country town.

Whyalla had an estimated population of 20,000 in 1965. No doubt the population has increased since then because I understand that northern towns on Spencer Gulf have a population increase of about 3.4 per cent a year. Whyalla has an $80,000,000 Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited steelworks now in production and a second blast furnace under construction. It has a ship-building industry employing 1,200 men. The booklet to which I have referred lists the orders outstanding in early 1965. Other industries at Whyalla include C. A. Parsons of Australia Limited, Perry Engineering Works, and general engineering works, while nearby are the Iron Knob and Iron Baron ore quarries. Also, there are timber yards, brick kilns, a plaster manufacturing works, and an A class shipping port. This is a centre of major importance not only to South Australia but to Australia.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Several other important industries have been established since that booklet was published.

Mr. HALL: That could well be. Of course, that is the trend in these towns and I have already referred to the increase in population. This increase does not occur merely because people like to go to these places (although undoubtedly many go for that reason): it results from the expansion of local industries. In 1965 Port Pirie had a population of 16,500 and industries such as the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited (which is the world's biggest lead smelter), Cheesman's engineering works, foundries, shipping agents and agricultural retailers. Again, the smelting industry in Port Pirie is the biggest of its kind in the world and is of major importance to the whole of Australia.

Port Augusta had a population of 11,000 in 1965. In the way of industry, it has the headquarters of the Commonwealth Railways Department, the Electricity Trust (two power stations there generate 80 per cent of metropolitan requirements), the Augusta Salt Limited, Forwood Down, and smaller industries. Wallaroo is the smallest of the Spencer Gulf towns to which I refer in my motion. The Wallaroo corporation lists a population of 2,200 in 1965. Wallaroo has two large superphosphate works, a thriving sea-port and a cool drink factory. The facts I have submitted give a basis of comparison of the relative potential of the two routes that the pipeline could take. Of course, in addition the four Spencer Gulf towns are on the sea-board and have direct access to world markets. As the member for Wallaroo knows, an oversea company, in anticipation of the provision of natural gas, has bought much land at Wallaroo on which to establish an industry.

We must also consider the cost and the desirability of bringing gas to these places, if it is at all possible. I shall now read the following statement made in the *Current Affairs Bulletin* of August 8, 1966, which deals with the possibility of increasing activity in Spencer Gulf ports:

The great increase in demand for steel in recent years required the planning of much additional plant capacity by the B.H.P. With improved metallurgical techniques, the coal requirement per unit of steel produced has been considerably reduced, and this increased the possibility of more economic steel production at Whyalla. The final decision on the steel works was taken in 1958 after further State Government pressure. In the agreement the State made further concessions relating to the Middleback leases, the provision of housing, the acceptance of an increased responsibility for the town, the supply of electricity and the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. Thus, the estimated $100,000,000 capital investment by the company was to be at least equalled by the State's own additional expenditure.

Apparently the important factor that the State has tremendous investments in these areas has been ignored by the present Government. In the development of the areas, $100,000,000 has been spent and this can be related directly to the sum of about $50,000,000 that has been spent to provide water for the city and industries of Whyalla. If we have already spent so much in one of the four Spencer Gulf towns, then why does the Government refuse to spend an additional $2,600,000 to supply natural gas? This does not make sense.

As a member of the Playford Government until 1965, I am proud that the extensions and facilities were made by that Government to Whyalla and other centres. I accept my share of the responsibility for the money

spent to bring this about. Apparently the Government's unwillingness to spend an additional $2,600,000 (or only 2½ per cent more than the $100,000,000 already spent) is stopping us from supplying one of the greatest single means of increasing activity in these areas.

It has not been proved to the satisfaction of the Opposition or of the public that bringing gas *via* the western route would involve extra costs. For many months we have tried to find out what the Government knows about the costs of the alternative western pipeline. Last year we asked pertinent questions of the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) and he gave significant answers. We asked that the complete report of the Bechtel Pacific Corporation on its investigations into a pipeline to the metropolitan area be made available. However, the report was denied to the Opposition. It was offered to me and my deputy on a confidential basis, but we refused that offer because, by accepting it, we would have been prevented from disclosing to the people facts that they should know. On March 8 last, during the last session, the then Premier referred to the report and said:

The Government has no objection to making these copies available: in fact, I offered them to the Leader this afternoon for his consideration, in case he or his deputy desired to peruse these copies. I said that, if it was made available, the report would certainly injure some of the organizations named in it. I would not be a party to injuring any established organization.

The consultants and the department, after a broad analysis of the two routes, satisfied themselves that in the practical circumstances the western route offered increased costs without a significant compensating gain. In the early stages the additional costs (assuming an 18in. pipeline or thereabouts and the gas reserve of the order in sight) could not offer increased revenues, because all the gas known to be available, all of which could be handled by an 18in. pipeline, could be sold in Adelaide, without the additional cost of other diversions of the route or significant branches.

He then made this significant statement:

Accordingly, the detailed survey was restricted to the eastern route.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It also implies that there is no gas to spare for the other towns.

Mr. HALL: Let us assume that there is only that quantity of gas available in that area. Where is the flexibility of gas supplies in South Australia? Gas may be discovered 100 miles south of Adelaide. It may be struck in St. Vincent Gulf, and this is not an idle thought, because I understand that further exploratory activity in the gulf is being considered. If a discovery is made there, will we continue to bring gas down uneconomically in comparison with the cost of gas available closer to the city and not divert the northern gas to Port Augusta, Port Pirie or Whyalla? It is nonsense to fix a grid to one market when there is a good chance of further gas discovery closer to the metropolitan area. Even accepting the former Premier's statement that all the gas would have to come to Adelaide initially, we could expect that Adelaide would be able to be supplied from another source in the next few years and that the northern supplies could be devoted to industries in Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Whyalla. The exploring companies expect that the reserves in the northern areas are much greater than have been revealed by exploration up to the present.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They are not in a hurry to confirm it.

Mr. HALL: No. They are not drilling actively and they have shifted their drills. However, I desire to restrict my remarks to the three factors in my motion. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of having the gas pipeline to Adelaide versatile and flexible as to what can be accomplished. Gas might become available more cheaply nearer to the metropolitan area. If it did, we would be foolish to have $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 invested in a pipeline that could effectively supply only the metropolitan area. The former Premier's words show that the Government was not sufficiently concerned to have the western pipeline costed at that time, and he made a strange statement. He said:

The authority to be set up by the Bill will be responsible for raising finance. Undoubtedly, the Government has appointed the Bechtel Pacific Corporation as its own authority to make all the necessary investigations into the scheme.

That was a wide statement. He said, as reported at page 3515 of *Hansard*:

The Bechtel survey is going more closely into the alternative route and into eventual branch line possibilities. This is nearly finished, and it is hoped that it will be presented to Parliament before the recess.

That was the first and possibly the only intimation to the House that the Government was at all considering the cost of the western route for the pipeline. No information has been given to us since. The best way for the Government to answer is by supplying further information. I should welcome a clear statement about relative costs of the two

routes. I again draw attention to the surprisingly low cost of pipe in this matter. The total amount mentioned in the Bechtel Pacific Corporation's report, which was tabled in Parliament, was about $31,000,000 and the total involvement in pipe and freight was about $13,000,000. The amount allowed for installation was $6,700,000. For engineering contingencies $6,188,000 was allowed. Those figures show that the terrain on which the pipeline is built and the freight have a great bearing on the final cost.

Interested persons have said that the lower installation costs and the increased quantity of gas available on the western route could bring the two costs to an almost identical figure. No-one has yet refuted this statement. Nothing the Government has said has proved that the western route would be more costly than the eastern route, but these figures should be made available. If no documented proof is available the western route should be used. It has been stated that the present market for gas would not be great in the Spencer Gulf ports, but the member for Wallaroo said that if gas were available an industry would be established at Wallaroo, and the South Australian representatives of the company have confirmed that with me. The Minister of Mines received a report by Mr. Funnell on behalf of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited when he visited Port Pirie last February, and part of that report states:

> The position of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters is that at 1,500,000 cubic feet of gas a day we would be only a relatively small gas consumer, but we feel the Government should keep in mind that we produce sulphuric acid, and that our industry is expanding. We are concerned that if the pipeline is constructed 70 miles from Port Pirie, it may be that the price at which gas could be supplied to us would be higher than if the trunk route actually took a route west of the Flinders Ranges. We feel the position would be the same for any other possible project that might be contemplated in any of the Spencer Gulf ports having as its base a large natural gas consumption.

This is a statement from a responsible organization made on behalf of the Spencer Gulf ports and, although a minor user of gas, it would like to have the convenience available. In the United States of America the use of gas has increased tremendously in a short time and, if transport and market factors are favourable, industries follow the pipeline.

The motion concentrates on a narrow aspect: it is not trying to open a wide debate on gas supplies, to fix the price, or to disagree with the need for gas in the metropolitan area. The estimated cost of the Chowilla dam was much below the tender price submitted by the possible building authority. We have an estimate of the cost of the pipeline, but it may not accord with the tender price. It is futile for the Government to state that the western pipeline would cost $2,600,000 more than would a pipeline on the eastern route.

My comparison between centres adjacent to the routes show that the Spencer Gulf ports will benefit from a gas supply and that the economic growth and build-up of industries and services in the towns would be considerable. I ask the Government to present to the House the facts that have not been made available to it. If they are not known the project should be considered by the Public Works Committee, so that it might obtain the comparative costs of a project that is of great importance to towns and ports in the Spencer Gulf area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this short Bill is to try to effect an important improvement in the scope of its application, and to include within its ambit a type of property which at present, because of interpretations of one or two of the provisions of the present Act, has been excluded from consideration. I refer particularly to land in areas of the State where new development is occurring and where, although the potential is well recognized, the performance from a productive point of view has not been actually established because the land is as yet only partially cleared. Such properties have no history of production—their history has only just begun.

This has created two difficulties which this Bill seeks to remedy: first, the land has a value in excess of the value that the Land Board can fairly apply to it under the interpretation of the relevant clause of the Act as it stands. Secondly, the Director of Agriculture, in conforming with the provision which requiries him to furnish a certificate, has

obviously to exercise some imagination in deciding what interpretation he should place on the relevant section.

I want it to be clearly understood that I offer no criticism whatever of the Land Board in regard to the valuations it has approved, or of the Director of Agriculture in the recommendations he has made. In many cases they both have appreciated the problems and have exercised some wise judgment in the areas of their respective responsibilities under the Act, but I want their actions to be clearly validated and desire that the Act should be more specific in defining the judgment they should exercise: hence two amendments are desired in this Bill.

Quite clearly, limitations in the present Act were foreseen by many members when the original Bill was being debated in this Chamber in 1963, and for this reason they were lukewarm in their support of it at that time. The fact that they did support it both from the Government and Opposition sides does them credit, and their action is proven fully justified by the success of the legislation since its operation commenced. Recently, the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) sought information, by way of a question on notice, as to the number of applications lodged, and the number approved, since this legislation was proclaimed: in 1964-65, 84 applications were made and 45 subsequently granted.

Although I do not know the number of applications for 1965-66, I point out that there were 22 approvals; and in 1966-67, 26 applications were made and 15 subsequently approved. The 84 applications and 45 approvals in the first year of the Act's operation indicate that many people desired to take advantage of the legislation. Quite clearly, because of the limitations in the Act and the fact that some applications were naturally of an optimistic nature, the restrictive provisions of the legislation reduced the number from 84 original applications to 45 actual approvals. I do not put that forward as a clear indication that the Act is very restrictive in its operation: rather, the figures show that the limitations placed on applications are, in the main, proper because it is quite obvious that a number of applications, on close examination, could not be reasonably approved.

However, although some members in 1963 could not see much value in the legislation, 45 successful applications were made for assistance under the Act in that first year. I think that indicates, as the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) affirmed, that a real need existed for the legislation and that the legislation fulfilled that need. It enabled 45 people who sought to establish themselves on the land to so establish themselves under the special terms and provisions of the Act. In the short time that the Act has been on the Statute Book, there have been no fewer than 82 successful applications for assistance under the Act. Almost 30 farmers have been settled on the land each year since the inception of this legislation.

Therefore, it would be idle for me to claim that the weaknesses which I see in the Act and which I seek to correct have been a serious embargo on the operation of the Act, and I do not so claim. However, I claim that cases exist in which this legislation has not been applicable, because of the wording of one or two of the requirements in the safeguard provisions that I believe can be altered to advantage. Indeed, that is what I seek to do. During the previous debate in 1963, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Frank Walsh) had the following to say at page 1422 of *Hansard*:

> . . . if this Bill was instrumental in only one primary producer being assisted in his establishment, my support for the second reading would be achieved, because Labor policy is quite definite that adequate assistance should be given towards primary producers—

to which, of course, we would all say, "Hear, hear!" My colleague the member for Albert, who was in favour of the original legislation, wondered about the very matter that concerns me today. He said:

> I suggest . . . a panel of valuers . . . because I can see that many valuations will be turned down.

Under the Act's provisions, the valuing authority is the Land Board. The honourable member's suggestion received some support later in the debate, but no amendment was moved. I am not advocating that any change should be made in the valuing authority at this time. The present Minister of Education said at page 1515 of 1963 *Hansard*:

> I think it is open to question whether this Bill, if it is passed, will secure many transactions carried through to their logical conclusion. I say that because I agree with the comments of the member for Albert . . . that many valuations would be turned down under the terms of the Bill.

The honourable gentleman foresaw some of the problems that I now seek to solve. I am sure that the Minister, having had some experience in the development of farming areas, will agree to what I suggest.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What did the Leader of the Opposition say at the time?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the ex-Premier will give me a little time, I shall quote what the present Leader of the Opposition said because, frankly, he was not keen on the legislation. This is not a Party-political issue; it was not in 1963, and I hope it will not be such an issue this time. The Minister of Education continued in the 1963 debate as follows:

> The legislation is worth while . . . I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

However, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), who then followed, said:

> In supporting the Bill I have grave reservations as to its value.

He went on to discuss the fair value of land, and I interjected that, under the Bill, it meant the productive value. At page 1517 of *Hansard,* the present Leader of the Opposition said:

> I am sorry that when this legislation was first suggested it attracted so much publicity, because I know from personal approaches made to me that many people gained hopes that will not be realized.

To some extent, the Leader was correct, because out of the 84 applications made in the first year of the Act's operation only 45 could be approved. The Leader would now agree that this Bill has been a valuable piece of legislation and that, perhaps, he was a little limited in his assessment at that time. The views expressed by members in the original debate reflects, to a large extent, the areas they represented. Members experienced in regard to newly developed areas of the State were the members for Albert, Whyalla, Eyre and Yorke Peninsula. For my part, I had helped develop land on Yorke Peninsula and later on Eyre Peninsula. The members in the developing areas of the State saw value in the legislation whereas the members in the more highly developed areas did not see so much value. That shows that there are opportunities for the legislation to operate in the developing areas without taking real risks, whereas such opportunities are not so frequent in the more closely settled and highly developed areas. At page 1518 of *Hansard,* the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) said:

> It may be that many applications will be made for land where it has not been proved that the maximum desired production can be recovered from such land, and I think the board must be realistic and make allowances in this respect.

The honourable member there put his finger on the point I am now considering: that many applications would be made where it could not be proved that maximum desired production could be achieved. Mr. Loveday then interjected:

> You don't think it could fix a value on the future possibilities of the land?

That interjection was very significant, because the honourable member foresaw the problem I am now trying to solve. At page 1521, Mr. Casey made the following interesting contribution to the debate:

> I agree with the title of this Bill, but I do not agree one iota with its contents.

I do not hold that against the honourable member, but it is rather interesting to note that he is now Chairman of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee, which sits in judgment on the applications coming before it. That honourable member, being an honest soul, would be ready to agree with me that from the experience he has gained from the operation of this legislation, he sees more merit in it now than he did then. I think he nods approval, and I give him full marks for that. I do not blame him for not seeing merit in the legislation at the time. His part of the State does not offer many opportunities for this legislation to operate. Hence, his views were so framed. The present Minister of Lands said that he supported the Bill. You, Mr. Speaker, as member for Stuart, said that you supported it because, limited though it was, it would assist some people. You, Sir, saw some of the limitations I now seek to remove. All this is a matter of history, but I refer to the quotations and the interesting debate that ensued to show that there was widespread support for the original legislation. There was doubt whether its provisions were too limited, and the hope was expressed that it would do some real good.

I believe the Bill in 1963 gained approval of the House for two particular reasons. First, there was an expressed desire by all members to assist worthy people to become successfully established on the land and particularly to assist those who did not possess and could not otherwise obtain the necessary finance to buy land under the normal conditions of bank finance. Secondly, in the Bill there were a number of stringent provisions which collectively safeguarded both the Treasury and therefore the taxpayer against potential loss under the guarantees provided. They also restrained the purchaser from making an over-optimistic assessment of his prospects

of success. There is no suggestion or attempt in this Bill to either remove or weaken these safeguards; the provisions of the original Act in all these respects are unaltered and remain as before. I emphasize this point.

However, in my experience some transactions have been approved in respect of older developed properties which perhaps may contain an element of risk. However, some applications have been declined where, because the land is only partially developed, success depends upon realizing and accepting the potential of the property. At the moment there is no established history of production. I am firmly convinced that it is this latter type of property which young men who possess the necessary qualifications should be encouraged and assisted to buy. These are the properties which, if I were a young man needing land, I would desire to purchase because, firstly, they have not yet been loaded with heavy capital expenditure and therefore sell for less and, secondly, every year of work done on them and every dollar prudently expended directly enhances the value of the land. This enables the young owner to turn his labour into capital and ensures that the asset created quickly improves the asset liability ratio with corresponding security to him. Therefore, provided rainfall and area are adequate, the Act should be more clearly directed to this type of property than it is at present. Amendments therefore are designed to give the Land Board more latitude in considering the potential of the land in making valuations and the Director of Agriculture a clearer definition on which to base his recommendations. Both of these amendments are to section 3 of the Act and are the only amendments to the Act for which this Bill provides. The Act as amended will give the young applicant who has to seek this kind of finance an opportunity more nearly equal to that of other buyers who obviously recognize the potential factors I have mentioned and base their judgments accordingly. I ask the House to support the Bill, as I believe that it is a contribution to land development and that it improves this worthwhile legislation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SAN JOSE SCALE

Adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 684.)

(Continued from July 19. Page 685.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I ask leave further to continue my remarks.

Leave granted: debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That in the opinion of this House, for the purpose of restoring the momentum of this State's development, the Government should immediately—

(*a*) create a Ministry of Development;
(*b*) appoint a Director of Development; and
(*c*) form an Advisory Council of Development,

which Mr. Casey had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

the Government is to be congratulated on its initiative in industrial development in—

(*a*) setting up a Premier's Department for this purpose;
(*b*) having appointed a Director of Industrial Development; and
(*c*) having announced its intention to create an Industrial Advisory Council and its support for an Industrial Research Foundation and an Industrial Design Centre.

(Continued from July 19. Page 703.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Last Wednesday I made various statements about motions placed on the Notice Paper from time to time by members of the Opposition and, apparently, the Leader of the Opposition must have been very conscious of what members on this side were saying because, earlier this afternoon, he said that Government members would say that certain motions moved by members on his side were being moved for political reasons. Apparently the Leader was listening to me last Wednesday and consequently made that statement earlier today. Since the Labor Government has been in office, the Opposition has placed various motions on the Notice Paper in an endeavour to embarrass the Government and to achieve political ends.

On Thursday I referred to a report presented to Parliament on February 18, 1964, by the Industries Development Special Committee. I referred to certain recommendations brought down by that committee and endeavoured to impress on Opposition members that the Government had done something in connection with those recommendations. Yet the member for Mitcham interjected, "Why didn't the Walsh Government do it?". I know the functions of the Industries

Development Committee because at present I am its Chairman. However, the Industries Development Special Committee was appointed by Parliament as a result of a number of requests made by the late Mr. O'Halloran for a Royal Commission to be appointed in regard to decentralization. The then Liberal Premier of South Australia was not prepared to accede to Mr. O'Halloran's request. However, the Government at that time was becoming shaky and the people of the State were beginning to wake up to the fact that it was not living up to what it was saying about decentralization. That Government decided to give a piece of cake to the Opposition by appointing the Industries Development Special Committee which, as part of its term of reference, was to take evidence in country areas.

As I said last Thursday, the committee presented a fine report to Parliament but its recommendations were completely ignored by the Liberal and Country League Administration. Some of the decisions made by the committee were unanimous, and the various members signed the final report. One of its recommendations was to appoint a development branch. Of course, as this committee had been appointed only for political reasons, its worthy report was completely ignored. The Leader of the Opposition is completely wrong in what he says about our attitude towards a development branch, and I point out that in 1964 a Liberal Government completely ignored a recommendation to establish a development branch. Immediately the Walsh Government was elected it did something about this matter that has resulted in benefits to the people of South Australia. I wish to read again for honourable members what was said about the position in other States in the final report presented in 1964 by the Industries Development Special Committee. The report stated that in New South Wales a Division of Industrial Development was set up in the Premier's Department in 1948; that a similar arrangement existed in Victoria; that in Western Australia a Department of Industrial Development was established; and that a Commonwealth Division of Industrial Development was formed and attached to the Ministry of National Development. However, the unanimous recommendation of the Industries Development Special Committee to establish a development branch in South Australia was ignored by the Liberal and Country League Administration. The committee's report stated:

The committee believes it to be desirable that industrialists have some definite point of contact with the Government which can give information on the various aspects of the State's industrial and economic forces, and assistance on the various technical aspects of choosing and operating from a particular location. This can best be achieved by setting up a special department or branch of a department to promote country industrial expansion and, in association with local committees, publicize the natural advantages which certain locations may possess. Such a department could provide a most valuable service to industry generally and to decentralized industry in particular. The committee does not propose to set out in this report its views on the scope of the functions of such a department, but it believes that the head of the department should have direct access to the Premier and that it should be staffed by personnel—administrative, technical, public relations and accounting—to give a service to industry and to publicize the advantages of South Australian locations in general and, where applicable, of country locations in particular.

That was the unanimous decision made by the committee at that time and it was included in the final report as a recommendation to the Liberal Government. However, it was completely ignored, and it was not until the Walsh Government took office that anything was done in connection with that recommendation. Last year the member for Torrens moved a motion that completely condemned what public servants (worthy men, who were doing their best for the State in an endeavour to encourage new industries to come to South Australia and to help industries in the State to expand) were doing in connection with the new Premier's Department. The motion moved by the member for Torrens stated:

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.

Last week I emphasized two parts of that motion. The main words were "that as a matter of urgency" and "be set up without delay." I again ask honourable members opposite what happened. That motion had been placed on the Notice Paper on about July 13, 1966, and was not tested until March 21 or March 22 this year (I am not sure of the date), about eight months afterwards and on the last day of the last session of Parliament. Yet, the matter was said to be one of

urgency and the department was to be set up without delay! It was only a farce, and it is no wonder that thousands of people in South Australia hold Parliament up to ridicule when members place motions on the Notice Paper and leave them there without taking the appropriate steps to have them tested.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad to have interjections on this matter, but let us have them one at a time so that I can answer them. Now that I have challenged individual members, not one makes a sensible interjection. They remain quiet because they know that what I am saying is true. If I received some interjections such as were made when I was speaking last week, I should not mind speaking until next Wednesday. The motion that is on the Notice Paper is ridiculous and absurd, and I may as well waste the time of the House in the same way as members opposite have done. If the Opposition brought up something sensible, I should be the first to listen. The Leader of the Opposition knew before he placed the motion on the Notice Paper that the Government had already been attending to the matter.

Mr. Heaslip: That is not correct.

Mr. HUGHES: It is correct. I proved that when I referred to the motion of the member for Torrens. It would take more than the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister to get through to the honourable member.

Mr. Heaslip: You know the truth.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes and I am telling the Opposition that this department was set up when the Walsh Government first went into office.

Mr. McAnaney: That was when the slump started, wasn't it?

Mr. HUGHES: The Walsh Government immediately set about carrying out its promises and one of the first was to set up the department. The member for Stirling might not have been in the House when I said last week that the member who last year placed on the Notice Paper the motion about the Premier's Department had not done his homework. If he had done it, he would not have fallen for the suggestion from the Opposition Party, as he did.

Mr. Rodda: How do you know that?

Mr. HUGHES: I know the member for Torrens.

Mr. Clark: It is a commonsense assumption.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. He would not have moved the motion if he had known what the Premier's Department comprised. He held himself up to ridicule, because he advocated bringing into the Premier's Department the Industries Assistance Branch, which had been attached to the department by the Walsh Government months earlier. The member for Torrens knows now and he will have plenty of opportunity to tell me that I am wrong if he wishes to do so. If the member for Victoria reads the speech made by the member for Torrens, he, too, will see that what I have said is correct. Apparently, the member for Stirling is another who is not familiar with what takes place in this House.

Mr. Ryan: He is not familiar with many things that take place in the House.

Mr. HUGHES: If he were, he would not say what he has been saying this afternoon. Last week I explained why motions such as this were placed on the Notice Paper. The practice has continued today, for political reasons. I shall refute the arguments used by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. The Walsh Government did a good job in setting up the Premier's Department, and I compliment its personnel for what they did. I do not hold them up to ridicule as did Opposition members last year. Opposition members would be the first to criticize the Government if it saw an opportunity to expand industry and did not take it. The Government, realizing the need for expansion, set up the Premier's Department under the Hon. Frank Walsh, and the industrial results are obvious. Despite the fact that I disagreed violently with what the former Liberal Premier did and said, I did not decry his efforts, because every dollar invested in this State under his or any Administration was to our advantage. When the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford leaves this House the Opposition will be in the biggest mess it has been in. I have said that before, and it is true.

Mr. Rodda: You were in a mess last week when the Premier was away.

Mr. HUGHES: We were not. An arrangement was made between the acting leader of the Government and the Opposition member who charged him about a certain matter. There was an amicable understanding between them but, apparently, this was unknown to the member for Victoria. Opposition members knew that the Bill was under the control of the Premier, and no-one could expect the Minister of Works to be familiar with it.

Mr. Nankivell: Why did you bring it on?

Mr. HUGHES: There are several silly interjections this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think it is proper that that matter should be pursued. The honourable member should return to the motion before the House.

Mr. HUGHES: I digressed, Sir, because of the foolish interjections trying to belittle the acting leader of the Government. Tomorrow, when Opposition members want something, they will be crawling up his back. The Industries Development Committee advocated that Parliament should consider the tourist trade as an industry, and under the Labor Government it is being considered as such. Opposition members have charged us with not carrying out our election promises, but they knew that no Party could do everything in one or two years. However, in the time we have been in office most of our promises have been fulfilled, to the benefit of the people of South Australia, and this Government will continue to honour its promises. The report of the Industries Development Committee suggested that the tourist industry should be seriously considered. A statement by the Minister of Lands (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) in today's *News*, reflecting the consideration that this Government has given to this important industry, states:

South Australian Government moves to back Tourism: A Government move to boost South Australia's $60,000,000 a year tourist industry was announced today.

The tourism Minister, Mr. Corcoran, said the Government would guarantee financing of approved tourist facilities in the country. This would encourage tourist promoters to provide better accommodation and facilities at tourist attractions, he said.

Mr. Corcoran, who recently took over the tourism portfolio, said the policy change was already in effect, and an application for assistance to build a motel in the Barossa Valley was being considered. He said funds would be guaranteed under the Industries Assistance Act.

"I regard tourism as a very definite industry in South Australia," he said today. "Visitors from overseas and interstate spent an estimated $30,000,000 last year in South Australia, and intrastate travellers spent about the same. This assistance we are prepared to give to people who want to promote tourist centres is a firm type of promotion of the industry, and is linked with further plans for boosting the industry in South Australia."

Mr. Corcoran said the money would be guaranteed if promoters met several conditions, such as the desirability of the scheme, its economics, standards to be maintained, and its location. "I regard this policy change as a major step forward in the provision of country tourist facilities and a benefit to decentralization," he said. "Tourism is a way some country areas can develop a worthy and profitable industry apart from agriculture."

Mr. Corcoran said South Australia was well endowed with tourist attractions, and full use could be made of these with more promotion.

This action should be appreciated by Opposition members, because assistance can be given to any district. Perhaps it may not affect city districts but it can be a great boost to country members, who should commend the Minister for this move. For some months he has discussed this project with me, as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, on an unofficial basis, because he wanted to be sure that when it was introduced it could operate immediately. Having every confidence in the Minister, I compliment him on this action, because tourism is a worthy industry and one that can be promoted more than it has been. We cannot ignore the tourist industry, because it will lead to the development of, and create employment in, country areas.

Mr. Heaslip: Don't you think that money would be better spent on supplying water to Kimba?

Mr. HUGHES: That is a foolish interjection, because I should have thought that the honourable member, who comes from a rural area, would know that, if the people in his district were able to be assisted by the establishment of a profitable industry, they would welcome such an industry.

Mr. Heaslip: Do you think that water for Kimba is a foolish matter, too?

Mr. HUGHES: No. However, I will not develop that argument, because I have already been ruled out of order for dealing with matters other than the one before the Chair. The member for Rocky River, who has been here a long time, knows how highly I regard the workings of the House.

Mr. Heaslip: You don't regard me highly?

Mr. HUGHES: I do.

Mr. Heaslip: You shouldn't talk to me like that, then.

Mr. HUGHES: I was invited to do so. If I ignored the honourable member he would be offended. I admire the honourable member; we occasionally have discussions over a cup of tea; we meet as friends; and I wish it to remain that way. The honourable member is leaving the House at the end of this Parliament, and we know that he will be missed. He is leaving us voluntarily which is perhaps more than some other members opposite will be doing. I am prepared to leave water schemes to the Minister who is responsible for them. Indeed, nobody can decry the

Minister's endeavours to ensure that everyone in South Australia receives a satisfactory water supply.

Mr. Heaslip: If you spend money on the tourist trade you can't have it for water.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member is wide of the mark. I have commended the Minister for what he is doing, and I point out that the Labor Government is trying to implement various recommendations that were made, for which action it is being criticized. If any criticism is to be levelled, it should be levelled against members opposite for ignoring a report for so long. I think I have proved that members opposite who have placed certain motions on the Notice Paper have not been sincere. When moving a motion last year, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) tried to belittle various senior public servants. I have proved that his motion was not sincere; otherwise, he would have put it to the test and had it voted on. However, the honourable member merely left the motion on the Notice Paper for about eight months. If the honourable member considered his motion so important that senior public servants were falling down in their jobs, and that no advancement had been made in South Australia, he should have tested his motion. He did not believe in it, however, and nobody will convince me otherwise.

Mr. Nankivell: Are you saying that he was not sincere?

Mr. HUGHES: I will not be distracted today; last week the member for Albert made three attempts, I think, to have me call him a liar, but I was not prepared to do so. In fact, the honourable member himself, not I, was saying the he was a liar.

Mr. McKee: He would be right.

Mr. HUGHES: If I were not to observe your rulings, Mr. Speaker, I would say certain things.

Mr. Nankivell: Come outside now!

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member has just jumped into his seat, because he knows that certain people have entered the gallery.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in referring to anyone in the gallery. I ask him to address himself to the motion.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall be pleased to do that, Sir, but I will continue first to refer to certain remarks made last week, and I think I have your protection there.

Mr. Nankivell: You'll need it!

Mr. HUGHES: I apologize for referring to the gallery. However, three times last week the member for Albert tried to coax me into saying that he was a liar. I do not for one minute think he is a liar, and I am not prepared to say that he is.

Mr. Lawn: You wouldn't say he was wrong, surely?

Mr. HUGHES: I will not go that far, because I like the honourable member and I know he likes me. We differ in the House, and we are justified in doing so.

Mr. Lawn: It doesn't sound as though you like each other.

Mr. HUGHES: I like the honourable member but I do not like his politics. Apart from that, he is all right.

Mr. Coumbe: Come on!

Mr. HUGHES: The Government might well have said "Come on" to the member for Torrens about his motion last year. That motion was moved only for political purposes. Moreover, I make no secret of the fact that the people of South Australia are beginning to realize that the Opposition is placing motions on the Notice Paper merely for political purposes, and that will react against members opposite. If I were to place an urgent motion on the Notice Paper, and if I were sincere about it, I would take the first possible opportunity in the House to have that motion tested. The honourable member need only to have told the Premier that he wanted his motion put to a test, and he would have been given the opportunity. No Premier would have refused that request by a private member. The same thing happened with the Leader of the Opposition. A fortnight ago it was entirely in his hands to have the motion tested if he desired to do so, because the House broke away from normal procedure. I took notice today when another motion was moved, but normal procedure was adhered to.

Mr. Coumbe: At whose request?

Mr. HUGHES: There is no mistake about it. What is more, if the member for Torrens wanted to get up and second the motion—

Mr. Coumbe: It was adhered to!

Mr. HUGHES: If he had wanted to second the motion this afternoon, he could have done so.

Mr. Nankivell: The previous agreement was adhered to also.

Mr. HUGHES: I disagree with the honourable member. The Leader could have done it, because it was done a fortnight ago.

Mr. Nankivell: It was not done by agreement.

Mr. HUGHES: Don't give me that. He could have done it, because that was his right.

Mr. Coumbe: Sit down!

Mr. HUGHES: I do not intend to. I told members earlier that I did not mind how much time I took on private members' business, because of the stupid motions that have for political purposes been placed on the Notice Paper. If members opposite want to waste time by putting them on the Notice Paper, there is no reason why I should not help them waste time. I could have finished my speech in half an hour last week.

Mr. Nankivell: You couldn't.

Mr. HUGHES: I could, but honourable members opposite urged me to keep going because they knew they had nothing with which to back up their Leader on this motion. In this motion they are asking for things that have been done already.

Mr. Hall: The honourable member should be the Minister for the promotion of Wallaroo!

Mr. HUGHES: Wallaroo has been well looked after. The honourable member was absent when I referred to that earlier.

Mr. McKee: It did not go too well under the Liberal Administration for 30 years.

Mr. HUGHES: No, it did not. I am glad the member for Port Pirie reminded me of that. For 30 years the Liberal Government had nothing to do with the Wallaroo District: it did not put any industries there.

Mr. McKee: It took them away.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes.

Mr. McKee: For political reasons.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and now, for political purposes, we have this great display of interest in Wallaroo. How ridiculous can one get! For 30 years nothing was done. Not only was the best industry taken from Wallaroo but the Liberal Administration paid for it to leave.

Mr. McKee: This afternoon the Leader said he was concerned.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not hear that. I heard a personal explanation given last Thursday about what I had said, but I have not heard anything about that since, because I told the truth. It is all right for members opposite to say they take an interest in Wallaroo, but this is the first real opportunity Wallaroo has had for a number of years of getting an industry. It is a $10,000,000 industry, yet honourable members opposite laugh about it. Of course, they do not want this Government to get it, because the Leader of the Opposition went out into the country and said that the Government had turned its back on the country regarding natural gas. He knows he said that.

Mr. Hall: Don't you agree with that?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I do not; I proved to the Leader last week that that was not the case, and I will prove it again. I remind the Leader that, with all the political stunts he has been putting up for the benefit of people in the country districts, he has been losing very badly lately. He needs more than a caravan. We have to treat this matter on its merits. I met the people who came out from America, and apparently the Leader of the Opposition, from what he said today, also met those people or their Australian representatives.

Mr. Hall: I have spoken with them.

Mr. HUGHES: I would have thought that if the Leader spoke with them he must have met them. From his remarks, I had assumed that the Leader had met them.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: I made a plea in this House some weeks ago for the Opposition and the Government to speak with one voice regarding industry in South Australia, and I thought the Leader had taken me up on that and that he would try to undo the wrong he had done.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: I thought that the Leader would try to work with the Government in an endeavour to get this $10,000,000 industry for Wallaroo. Although I cannot quote his exact words, he said this afternoon that—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting. Also, I remind the honourable member for Wallaroo that he cannot refer in this debate to a previous debate this afternoon.

Mr. HUGHES: Very well, Mr. Speaker, but I was tempted into it. I shall have ample opportunity later to reply to the Leader of the Opposition. Many will recall that when the Hon. Mr. Dunstan was appointed Premier of South Australia he said that we in South Australia should concentrate on our ability to sell our skills. He said that we had to get ahead in the race, not merely in industrial but in technological development. I assure honourable members opposite that the Premier since making that statement has not let the grass grow under his feet. A few weeks ago, after discussions over the weeks prior to that,

Cabinet announced that Mr. Donald Currie, a man of considerable experience in developing technology and in industrial administration and expansion, had accepted the appointment as South Australia's Director of Industrial Development. I say this afternoon that that person is the best qualified Director in this sphere in Australia. The report that appeared in the *Advertiser* of July 11 following this appointment states:

Mr. Currie, 52, who is married with three children, lives in Stanley Street, Leabrook.

Mr. Heaslip: We are not having all that again, are we? What about making a speech of your own?

Mr. HUGHES: If the member for Rocky River does not want to listen to me, he knows of other comfortable places where he can go. It would not matter to me whether or not he was here, because nothing I said in support of the amendment of the honourable member for Frome would please the member for Rocky River. The report continues:

He has almost completed 29 years' service with I.C.I. Mr. Currie joined I.C.I. in England and subsequently worked in Scotland before coming to Australia in 1940. For his Master of Science degree he majored in chemistry. He has had various technical appointments with I.C.I., mainly as a works manager. He is currently President of the S.A. branch of the Chemical Institute and a member of the council of the Chamber of Manufactures and the Industrial Safety Council.

If I were to say the things I wanted to say this afternoon regarding this appointment, members opposite would try to ridicule me and say that I was boasting. However, I am not telling honourable members of anything that I said: this is what was printed in the *Advertiser*, and it will not hurt members opposite to hear it again, because Mr. Currie is a good man. Of course, I realize he is the type of person the Opposition did not want.

Mr. McAnaney: Is it a good newspaper?

Mr. HUGHES: There is nothing wrong with the paper.

Mr. Lawn: The only thing wrong with it is what is printed on it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not here to answer the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) regarding whether or not it is a good newspaper: I am merely quoting the report it printed concerning this man's appointment. I have my own idea regarding the value of the *Advertiser*, and the member for Stirling can have his idea of it. The press report continues:

At a press conference yesterday, Mr. Currie said he realized there was far more than five years' work involved in his new post. This sort of appointment was a normal one for I.C.I. in England. It was not unusual for a senior man to move out of the company into some field of public service. He thought, however, that the present appointment was the first of this kind in Australia, apart from perhaps during the war years.

Mr. Currie said he had been overseas several times for his company, including visits to Japan, Europe and America, where contacts made would help in the new post. While it was yet too early to go into detail he believed South Australia had to make full use of its resources and make certain that untapped resources were put to use. "If South Australia is to set the pace, achievement must be lifted in absolutely every field," Mr. Currie said. "We can be right up with it or lagging, but I know we have the people, knowledge and materials here to do the job."

That is the point I want to make this afternoon. Mr. Currie, whom the Government has seen fit to appoint to this position, realizes that we have the personnel and the materials in this State to achieve what this Government has set out to do. The report continues:

There was quite clearly widespread support for the course Cabinet had decided to take.

How true that is. I have travelled extensively in South Australia during the last fortnight and wherever I have gone people have commended the Government for the appointment of Mr. Currie as the Director of this department.

Mr. Rodda: Who found this gentleman?

Mr. HUGHES: The Premier and his colleagues. However, now that the honourable member has raised the matter, I will tell him that many inquiries were made by the Premier and other Cabinet members to procure the right man for this position. Of course, members opposite knew about this. Some weeks ago (and this makes stronger my point about how foolish was the Leader to suggest that this was his idea) the *News* contained an article about the possibility of the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust being appointed to this position. He would have been a good man for the job but the Government needs him in another field. I am sure Mr. Ramsay would be the first to realize that. Apparently a member opposite took the bull by the horns and said that Mr. Ramsay was the man we were going to have, but I do not think for one moment that Mr. Ramsay would regard the fact that he was not appointed to this position as a reflection on him. I do not know whether he was asked to accept the position: those matters are dealt with by the

Premier and other members of Cabinet. Undoubtedly Cabinet consulted many people before selecting the Director, but that is only my opinion.

Mr. Rodda: What sort of industry are you going to establish in the northern suburbs to fill the 500 empty houses?

Mr. HUGHES: I have already been called to order three times this afternoon because I have been side-tracked by interjections. These interjections are red herrings, designed to lead me away from what I am trying to say. From now on I shall ignore them, because they are not genuine interjections at all. As the Premier has said, one of the tasks that will now face the Industrial Development Department will be (in co-operation with industry and commerce in South Australia) to set up an industrial research foundation. It is vital for development in Australia that we become preeminent in the field of applied scientific research. South Australia is well based for such a development. This State has, in the Waite Agricultural Research Institute and the Wine Research Institute, the best research facilities of the kind in Australia.

In the field of applied research into mineral development, this State has (with the cooperation of the Commonwealth Government, private industry, and the State Government) the Mineral Development Laboratories. Regarding medical reasearch and veterinary research, we have the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and, through the Institute of Technology, which grew out of our old School of Mines, South Australia has for long been the main training centre for metallurgists and for other technicians in the Commonwealth. In South Australia we have the know-how of the scientists of the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury. Therefore, we have the requisite background and climate for preeminence in the applied research area.

As the Premier has said, in diversifying our industry we must provide facilities for general industrial research in the South Australian situation. True, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization does research of this kind over the whole Commonwealth, but only to a limited extent is its work applied to the particular situation of our State. Countries overseas, such as Sweden, Switzerland and Israel (with limited natural resources but a high degree of industrial know-how), have been able to boost their industrial development and their exports by concentrating on applied industrial research. Therefore, this Government is seeking the co-operation of industry and commerce to get these facilities in South Australia.

The Government will need not only some Government money, but heavy endowments (as the Premier said on television recently) from those who will benefit materially from the results of this work and who can see the benefits accruing to the future of the State from such a foundation. The Premier hopes that shortly the necessary organization will be set up to get the foundation under way so that an important gap in the development of our industry can be filled. South Australia has the notable achievement of having an economy adequately balanced between primary and secondary production, and consequently enjoys the stability that such an economy provides. However, stability has been attained not only through a balanced economy, but also because of a number of factors to which I shall refer, as they are of particular interest and importance to investors and industrialists anxious to promote their own particular enterprises.

Because of the enlightened outlook of management and employee organizations alike (working in co-operation with a progressive Government), South Australia has a remarkable record of industrial harmony. In 1965-66 in South Australia only 61 working days were lost; in N.S.W. 273 days were lost. There is no need for me to emphasize the importance of this factor to industrial production and costs. Because of adequate forward planning by the Government and its instrumentalities, essential services, such as water, power, transport facilities, roads, and educational and hospital services, have been progressively developed so that fully serviced industrial sites are readily available at prices much lower than prices for similar sites in Sydney or Melbourne. The State also enjoys the benefits of comparatively lower building costs. While talking of a low cost structure, I should like to quote a report from the *Advertiser* of July 11, which supports what I have said. I am glad the member for Rocky River is not in the Chamber, because he dislikes my quoting from the *Advertiser*. The report states:

The President of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. F. R. Curtis) said: "We welcome anything which is going to encourage industrial development in this State. The fact that an industrialist has been appointed to this very high position should achieve this purpose. However, he cannot be left alone in this important role and will need the full support of the State Government.

Lacking as we do in natural resources, and suffering the handicap of being remotely situated from our main markets, we must retain our lower cost structure if we are to encourage new industry to this State."

I stress the last few words "we must retain our lower cost structure if we are to encourage new industry to this State."

Mr. McAnaney: Your Government is putting costs up.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member for Stirling is coming in again: he disagrees with the article in the press. The honourable member is disagreeing with this man, not with me. I merely read out what the President of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures said. The honourable member for Stirling is disagreeing not with me but with the President. Let him go and argue it out with the President, because that is his statement, not mine. I was quoting from the *Advertiser* what the President of the Chamber of Manufactures had to say, yet I am charged immediately with saying these things. The President made the statement.

Mr. McAnaney: And I agree with it.

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad the honourable member agrees with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Stirling that Standing Orders require that a member shall not speak except when he is in his own seat.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for stopping the row on the other side. I know that you are right, Sir, and that honourable members must accede to your ruling, but it did not worry me very much whether the honourable member was interjecting from his own seat or from the seat of another member. He was disagreeing with the President, not with me, because I did not add another word after quoting the President when the interjection came. So honourable members opposite, and the honourable member for Stirling in particular, disagree entirely with the President of the Chamber of Manufactures. The honourable member is in for some real trouble. I take the last words I quoted to be an admission that South Australia is a State of low-cost structure; otherwise, the President of the Chamber of Manufactures would not have said that. I do not see that any honourable member could read anything else into it. I do not want to read anything else into it. I quoted the President in full; I did not take it out of context for the sake of any argument.

Despite members opposite saying that our costs are spiralling all the time and that we shall be in real trouble, here we have the Chamber of Manufactures supporting the Government. Mr. Curtis said "We must retain". If we have not got anything, how can we retain it? If the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) has not 20c in his pocket, how can he retain it? That is the point. I thought I would quote that statement because it fitted in well with what I had been saying—and I know Mr. Curtis will not mind my quoting him in full. I would not quote him out of context, because of the importance of his position. I do not quote anybody out of context to gain political advantage. However, members opposite seem to disagree with these words.

Mr. Rodda: We did not disagree.

Mr. HUGHES: You did; you entirely disagreed by your interjections. I am sure the President of the Chamber of Manufactures will not be pleased, when he reads my speech, to know that three honourable members on the back bench opposite are trying to ridicule the statement he made to the press.

Mr. Rodda: You are showing a lot of animal cunning.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not; I am just giving the facts. When I quoted Mr. Curtis, in came the interjection straightaway. The honourable member for Stirling did not wait for me to make a remark. He did not know whether or not I was going to criticize him. He jumped in where angels fear to tread. The three honourable members on the back bench opposite did this. If I were Mr. Curtis, I would take exception to it.

Mr. Curren: You are doing it on his behalf now.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not, because Mr. Curtis is quite capable of taking care of himself. I will continue from where I was interrupted. An expanding road construction programme over a number of years supplementing the State railway system, accompanied by strong competition amongst road hauliers and between road and rail transport, has kept freight rates to a minimum. Transport costs are, therefore, not a disadvantage to the South Australian manufacturer serving the national market, as is evidenced by the number of international enterprises based in South Australia and transporting their production to all States as well as to other countries.

My remarks so far have been confined to facts of present-day conditions. What is the outlook for South Australia in the future? If Australia is to continue to develop, it must become more highly industrialized. I made this point when speaking in the debate on the

Address in Reply. That was my opinion then, and it still is. It naturally follows that industry will assess the facilities available and the conditions prevailing, and I believe that the advantages that South Australia has to offer will be readily appreciated by those responsible for making surveys associated with the establishment of new industrial development. In the first instance, I wish to make it clear that commercial and industrial enterprises contemplating establishment in South Australia can be assured of sympathetic support from the Government of South Australia. The Premier personally administers the activities of the Government associated with the promotion of industrial development. The Government has a policy of assistance to industry in various ways.

The Government itself is responsible for the provision of water, sewerage, railways and roads. Statutory bodies closely associated with the Government are responsible for the provision of electricity and gas. With the forward planning carried out by the Government, no enterprise contemplating establishment in South Australia need have worries about the provision of these essential services. Housing for an expanding work force is another facility that the Government is able to assure industrialists through the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust, a statutory body responsible for its administration to the Minister in his capacity as the State Minister of Housing. The trust has not merely confined its activities to housing but, in association with the Premier's Department, has for many years acquired land at prices that enable it now to offer industrial estates at comparatively low cost, as well as to provide high quality housing at cheaper rates than can any of our sister States. The trust is also empowered; under certain conditions, to design and erect factories for industrialists for either sale or leasing.

Adequate facilities for technical education and training are matters of vital importance to promoters of industry. In this field South Australia has facilities of which it is justly proud. The State's universities and its Institute of Technology are of a standard that compares more than favourably with similar institutions throughout the world. In fact, the provisions in this State for the training of apprentices are unequalled in Australia. Scientific knowledge is readily provided through our universities and the Institute of Technology and, in addition, we have the facilities of the Weapons Research Establishment, the Australian Minerals Development Laboratory as well as the C.S.I.R.O. It follows naturally that Adelaide has great potential as a centre for industrial design and research, and recently the Premier has been pleased to announce that the Government has decided to materially assist in the establishment of an industrial design centre in Adelaide. The active co-operation of the Government with private enterprise in this activity will be of great value to the future of industry in our State.

Stability in the workforce is another factor that is of prime importance to industry. In this respect, South Australia again has an enviable record. Through its active and progressive housing policy it has been able, in collaboration with industry, to plan a programme that has provided housing for workers as and when development takes place. A typical example of this is the establishment by Chrysler Australia Limited of its multi-million dollar engine plant at Lonsdale. Here we have been able to observe private enterprise proceeding with the erection of its large undertaking, in the confident knowledge that housing will be provided to ensure the adequate provision of its workforce. I say with pride that the members of the workforce of South Australia take a personal pride not only in their own State but also in their own homes as individuals. This assures to industrialists within the State a significantly low turnover in the labour force and consequent efficiency in operation.

I have spoken in the latter part of my speech in very general terms about the advantages that, South Australia offers for investment and industrial expansion. The Premier would welcome the opportunity at any time to discuss in detail any particular project that any industrialist may have in mind. I assure this House that the door of the Premier of South Australia, Mr. Dunstan, is always open to investors and industrialists contemplating establishment in South Australia and that his personal attention will always be given to propositions of this nature. I support the amendment that has been so ably moved by the member for Frome, and emphatically oppose the motion.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): We have listened for a considerable time to a ranting by the member for Wallaroo. His effort was full of ranting, tub thumping and clowning, in which he charged the Opposition with insincerity. The member excelled himself. He spoke for a total of more than four hours

last week and today but did not say anything constructive. I hope the member will stay and listen to me, because I was one of his captive audience and had no choice. He has criticized me rather severely and I hope that he has the decency to sit down and listen to me.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It will take only four hours.

Mr. COUMBE: It will not take four hours to deal with the member for Wallaroo, because if ever a hypocritical speech was made in the House, full of utter rot and twaddle—

Mr. HUGHES: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object to being referred to as a hypocrite.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member said "a hypocritical statement".

Mr. COUMBE: I agree, Mr. Speaker. I was very careful about the words I used. I trust that the member will sit down and take the criticism I give him in the same way as I have sat and listened to his twaddle.

Mr. Hughes: I'll take it.

Mr. COUMBE: I was about to say, when I was so abruptly and rudely interrupted, that the member's speech, which was so full of rot and twaddle, easily topped the list of that kind of speech in this House. Even members of his own Party walked out on him during the four hours for which he was speaking. He charged the Opposition with insincerity and time-wasting efforts. His effort was a prime example of time-wasting. He took four hours to say nothing.

He said that in the last session I had deliberately delayed having a vote taken on a motion dealing with industrial development. I charge the member for Wallaroo with deliberately wasting the time of this House last week and today. Never since I have been a member have I seen such a spectacle and I hope I shall never see one like it again. The member made quite a point from his point of view about the Industries Development Special Committee's report. He said that the Liberal and Country League Party had completely ignored the recommendations in that report. He ranted on and on about that matter. I agree with this statement that he made:

> The main feature of the report was the recommendation to set up a Department of Development.

The member for Wallaroo chided the Opposition and the previous L.C.L. Government because we had not done anything about that report. Let us change from the ranting and look at some of the facts of life in this regard, because this motion requires that a few factors be considered. The member for Wallaroo quoted from the report of the special committee of which he was a member.

Mr. Hughes: No; I was not.

Mr. COUMBE: He is at present the chairman of the Industries Development Committee. He referred to the report that was laid on the table of this House on February 18, 1964, at the end of the 1963-64 session. What happened? The Playford Government of that day acted on that report, contrary to the insinuations that the member has made today; it announced in the Governor's Speech at the opening of the 1964 Parliamentary Session that action would be taken. The then Government took the first step as early as possible by introducing a Bill the first reading of which was on August 19, 1964.

The first reading was moved by the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, now the member for Gumeracha; it was a Constitutional Bill to provide for an extra Minister. In his second reading explanation the then Premier stated that the Bill would set up a department of development, following the committee's report. He went on to explain that the Minister's job would be to concentrate specifically on industrial development. Did the member for Wallaroo support that Bill to give effect to that recommendation?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: If he had supported it, it would have been carried.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. The Labor Party voted against the Bill and opposed it out of hand; it was defeated because it lacked a constitutional majority. If only the member for Wallaroo—just he—had supported the recommendation in that report, the Bill would have been carried, the office of Minister created, and the department set up. This is the member I am talking about—the member for Wallaroo—who last week and today has had the effrontery to accuse my Party of doing nothing. I ask the member to get his facts right in future.

If he and some of his colleagues had supported the Bill on that occasion, the department would have been set up three years ago. I would not have thought at that time that this would be a political question at all; I would have thought that all members of this House would support the committee's recommendation and be glad to see the department set up. But, no! For reasons of their own

the members of the then Opposition opposed it. Why? They did not want an extra Minister appointed. However, upon the change of Government, without any increase at all in the size of this House, the Labor Party very smartly appointed the ninth Minister; it very quickly changed its tune.

Mr. Langley: You supported that Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, we supported it. When the Hon. Mr. Corcoran was appointed to the Ministry was he given the portfolio of industrial development? No! To this day there is not a direct minister of development.

Mr. Langley: Did you have one over a period of 20 years?

Mr. Hughes: What about referring back to the report again and getting your facts right? The Industries Development Committee did not recommend a ninth minister; it recommended that the department be answerable to the Premier. You would know this if you had read the report. You have not read it.

Mr. COUMBE: This was specifically explained in the second reading speech in August, 1964, by the then Treasurer. We could have had this department in operation three years ago, and if the member for Wallaroo wants me to pursue this further I shall do so immediately.

Mr. Hughes: I shall prove you wrong again.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member will find that difficult. I want to speak on this motion seriously, because it is important and because it provides another opportunity for me to speak on a subject which is very dear to me and on which I have spoken several times before. Last week we had the unusual and curious experience of both Parties reaching some unanimity on the subject; they agreed, following the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, that we should have a Director of Industrial Development and an advisory council on development. We had heard the Leader of the Opposition state that the Government had adopted the Opposition's suggestion made on several occasions and that it had appointed a Director of Industrial Development. The Leader of the Opposition also stated that the Government had further agreed to his suggestion that an industrial advisory council should be set up. The Premier replied, in effect, that he was pleased that the Opposition was supporting the Government's action in taking these steps. The Opposition had put this forward as a sincere, constructive and positive idea, and it is pleased that the Government has adopted it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: At long last.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and it has implemented it. The Opposition intends to use every means at its disposal and to grasp every opportunity to bring more industry to South Australia to create more employment. We had witnessed the completely unnecessary action of the member for Frome in trying to amend the motion of the Leader of the Opposition, and then in came the member for Wallaroo and straight away put his foot into it. The member for Frome had patted the Government on the back for following Liberal policies, and then the member for Wallaroo came in like the tide and succeeded in bringing a considerable amount of acrimony into the debate by introducing personalities. He immediately in his inimitable style started to throw a tirade of abuse at the Opposition. Several members, including me, were singled out. I am delighted that a Director of Industrial Development has been appointed, because last year I urged the Government to set up a Minister of Industrial Development and was criticized trenchantly by the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Langley: Why don't you say something?

Mr. COUMBE: I will say what I have to say, and not waste the time of the House. I know Mr. Currie, and travelled to Gidgealpa with him and officers of the trust to inspect drilling operations. I wish him well in his appointment, but he will need much assistance and co-operation from many people.

Mr. Lawn: Including the Opposition.

Mr. COUMBE: And the Government, too. I suggest that legislation the Government is introducing will not make his job easier. He will need all the co-operation he can get from industry, commerce, and the general community. No matter who holds this office, nothing can be achieved without this co-operation. I was interested when the Government announced that it had agreed to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that an Industrial Advisory Council should be set up. The member for Wallaroo criticized me for what I said when I introduced a similar motion last year. However, what I set out to do has been vindicated by the actions of the new Premier by announcing the appointment of a Director of Industrial Development. I tried to emphasize to the Government and the people of this

State the need for such an appointment in order to stimulate industrial development and prevent unemployment in this State. At that time the number of unemployed persons was high, and still is. Since I first suggested appointing a Director of Industrial Development, a delay of 12 months occurred before the appointment was made.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Frome was the first person to suggest it.

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Adelaide tries to belittle anyone who is making a sensible speech.

Mr. Lawn: You weren't the first to suggest it.

Mr. COUMBE: I don't suppose I was, but I know that the member for Adelaide did not suggest it. Adam thought of many things first.

Mr. Clark: Adam did not wait until he was over 30 to do it!

Mr. COUMBE: The member for Gawler must have a good memory. I am pleased that the new Premier agreed to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Casey: He did not.

Mr. COUMBE: Twelve months ago the Government opposed and defeated an Opposition move to set up this department, but it has now adopted that suggestion. Premier Walsh described the motion as wasting the time of the House, but the new Premier, within a day or so of assuming office, proceeded to implement Liberal policy. The views of the two gentlemen are in direct conflict. Premier Walsh opposed my motion, but Premier Dunstan proceeded to implement it.

Mr. Lawn: He was right in opposing it.

Mr. COUMBE: Of course! It draws attention to the fact that the Labor Party, which is supposed to speak with one voice, does not always do so. One leader says one thing and the other says the opposite. One says we shall not do it, but the new Premier says we shall.

Mr. Lawn: You are having the same trouble in your Party.

Mr. COUMBE: What Government members voted against last year is now being supported because, I presume, they support their new Leader's decision. What the member for Wallaroo spoke against so vehemently last year he is supporting today. Twelve months ago he moved an amendment to my motion and, instead of agreeing to my suggestion that a Department of Development should be set up, he advocated that the work of the Premier's Department in attracting new industries to this State and promoting the expansion of existing industry was worthy of approbation. What has happened since the new Premier assumed office? Premier Walsh said that his department was doing everything possible, and that I was wrong to criticize it. However, the new Premier said that the work in the department had to be doubled because it was not effective enough, although Premier Walsh had said that everything was satisfactory and that the job was being done. Premier Dunstan, on the other hand, said, "No, this work is not effective enough. We must double the number of staff." That was reported in the press on either the first or second day after he assumed office. Therefore, one Premier says one thing and his successor says another.

Mr. Lawn: In effect, you are saying that we have a good Premier today.

Mr. COUMBE: I am saying that the present Premier is good in one respect: he is now adopting Liberal policies. In other words, he is coming back again to the Liberal Party! Having once been in the Liberal Party and then labouring for years in his present Party, he is coming back to Liberal policy at last! Further, I agreed with the present Premier's desire to create this position, because I was one who advocated it, amongst other things, last year. I also agreed with the Premier when he accepted the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition to appoint an industrial advisory council. I agreed, too, with the Premier's announcement that he intended to set up an industrial design centre and an industrial research foundation.

Mr. Lawn: We have an excellent Premier, in that case. You ought to tell your Leader.

Mr. COUMBE: During the debate on my motion last year, former Premier Walsh criticized me fairly trenchantly, and the member for Wallaroo, in his inimitable style, did so again today. The honourable member accused me of unfairly criticizing members of the Public Service, especially senior members.

Mr. Hughes: That's right.

Mr. COUMBE: I thought, when I spoke on the motion last year, that I went to considerable pains to make my position perfectly clear.

Mr. Hughes: You must admit you mentioned three officers.

Mr. COUMBE: I strongly resent the imputation that I was deliberately attacking members of the Public Service. At the time, the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) criticized me for attacking public servants and not the Government.

Mr. Hughes: Why did you mention three?

Mr. COUMBE: I shall repeat what I actually said, so that my comments will not be twisted as they have been today. At page 579 of last year's *Hansard,* I said:

So that my remarks will not be misconstrued, I say at the outset that any criticism I make is directed completely at Government policy and not at any particular Government servant. Like other members in this House, I have a high regard for South Australia's Public Service. However, the Opposition is concerned at Government policy-making decisions and at the directions given to members of the Public Service. Knowing Mr. John White personally, I appreciate his work in the Premier's Department as Secretary to the Premier; I know, too, of the work Mr. Lloyd Hourigan was doing in that department before he became Secretary of the Public Works Committee, and I know of the work Mr. Belchamber is doing, following his appointment to take Mr. Hourigan's place . . . I should like to see the work of the Premier's Department expanded; my comments are directed not at the officers concerned but at Government policy in this regard.

I mentioned three specific members of the Premier's staff. In criticizing the work of the department, I specifically set out to say that it was not effective and that we believed that it should be under direct Ministerial control. Indeed, that was the purport of the motion. Any member opposite who has been in the House since I have been a member will know that, although I may often criticize the Government, I do not go about criticizing public servants, who cannot answer back. I resent the imputation of the member for Wallaroo, who has twisted my comments in this regard. If he thinks that I reflected on any officer in that way, all I can say is that that is the product of a warped mind.

The honourable member also criticized me for what I said about the Industries Assistance Branch: let me assure him that I was closely connected with that branch long before he ever thought of coming into the House. I recollect that, as far back as 1948, I was closely associated with many works and industries in this State and with the branch before I became a member of Parliament. Being a personal friend of Mr. Dean, the Consulting Engineer, I know him professionally as well. I have the greatest admiration for him, for Mr. Moore, his assistant, Mr. Holliday, Mr. Wallace, and the other officers in the branch.

Mr. Hughes: You didn't know they were in there last year. That's why you didn't excuse them.

Mr. COUMBE: I knew about their being in the State Bank building in Pirie Street. As the honourable member knows, for many years, since the branch's inception, those officers were under the control of the Minister of Labour and Industry. I know the work of the branch and I have the highest regard for its officers. All the member for Wallaroo has succeeded in doing is to cast doubts on my veracity in this regard.

Mr. Hughes: You didn't know they were there.

Mr. COUMBE: The honourable member has done a disservice to himself; I know these officers; I have spoken to them since he made these suggestions, and they do not appreciate what he has said.

Mr. Lawn: You ought to tell your Leader, who has just come in, what you said just now about the Premier.

Mr. COUMBE: I said he had done a good job, because he had adopted what the Leader of the Opposition suggested. Every day, as the Premier is attempting a little more of Liberal policy, he is getting better. As a Parliament we should ask ourselves what should be done about industrial development. Some of the things I set out to do last year have been achieved by the Premier, but what should now be done? I assure the House that, if I can do anything to help Mr. Currie, or whoever holds this position, to make a success of his job, my services will be readily available.

Mr. Hughes: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. COUMBE: Did the honourable member ever doubt it? A climate of industrial confidence must be created in this State as soon as possible. We must have confidence in the future of the State, and everybody should strive for this. We must create confidence in the potential of South Australia and in the ability of existing industries to trade with other States and countries overseas and to expand. We must create the confidence for other industries to come to this State from other States or overseas, and confidence must be created in the State in order to attract investment here. If investment is attracted to the State it will creat more industries, and the creation of new industries will produce a snowballing effect. If we can obtain industries of the right type and diversify in this regard, I hope that this will snowball and pick up other industries. This could mean more employment and a rise in the standard of living for every man, woman and child in the

State. We should be able to create confidence in order to progress and to provide more opportunities for our work folk to obtain employment here instead of being compelled to go to other States.

I was appalled the other day to read an article from Western Australia dealing, in particular, with the building industry. It stated that, in order to overcome its labour shortage, Western Australia, which is experiencing a minor boom at the moment in minerals and in housing construction, not only recruits from other States, but now recruits oversea labour or is attempting to do so. Unfortunately, some workmen are going there from this State. This position must be overcome, and one of the best ways to do that is to create confidence. One of the obstacles that Mr. Currie may have to overcome (and it will be an obstacle preventing the creation of this confidence) concerns some legislation the Government has foreshadowed. I am afraid that this may be the millstone around his neck, but I hope it will not be. I hope the Government tempers its views in this connection and introduces legislation that is more conducive to industrial development, expansion and confidence in the State. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I oppose the motion and support the amendment. The Government has already set up departments to deal with all the matters referred to in the Leader's motion. Therefore, I claim that this debate has been a complete waste of the House's time. I would not even have bothered to enter into this debate had it not been that natural gas was referred to. Natural gas seems to be very prominently featured in the speeches of Opposition members! The Leader of the Opposition tried to make great capital out of natural gas, but realized when he had finished speaking that he had not done so. He said he would have another look at this matter. In his frustration and desperate efforts to try to live up to the over-rated publicity that he is given by the press, the Leader is getting himself further involved. I am sympathetic toward him in this respect.

Mr. Rodda: You don't sound it.

Mr. McKEE: I am. I feel sorry for a man who has certain abilities but who, when he is over-rated and told he is such a champion, believes it. This is the terrible thing about it all. It worries me, because the Leader is out of his depth. He is concerned with some schoolchildren who have made certain statements, and I understand that he is doing everything possible to remedy the situation. This is not a very good situation for a man in his responsible position. Unfortunately, while he proceeds in the direction he is going, there is only one place he can finish up: the place from which he started.

The use of natural gas hinges on the cost of the pipeline, but members opposite pretend to ignore this, although they know that the initial cost of the development of the pipeline will determine whether we go into business. The Leader of the Opposition should place the general welfare of the people and the development of the State above politics. If the people ever expected this of the young man who has been elected Leader of the Opposition, they have been sadly disappointed. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING BILL

(Continued from July 12. Page 535.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Bill be recommitted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not certain of the effect of this motion. Is this merely adopting formally what in fact has already taken place, namely, the reprinting of the Bill?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Repeal and savings".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I regret that having prepared a number of amendments following the representations made by numbers of organizations interested in this matter, and having had the Bill reprinted *pro forma*, further amendments have now been suggested by numbers of the organizations concerned. In consequence, there are before honourable members at this stage, either in print or roneoed, about three sets of amendments to be moved by me. I regret this, but as this Bill is one that gives rise to second and third thoughts, on mature consideration, by the interests involved, I thought it proper to put forward these additional amendments as a result of the further representations that have been made. I move:

In subclause (5) to strike out "deemed" and insert "declared".

This is purely a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (5) after "application" to insert "whereupon the licences shall for the purposes of this Act be deemed to be a wholesale storekeeper's licence or a retail storekeeper's licence granted under this Act".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to strike out subclause (6) and insert the following new subclause:

Amendment carried.

(6) Every permit granted under section 197a of the repealed Acts and in force at the commencement of this Act and every storekeeper's Australian wine licence in force at the commencement of this Act shall continue and remain in force and confer and impose the same rights privileges liabilities and effects as it conferred and imposed under the repealed Acts. During a period of three years after the commencement of this Act but not thereafter every such permit may be renewed, and any such licence may be granted in respect of previously licensed premises, renewed, transferred or removed, as the case may be, and every such permit if renewed, and every such licence if granted, renewed, transferred or removed, as the case may be, under this subsection, shall confer and impose the same rights privileges liabilities and effects as it would have conferred and imposed under the repealed Acts. The fee payable for every permit renewed, or licence granted, transferred or renewed under this subsection shall be calculated and paid in the same manner as such fee was calculated and payable under the repealed Acts.

This is an essential transitional provision, covering the first three years before there is a transfer from the old form to the new form of licence.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Are the holders of storekeeper's Australian wine licences to receive other types of licence at the end of the three years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Within the three-year period, they have to apply for one of the new licences under the new Bill; that is, they have a three-year period in which to transfer to the new form of licence.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the subclause is carried, at the end of three years will holders of wine licences not be able to hold their present intermediate licence but have to hold either a wholesale or retail licence?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the effect of later clauses in the Bill but it is not the effect of this subclause, which simply allows them to continue during the three-year period in either their present premises or in premises to which they transfer in accordance with the repealed Act. However, the effect of later clauses will be that a holder of a retail licence or a wholesale licence (either a storekeeper's Australian wine licence or an ordinary wine shop licence—not a wine saloon licence) will have to convert to either a new retail licence, in the case of the present retail shops, or, if he owns one of the wholesale shops (that is, those holding storekeeper's Australian wine licences), to a wholesale licence or a retail licence.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

After the definition of "bar-room" to insert the following definition:

"bowling club" means a club which is a member of the Royal South Australian Bowling Association Incorporated or of a Bowling Association which is a member of the Australian Bowls Council or of the Australian Women's Bowling Association Incorporated:

This is the first of a series of amendments concerning the position of bowling clubs in South Australia. I am advised that in fact all the bowling clubs in South Australia (I think with the exception of one which may be promoted by a private individual) are members of the Royal South Australian Bowling Association Incorporated; which is itself a member of the Australian Bowls Council, the federal body comprising the associations in the various States. So that, considering the definition down to this point, I have included in the definition of "bowling club" every bowling club in this State and in the other States which is a member of the Australian Bowls Council. That is substantially all the bowling clubs in Australia. Finally, there is the Australian Women's Bowling Association Incorporated. I am informed that this is the association of women's bowls clubs. So the object of my definition, which I hope I have achieved, is to include in the definition of "bowling club" virtually every bowling club, for both men and women, throughout Australia.

Perhaps I could now mention the numbers of bowlers and bowling clubs in this State, because I think honourable members will agree that those people who play bowls (bowlers, as they are called) are a significant group of people within our community. I am informed that within the metropolitan area there are 63 bowls clubs with a membership of something well in excess of 7,000, and that in the country areas of the State there are 150 clubs with a membership of over 8,000. So there are about 15,000 men bowlers throughout

the State, in well over 200 clubs, the majority of which are not in the metropolitan area but in the country areas. In addition to the men bowlers, there are about 11,000 women bowlers throughout South Australia, many of whom are, as one would expect, the wives of the men bowlers. So we are dealing with the pastime of a significant number of people in the State. The particular matters bothering the bowls clubs (and these are the subject of my later amendments) are these. First, under the Bill as drafted it would not be possible for visiting members, whether members of bowls clubs or not, to go to a bowls club and themselves buy a drink: it would be necessary for any drinks to be bought by a member of the club and consumed in the presence of a member of the club. The second matter is the necessity, as the Bill is drawn, for a *bona fide* meal or substantial refreshments, or whatever the proper term is, to be provided with drinks.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is not a *bona fide* meal. I think that is in the circular, but it is not right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The bowlers want to be able to have a drink without having to have food with it. The third matter concerns the ability of bowling clubs to hold liquor, not only to sell and supply it, on premises. Sunday opening may be involved but that is not a main consideration in these matters. Those are the three main matters that I shall be canvassing. This amendment is simply to include a definition of bowling club: the other amendments will follow from it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that I cannot accept the amendment. The honourable member seeks to insert a definition of bowling club that proposes to give special privileges to bowling clubs as distinct from other sporting clubs of any kind. I do not think there is any reason to do that, from the points of view of either the bowling clubs themselves or of properly protecting those who make their living from the purveying of liquor in the State.

The bowling clubs say that, if visiting teams come to their clubs, they want the members of those teams to be able to buy liquor at the bowling club, as has been the practice illegally so far, and that they do not want the members to have to buy all the rounds of drinks. That can be coped with easily under the Bill. Clause 86 (1) (*g*) makes quite clear that it is possible for a club, when making application to the court for registration, to provide for honorary membership, and there is not the slightest reason why a bowling club making such application cannot provide in its rules that members of visiting teams are for that occasion honorary members of the club. It is done in other States.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is involved in the process of making them honorary members?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Simply putting a provision in the rules when application to the court is being made.

Mr. Heaslip: Don't they have to write the names in?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, that is not necessary if it is in the constitution. I am, by virtue of the fact that I am member for the district, an honorary member of the Norwood Club. That is in the constitution. I do not have to sign a book when I go there; as an honorary member I can go in at any time and enjoy its facilities. Any bowling club can provide in its constitution that members of visiting teams are honorary members on the occasions of their visits to the club for bowling contests. This happens in other States, and there will be no difficulty about this.

The second difficulty that the bowling clubs foresee is that after 10 o'clock they will be required to provide substantial food with any drink that they provide. Surely it is not difficult for bowling clubs to provide supper for the members who are there; in fact, it is what nearly all of them do now. As long as substantial food is provided (it does not have to be a *bona fide* meal—it only needs to be something in the form of supper) they can go on for the period for which they normally play and have their refreshments in the normal way. There is no difficulty about that, either.

As soon as we start to provide that a club of a special class is to be granted trading facilities and provisions outside the normal trading hours provided in this Bill, so soon do we run into trouble. Everybody will be seeking a special exemption, and necessarily the hotelkeepers will be deprived of their normal trade if some special facility is being provided to somebody else in the area.

The bowling clubs, in the course of their ordinary activities, are under no difficulties whatever under this Bill. Everything they provide at present can be provided under this Bill in the normal way within the normal conditions. They will be able to get a conditional club licence or, if they can prove

that they constantly give the general facilities of a club, they may even get a full club licence. At any rate, they should have no difficulty in getting a club licence, subject to the condition that they provide facilities in association with the activities that are the object of the club and that they buy their liquor from a retail outlet in the vicinity of the club. In these circumstances they can provide during normal trading hours the facilities of any other club, and those trading hours include a coverage of the hours that bowlers normally work under. In these circumstances I cannot agree that there is any reason to put a specific provision in this Bill for bowling clubs. Of course, the honourable member's purpose in proposing provisions for bowling clubs is to give them facilities not applicable to any other club.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Premier has mentioned that this can so easily be overcome by creating honorary members, but I can see a great danger here, as any person whom a member likes to bring along can be made an honorary member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; there is a restriction in the Bill on the entry of members, and the court has to look at this. If such entry is in association with the purposes and activities of the club, this would be proper. This provision is already in other States' Acts.

Mr. HEASLIP: It appears to me that there is a danger because, although bowling clubs have traded illegally as so many other clubs have done over the last few years, they have restricted these activities to their members and, if anybody walks in off the street, he is put out straight away. Although the law has been broken for some time, we are trying to legalize the position but still allow clubs to retain their rights. Unless this definition is included this will not happen. Bowling clubs are different from other sporting clubs because the sport is played both during the day and evening, whereas most other sporting activity is conducted during the day. In addition, no person can become a member of a bowling club if he is under 21 years of age, another difference from other sporting bodies. Section 3 of the Rules and Regulations of the Royal South Australian Bowling Association provides for this. Also, the average age of members of bowling clubs is about 50 years, which is different from the average age of members of tennis, cricket, football and other sporting clubs. Physically handicapped persons can play bowls, although they cannot participate in other sports. As the clause is drafted, I point out that, with a Parliamentary bowling carnival soon to take place, not one member will be permitted to buy a drink at the club at which he is playing.

Mr. McKee: This has just been explained to the member for Mitcham, and he accepted the explanation.

Mr. HEASLIP: The amendment will ensure that the people to whom I have referred will continue to participate in activities in the way they have participated in the past.

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier clarify the application of the clause to the activities of certain football clubs on Sunday mornings?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee is at present considering the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham dealing with the definition of a bowling club.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot accept the Premier's explanation. In one breath he says that the bowling clubs can get all they want under the Bill and all that we are asking for in these amendments. In the next breath he says that if they get what they want they will be giving unfair competition to the hotels in the neighbourhood. Those statements are completely contradictory, one to the other. For the reasons explained by the member for Rocky River, who is more familiar with arrangements in the clubs than I am, I am not prepared to accept from the Premier that, in fact, the bowling clubs will be able, under the Bill as it stands at present, to get all they want. The Bill is undoubtedly giving privileges to special groups.

Bowling clubs are set aside from other sporting clubs by the fact that there is almost (if not entirely) a 100 per cent participation in the sport. In addition, bowlers are moving about from one club to the other in the course of competitions, tournaments, and so on, and that means that they are away more than they are at home. I refer to what the member for Rocky River has said on the point of honorary membership and the purchasing of drinks, etc. This is something the Premier says they can get now. If that is so, what is the vice in putting it in this form in the Bill so that it will be perfectly clear?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It's already in the Bill. It's perfectly clear.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not. The other point is the question of food with refreshments. I am told that frequently a game of bowls lasts until after 10 p.m. The keen bowler does

not go in to have a drink before the game is finished, so I understand. All he wants to do is to have a drink, talk over the game, and go home; he does not want to have anything to eat. Why is the club to be obliged to provide food as a mere cloak, when it is not required and in some cases not eaten and, therefore, wasted? If this is the way we are going to keep people within the law, it is a very poor way indeed: to force the clubs to provide food that is not wanted, just to be able to say that we are not giving special privileges. This is what the Premier wants the Committee to accept. This is what will be required, unless we make the provision I am asking for.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have visited a number of bowling clubs, but I have rarely been to one that does not serve supper after 10 p.m. It is a standard practice, and that is all that is required by the provisions of the Bill. The honourable member is faced with my statement that there is no difficulty about visiting members being able to buy a drink. That is coped with by the Bill, so the only purpose of the definition is to say that those bowling clubs that do not serve supper after 10 p.m. should not be required to do so in order to comply with the provisions applicable to all licensed premises otherwise provided for in this Bill which could trade at that hour. Are we to be expected to make special provision for golf clubs, for instance? What about the habits of baseball clubs? I point out that thousands of people in South Australia are either involved in or attend night soccer and night baseball games. What the honourable member is seeking is some special privilege for one section of the community. What are the others going to demand in this direction?

There is no difficulty facing the bowling clubs in fitting in with the licensing provisions already provided in this Bill: they merely go along with the general provisions made for everyone. Once we start making special exceptions to say, "Everyone else has to provide supper in order to fit in with the provisions of the Act but the bowling clubs do not have to do that," we shall be inundated by other clubs saying, "If you give it to one sport, why don't you give it to others?"

Once we open the door so wide that clubs may trade without supper after 10 o'clock but publicans' licensed premises may not, we are getting to the stage where again we are placing difficulties in the way of the trading of licensed publicans. Under this Bill we are demanding of those who make their living from the retail purveying of liquor and the provision of services ancillary to that purveying that they provide greater service than they have before, without any clear increase in returns.

The central point of the Commissioner's report to this Parliament was that in requiring of licensed hotel keepers a greater service without any greater return we had to give adequate protection to their trade. He said that, if we did not see that the trade was profitable and that it was properly protected, there would be a decline rather than an improvement in the standard of service to the general public. In consequence, I do not see that there is any need for a special exception in relation to bowling clubs. All they need to provide for their members is available under this Bill, and what the honourable member is trying to do by putting in this definition is to say, "Here is an exceptional group of people who will not have to provide supper after 10 p.m. in order to serve liquor although every other licensed club and hotel keeper will be required to provide it." With great respect to them, I cannot see that they have any right to that exception. There is no difficulty in the way of bowlers providing supper after 10 p.m., and in those circumstances I think they should come within the normal provisions applicable to every other citizen in this State.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to see the amendment accepted, because I think that under the Bill clubs are treated in too wide a definition altogether. As has been pointed out, these vary widely from football clubs (where a few people play and thousands of people look on) to bowling clubs, where most people play. As the Commissioner pointed out, some bowling clubs have for years not been observing the law. Certain practices have grown up, and they vary throughout the country. Whilst I do not know the cause of this, I do know that at some clubs the main social day is a Sunday and at others it is a Saturday. I believe it would be reasonable to define bowling clubs so that we could make some provision for them distinct from, for instance, the provision made for football clubs. Although everybody supports the Bill, some disappointment has been expressed by certain groups, including bowling clubs. Everybody expected that the Bill would provide a relaxation of the previous licensing provisions.

Mr. Langley: Doesn't it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although we have been debating this Bill in Committee for only a short time and although we have been told it is a non-Party measure, there is an unhappy readiness amongst members opposite to interject.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There are many things going on illegally that will be legalized by the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I hope we will not have a barrage of interjections, because this is not an occasion when interjections are justified. I am thinking about one bowling club in particular at which people have bowled on Sundays for years. Bowls is the kind of game that is associated with the drinking of moderate quantities of liquor, and the bowlers at the club to which I have referred have had a few drinks there on Sundays. I do not know of any complaints made about the behaviour at any bowling club. However, the Bill will limit bowling clubs considerably in certain respects.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How will it limit them?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Because during certain hours they have consumed liquor and not observed the old law and if they drink during those hours in the future they will not observe the new law.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Have you looked at clause 66?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is limited considerably with regard to the type of permit that can be granted under its provisions.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is unlimited.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I believe it is limited, but I will not go into that now. However, bowling clubs will have to apply to a court for a permit, and I suspect that clause 66 will not provide the answer bowling clubs seek. In the past, people playing bowls at bowling clubs have consumed liquor on Sundays without the clubs' providing meals on those days; if clause 66 allows this to be done legally it will meet the wishes of the club I have in mind.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It does.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am assured by the Premier that it does. The club that I have in mind wants to play bowls and have drinks on Sundays. Its members have never misbehaved on Sundays other than indulging in the general non-observance of the licensing hours, as pointed out by the Royal Commissioner, who has said that generally the clubs have not been a social evil. He is concerned that they may become that, as in New South Wales, with poker machines as an added danger; but even without poker machines he is worried that they will disregard the provisions of the legislation. If this amendment is not accepted, will our bowling clubs, both country and city, retain the privileges they have under the present Act?

Mr. HEASLIP: For bowling clubs to retain what they have today this definition is essential. The member for Mitcham said that bowlers did not drink during play. In top pennant bowls it is unheard of for members to keep going in to the clubhouse to drink. Time and again a whole game has been played with no drinking. Sometimes a bowler will offer his opponent a drink twice during a game, and perhaps three times on a hot day. It is when a game of bowls is finished that the bowlers can drink and discuss the game. That is a pleasant part of bowls. If that practice is not allowed to continue, the game will be destroyed.

Many tournaments start at about 8 p.m. and play continues until 10.15 p.m., with no supper. Then is the time for a few drinks, when the game can be talked over. This definition is needed to preserve the present customs of bowlers. I disagree with the Premier's statement that there would be unfair competition with hotels and that we had to protect hotels. Hotels have had licences for many years but have failed to provide the facilities that they ought to provide.

Mr. Curren: All of them?

Mr. HEASLIP: Far too many. I am speaking of hotels generally. A person who could not have drinks at a club would not want to fight his way into a hotel bar and stand up to have a drink. Hotels have failed to fulfil their obligations and there is no need for this Parliament to protect them. The failure of hotels is not a legitimate reason for taking these privileges from bowling clubs and I hope that the many members who realize the need for this amendment will support it and help the 20,000 bowlers in South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE: I support the amendment. The Premier said hotels should be protected, but he is protecting them by demanding that the bowling clubs buy their liquor from hotels in the near vicinity. Why should eating be a condition to doing some good honest drinking? If I had a noggin of whisky and a nugget of

crayfish, I should be discussing bowls with myself all night! I and other members thought that the conditions which have existed too long in South Australia would be alleviated. A publican could not give service, even if he wanted to, because the premises were closed at 6 p.m. and after that time he was fearful about breaking the law. I look forward to the time when we can be grown up, get out of the short pants of our juvenile existence in South Australia and let people have a drink when they want to. That is done in other parts of the world.

However, we are not going to do it in this regard. Bowling club members play bowls at night and the hotels close at 10 p.m.; there is no earthly reason why bowling clubs should not have facilities so that their members can have something that is compatible with the life of the club and their sporting instincts. Consequently, I support the amendment. If what we are witnessing tonight is a foretaste of what will happen during the remainder of the Committee stage, we are going to have a fairly busy time sorting out all the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: The procedure on this Bill is no different from that followed on any other Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: But this Bill is more complicated than other Bills. I can see that I shall be opposed to some parts of this Bill, as all sorts of restrictions and prohibitions are placed on people because they want to have a glass of beer or some other drink. If I like whisky and somebody else likes lemonade, let him have it: I do not want to tax him for it. This is the freedom of the individual. Why do we persist in all these prohibitions?

Mr. CASEY: I oppose the amendment. While listening to the member for Burra I thought he was going to move an amendment that there be no restriction on the hours during which liquor may be consumed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been allowing a certain amount of latitude because the honourable member who moved the amendment said that, depending on the amendment being carried, he wished to move three subsequent amendments. He did not debate them; he briefly referred to them. I think honourable members are now debating subsequent clauses, particularly clause 66, and the three amendments that the honourable member for Mitcham proposes to move. I think the debate has gone far enough to justify, or otherwise, the insertion of the definition suggested by the member for Mitcham. I ask honourable members to confine their remarks to the matter before the Chair.

Mr. CASEY: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. The member for Mitcham is segregating the bowling clubs and the members of the bowling fraternity in South Australia. We should not do this in a Bill that covers everyone over the age of 21. It is most unusual for a member to move an amendment such as this, which was seconded, incidentally, by the member for Rocky River, who is against sectional taxes. The golf clubs may as well be included. We must stop somewhere. The Bill alters closing time from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. If bowling clubs are allowed unlimited trading hours, other clubs and hotels should be granted the same right. Hotel keepers have to close at 10 p.m. unless a special licence has been obtained.

Mr. Millhouse: Where do you expect bowling clubs to buy their supplies?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of honourable members to what I have already said. The question of where clubs buy supplies and whether they supply juveniles and others is not before the Committee. The question before the Chair is the insertion of an amendment, and honourable members should confine their remarks to whether the definition should be inserted or not.

Mr. CASEY: This amendment applies to one section of the community only and, for that reason, I oppose it.

Mr. RODDA: As many games of bowls are played after 10 p.m., does a specific bowling club come under the provisions of clause 66?

Mr. McKEE: I oppose the amendment. The clause provides for exactly the same sort of thing as takes place in other States. Although the Bill has been on the file now for a long time, I have not been approached by one official of any bowling club, and I doubt whether many other members have been approached. The amendment is something that has been raked up by the member for Mitcham as part of his stonewalling tactics. I do not think we can make fish of one and flesh of the other.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Concerning the charge against the member for Mitcham that he is stonewalling—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing only with the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to see the definition inserted. The club to which I have earlier referred wishes to know whether it can run Sunday tournaments, during which visitors may buy drinks; can it store liquor on its premises?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It can obtain a conditional club licence. If it applies only for a permit without obtaining a club licence it will, of course, be in difficulty.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the club be able to supply liquor without meals? Further, although this particular club has been in existence for some time and may not experience any of these difficulties, what provision is made for clubs that will undoubtedly be established in the future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision relating to tournaments on Sundays will apply only to clubs in existence at the passing of this Bill; clubs later formed will not be in that position, because the Government considers that it should endeavour to hold Sunday trading at its present situation.

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, you are giving special privileges to a class.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are giving special privileges to people who have been illegally exercising those privileges previously.

Mr. Millhouse: A class!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a very large class.

Mr. Millhouse: It is indeed!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The insertion of this definition will not clear up that position for the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm not opposed to it, but you are.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham asks whether bowlers will be able to have liquor without meals. They will at the trading times normally provided for liquor without substantial food or a *bona fide* meal. It was the view of the Commissioner that after 10 p.m. people should have liquor with food only with a supper-room permit or a dining-room permit in a hotel, or in a restaurant or a cabaret. The reason for this is related not only to the protection of hotels but to the protection of lives. It has to be substantial food, and that means there must be a supper of a reasonable size. If clubs apply for permits only for particular occasions, they would not be allowed to store liquor on the premises. Permits under clause 66 can, of course, be periodic permits not merely related to one occasion. The court must be convinced of the desirability of granting periodic permits. The normal procedure for clubs of this kind is to apply for a conditional licence under clause 27, and such a licence may be granted subject to conditions. If the honourable member will look at the roneoed amendments that I have distributed, he will see that all the conditions are spelt out. They have been circulated to all members.

Mr. Millhouse: You complained about my amendments yesterday, and now you complain that we have not seen things you have just had roneoed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member puts on great turns in this Chamber time and time again. There is never a Bill in this House about which the honourable member does not get up with a petulant complaint. He holds up the business in a ridiculous fashion. If he wants the public to have some say in this measure, he should have a look at the amendments before him and do his work. It is about time he started to do it. He has been sitting here since 7.30 p.m. If he looks at the roneoed sheet in front of him he will see that the two particular conditions have been spelt out. Conditional licences are provided for in the Bill, and that has been here for ages in front of members to read.

Mr. Heaslip: This sheet came only at dinner time tonight.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the provision for conditional licences was already in the Bill. The roneoed statement merely spells out two of the conditions. It states that without limiting the generality of the conditions which the tribunal may impose on the granting of a club licence, the court may impose conditions upon a licensee. It may restrict the sale of liquor by him to such periodic or other occasions as may be specified by the court. Therefore, these may be particular occasions associated with the purposes of the club. Another condition that may be imposed is that the licensee may be required to purchase all the liquor he requires for the purposes of the club from a person holding a publican's licence in respect of premises in the vicinity of the club premises.

In other words, bowling clubs could get conditional club licences in those circumstances for periodic occasions. Those clubs may buy the liquor in the vicinity. They can get a club licence if there are no objections from the local publican, and then they can store the

liquor on their premises. In fact, all the things the honourable member asks about as a result of the submissions made to him by the particular club in the situation he has mentioned have been coped with.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not believe that any section should have any special help under this Bill. Bowling clubs are no different from any other sporting clubs. Many clubs play sport on a Sunday and also at night.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't mean that, do you?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, I do. I am an average bowler, and I think I am an average citizen, so in this case I am going to take an average point of view. People under 21 years of age are precluded by law from drinking. Cricket, croquet and football are played on Sundays, and I see no reason why bowling clubs should have special privileges. I do not entirely agree that everybody has supper after bowls at night, because in my experience many bowlers finish at a later hour. If it is good enough for the bowling clubs to have a certain privilege, it is good enough for any other club in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot conceal my disappointment and surprise at the attitude of the Government on this amendment. I am particularly disappointed at the solid wall of hostility and opposition from the Government benches. It is obvious that a decision was made by Government members before this amendment came in.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are always saying things like that when you don't really know the position.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want all honourable members to realize that by supporting or not supporting this amendment they are deciding all the amendments I have regarding bowling clubs. If we vote against this amendment, it will not be worth while going on with my amendments later and we will then not have a chance to change our minds on this point.

Certain points have been put by those in favour of the amendment, and I am grateful to those who have spoken. The Premier, I think the time before last that he spoke, relied upon the report of the Royal Commissioner and said that one of the central points in that report was the protection of the hotel trade. It is impossible now for the Government or any member of this Committee to rely on Mr. Sangster's report. Mr. Sangster presented a complete scheme on licencing. However, as soon as the honourable gentleman and the Government abandoned a part of that scheme they ruined the lot, and they must take responsibility for every individual matter thereafter.

Mr. Clark: I do not think "ruined" is the word.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member likes, I will say that the scheme was murdered. The Bill bears so little resemblance to the proposals in the report that we might just as well not have had a Royal Commission. The only purpose in having the Royal Commission obviously was in the hope that it would recommend 10 o'clock closing, so that opprobrium for bringing in that provision would be taken off the Government's shoulders. I had hoped that as a result of a new Licencing Bill we would be able to make a fresh start in licensing, getting away from the position that obtained for many years where people were openly breaking the law because the licensing provisions of the State were not regarded as appropriate to the present time and were therefore ignored.

I hope members recall what the Royal Commissioner said about this. He said that he was appalled by the nature and incidence of the illegal practices actively or tacitly allowed to grow up and thrive in our community. If the attitude that we have seen on this amendment is to be the Government's attitude on the Bill, then we will see that situation come back quickly. We will be no better off than we were before. Does any honourable member think that bowling clubs are going to provide substantial food with drinks after 10 o'clock? What will happen (and I am not referring to bowling clubs specifically in this case) is that those people who do not get what they want through the Bill will break the law (as they broke it before) and the object of amending the law and bringing in a fresh Bill will be defeated. That will be the plain result of the unsympathetic attitude we have seen this evening.

I had understood that the object of the new Bill was to liberalize the law, bringing it into harmony with the views of people in the community on licensing matters. Apparently, we are certainly not going to do that regarding bowling clubs. I guess that what is good enough for the bowling clubs is going to be good enough for everybody else as we go through the Bill. I am extremely disappointed that the Government has taken this attitude and does not see fit to accept my amendments regarding bowling clubs, which are designed,

by and large, only to recognize the situation which obtains now and which obtained for so long before.

Mr. HURST: I oppose the amendment. During the recent Parliamentary recess I examined the Bill fairly closely to see just what the various clauses meant. Unfortunately, we have had much unnecessary debate on this matter. As I am a member of a bowling club, I know what bowling clubs have been trying to achieve. However, an examination of the situation reveals clearly that this matter can be amply covered by clause 86 (1) (*g*), while the side issues are covered by clause 66 and other clauses. Perhaps these submissions were made because the clubs did not really understand the position—as the member for Mitcham does not. If he had done his homework during the Parliamentary recess, he would have appreciated the true position.

I regret the procrastination and delay in this matter. I commend the Premier for giving his second reading explanation so as to enable members to study the Bill and be fully aware of the meanings of the clauses. I oppose the amendment because the Bill already covers this point.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Burdon, Ferguson, Freebairn, Heaslip, and Millhouse (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Stott, and Teusner.

Noes (20).—Mr. Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hall, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Nankivell, Pearson, Ryan, and Walsh.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out the definition of "Minister".

The reason for this is that the administration of the legislation may be committed to a Minister other than the Attorney-General and there is no purpose in specifying the Attorney-General as the Minister in charge of it.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2) Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to preclude or prevent a licensed person from allowing a female to sell, supply or serve liquor at, in, or about any bar-room on the licensed premises.

There are technical problems about this matter that, apparently, have been overlooked by the Royal Commissioner in his report, in which he recommended that barmaids be permitted, and in both Bills that have been before us. If the amended Bill now before us is passed in its present form, many people will be immediately thrown out of employment. I refer the Premier to the definition of bar-room:

"bar-room" means any room in which liquor is kept and in or from which liquor is directly supplied to customers.

Clause 154 provides:

No holder of a full publican's licence, limited publican's licence, wine licence or club licence shall allow any female other than his wife, his daughter, his sister, his step-daughter or his mother to sell, supply or serve any liquor at in or about any bar-room unless there is in force at the time an industrial award, determination or agreement under any Commonwealth or State Act binding on the licensee providing for the employment of such females on the same terms and conditions as males.

The prohibition is almost the same as that which was in the original 1936 Act. However, that Act was examined at the request of the Hotels Association, and the Crown Solicitor's advice was that no female could serve any liquor in any hotel without infringing its provisions. So, in 1954 new provisions were brought in which totally changed the law to allow many women to serve liquor.

Consequently, whilst everyone has pointedly said that barmaids are not allowed in South Australia, that is not the truth: the truth is that there is a prohibition on serving liquor in the bar, but females are lawfully able (and this has been so for 12 or 13 years) to go to the bar to get liquor and to supply it in the dining-rooms, parlours or any other part of a hotel. The 1954 amendment to which I have referred is clause 9 of the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, which provides:

Section 182 of the principal Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following subsection:

(5) A female shall not be deemed to sell supply or serve liquor at, in or about a bar-room within the meaning of this section or section 186 or 187 by reason only of the fact that she takes orders from and serves liquor to persons who are not in a bar-room.

So, if the amendments of the Government are carried, any female will be immediately prohibited from serving a drink in a parlour, dining-room or any other part of a hotel except where an industrial award is in operation, and at present no industrial award is in operation that provides the terms required by the Bill. I believe the Premier would agree that it is extremely unlikely that the arbitration tribunal will single out one

industry in making an award which would not be in common with the other awards of this State. So, the provision at present in the Bill will completely disorganize this State's hotel industry and it will prohibit women from serving any drink in any part of a hotel. I see no reason why women should be prohibited from doing this work.

It has not been suggested that they have not done the work competently and properly. In States where women are employed in bars the standard of service has been as good as it is in South Australia and the moral tone has been as good as, if not better than, the moral tone in this State. I do not object if an industrial tribunal awards women the same conditions as men, but it should be done on the basis that every person has an equal right to earn his living. Why should provisions of the Bill take away the livelihood of thousands of women who have been lawfully doing this work? In the drafting the 1954 provisions were overlooked, but I am sure the Premier will accept this reasonable amendment to cover any other deficiency that may exist in the present Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amendment will not accomplish what the honourable member has said it will: what it will accomplish is the dis-employment of many barmen. A bar-room means any room in which liquor is kept and in or from which liquor is directly supplied to customers. In other words, that is a bar as we at present know bars in South Australia. It is the same definition as the one in the original Act.

Mr. Clark: And not a lounge!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not at all. The Bill does not prohibit women serving in lounges, beer gardens or other places where liquor is not kept.

Mr. Heaslip: There are quite a few bars in lounges nowadays.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the places where there are lounges they are outside the law right now. Clause 149 (5) provides:

> A female shall not be deemed to sell, supply or serve liquor at, in or about a bar-room within the meaning of this section or section 153 or 154 by reason only of the fact that she takes orders from and serves liquor to persons who are not in a bar-room.

If a female serves in a bar-room, that is a room in which liquor is kept and in or from which liquor is directly supplied to customers, and it is not in the law.

Mr. Heaslip: It should be changed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All that the 1954 Act did was to declare the present law at that time: it was surplusage. We have not included it because it was unnecessary. The member for Gumeracha wants women to be allowed to serve in bar-rooms.

Mr. Bockelberg: Do you mean actually turning the tap on and pulling beer out of a keg?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The honourable member intends that women shall go into the bar-room, do the same work as barmen and receive 75 per cent of their rate. What is he doing to the barmen of South Australia? Such a provision is not sought by the Hotels Association and is bitterly opposed by the Liquor and Allied Trades Union in South Australia. I see no objection to women having an equal right to employment in this area, but they must compete on equal conditions; otherwise, we are depressing the standards of those already employed. That is the effect of the amendment.

Mr. Heaslip: The award does not say so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Many awards do, in fact, provide for equal pay.

Mr. Heaslip: Not here!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Many awards in force in South Australia provide for equal pay, and it is the Government's policy to support the principle of equal pay. We believe that women have a right to work, as men have a right to work, but that it should not be on the basis of competing at a lesser rate for the same job.

Mr. Heaslip: You would be denying them the right, here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are not denying them the right. We wish the Bill to clearly define a bar-room. If people are to serve liquor in a bar-room, they should be required to have the same award wages and conditions, terms of employment, and the like, as those applying to the other persons employed in that bar-room. They should all be on an equal basis. If there is such equality, there can be no objection to their employment. The amendment of the member for Gumeracha, far from providing for the continued employment of women in the State will provide for the dis-employment of men. There is no difficulty regarding the continuing employment of women in hotels in South Australia in areas of the hotel other than the bar-rooms. They can obtain the liquor from a bar-room, but they must not serve liquor in a bar-room unless

they have equal pay. This is vitally necessary for the protection of the people already employed in the industry. I entirely disagree that this will in any way adversely affect the employment of people in hotels. If the honourable member for Gumeracha is worried about this matter, I do not object to his putting in a clause similar in effect to the provision he inserted in 1954, although I think it is mere surplusage and does not do anything to the law. However, what he now proposes is different, and I cannot agree to it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In the main dining-room at the Loxton hotel is a little alcove in which liquor is kept. It is just off the main dining-room. Very often the waitresses, who are paid waitresses' award rates, serve liquor from behind the bar in the alcove and take it to the guests. What would be the position in that case?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the bar is, in effect, in the dining-room, then it is illegal right now.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Then under your proposal they must be paid the barman's rate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If it were a bar-room, that is true, but what the honourable member is suggesting is that there is some illegal activity going on at the Loxton hotel. I have no personal knowledge of the situation, although I know that the Licensing Court and the Superintendent of Licensed Premises examine the plans submitted to the court to see that a dining-room is not a bar-room. If there has been some provision in the premises other than the provisions in the plans presented to the Licensing Court, this would have to be examined. It is not allowable under the present law, and we do not wish to change that.

Mr. HALL: Many people have been breaking the law for years, and by this Bill they will be able to continue their present practices, yet, as the member for Ridley points out, such waitresses will be dis-employed. Of course, the Premier's policy is resting now on a technical definition of a bar-room. The situation at Loxton as outlined by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) is similar to that at many places throughout South Australia. Those places have a store or some source of supply of liquor for the people who are in that room or part of that room. It is nonsense for the Premier to say that this will not dis-employ people: it will dis-employ dozens of waitresses or barmaids who are at present acting in that capacity. I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. CASEY: I have heard some rubbish in my time, but what the Leader just said astounded me. The member for Ridley pointed out that at Loxton there is a dining-room that has a small bar. Whether the bar is in the dining-room itself or in a little alcove around the corner, I do not know. However, to insinuate, as the Leader has done, that the waitresses who are serving liquor with meals will be sacked because they are not allowed to serve drinks is complete rubbish. I have never heard anything so ridiculous in all my life. If they are breaking the law, no doubt the Licensing Court will have to look into the matter. In any event, all the hotel keeper would have to do is employ a waiter to serve drinks at the table. The other alternative would be to shift the bar out of the dining-room.

One has only to go to the Southern Cross Hotel to find a little bar in a room on its own where the waitress can go to get drinks to be served in the lounge. If a couple of walls were taken out, the bar would be in the lounge, but if the bar were in an alcove it would become a separate room. To say that waitresses who are now serving drinks in a dining-room will be sacked because they are not allowed to serve drinks is just too ridiculous.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Evidently the Premier is not conversant with the Bill. I must confess that I am not conversant with much of it, because it changes so quickly: the Premier changes it every day.

Mr. Millhouse: Almost every hour.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Frome also shows that he has not studied the problem very closely. Clause 3 repeals all the previous licensing legislation. That clause repeals the provision which was inserted in the amending Act of 1954 and which was the only provision that enabled women to serve anywhere in a hotel except in the bar. That legislation was not introduced lightly: it was introduced after the Hotels Association had received a Queen's Counsel's report and the Crown Solicitor had reported to the Government that there was not the slightest doubt that every woman who was at that time serving liquor in any part of a hotel was breaking the law.

That was why the 1954 amendment was introduced. That amendment gave an exclusion to every woman serving in hotel premises except those actually serving in what we might

describe as the bar proper. This provision is not re-enacted in this Bill. In the Government's first Bill barmaids were excluded altogether but in this Bill they are permitted with certain provisos, which they will not be able to meet. Clause 154 provides that no female (other than those specified) shall be allowed to sell, supply or serve any liquor at, in, or about any bar-room. How wide can a provision be? I agree with the Premier that my amendments go further than to reproduce the position as it was under the previous Act.

I believe that all people are equal before the law and that we should not discriminate against a particular class. Why should Parliament provide that a woman cannot lawfully earn her living in a hotel? The Premier acknowledged that the provisions in the Bill would stop women from competing, which he said would disemploy men. Although the Government intends to provide that these women shall receive equal pay, even women in its employ do not yet enjoy conditions equal to those of male employees. I make no apology for my attitude and I make no apology to the Australian Broadcasting Commission, which seems to think that my conduct in this matter is peculiar. From time to time the Premier assumes high moral tones. However, in this case the Government at first forbade entirely the employment of women as barmaids. When this was found to be politically unpopular, it obtained further instructions to the effect that provision was to be made for the employment of barmaids but that a tail was to be put on the provision so that it would be unworkable. The present provision has on it a tail that makes it abortive. I have no objection to equal pay for women. When the arbitration courts of the country provide for it, I shall in no way object to it; but at present the Government itself does not do it. Members opposite are quiet about that. Why does the Government single out these women and say that they shall not be employed unless they can get something that it is not giving its own employees? How hypocritical can we be? The Government says that women shall not be employed in any part of hotel premises serving drinks. I defy the Premier to get a Crown Solicitor's opinion that will substantiate the provisions of this Bill. The provision allowing waitresses to operate in hotels has been repealed. It is all very well for the Premier to say that my amendment goes further than reinstating waitresses in hotels. It does, but at least it reinstates the waitresses. If honourable members do not vote for this amendment, waitresses will not be reinstated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We all know that the Government and the Labor Party are in great difficulty here, for the reasons given by the member for Gumeracha. We know, too, that in this matter the Government is bound, whether or not it likes it, whatever it may think, to vote for one thing, and one thing only. What is the history here? When the Bill was last before the House, on the second reading, the policy of the Party opposite was to the contrary. This matter came up at the last State convention of the Labor Party and, had it not been for the intervention of the Premier, the policy would have remained the same. However, he said that the Government and the Labor Party were getting themselves into a ridiculous position by being the only Government and the only Party in Australia not to permit barmaids in hotels—and even then the jolly thing only just went through, with a tail on it because, as the member for Gumeracha said a moment ago, the Liquor Trades Federation and Mr. Fred Walsh (the former member for West Torrens—and a good member he was, too; it is a pity he is not still here) opposed it tooth and nail and the only way it went through was by adding this rider that women had to be employed at the same wages as men. Otherwise, it would not have gone through at all. May I remind honourable members what the Royal Commissioner said about the employment of barmaids?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Who appointed him?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was appointed by the Labor Government last year. He took evidence on this matter from Mr. Fred Walsh (I have read it) and from other interests opposed to barmaids, and said:

> I can see no reason for the continuation of the prohibition of the employment of females in public bars.

He then set out the arguments against barmaids, and continued:

> 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.

Let us mark the next sentence. The Premier a little while ago relied on this report in opposing an amendment of mine. The next sentence was:

Whether barmaids should be paid the same wages as barmen is a question not for this Commission but for the industrial tribunals.

Of course, that is the avenue in which this matter ought to be decided, and that is exactly what the member for Gumeracha proposes by his amendment. This is not a matter on which we should discriminate.

We have heard much about not discriminating by providing privileges for one separate class in the community in relation to another clause, yet that is exactly what members opposite want to do in the case of barmaids by opposing the amendment. They want to put them in a different position from that in which other women in this community are placed. Wages should be decided by the industrial tribunal. That is the policy of members on this side and should be the Government's policy. This is a perfect example of the way Government members are bound hand and foot by decisions made outside the House. What did the Premier say when he was only Attorney-General and was challenged about this matter in the second reading stage of the Bill? He said:

It is a free vote, except that every member of the Labor Party is bound by a pledge that he has signed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that he is not in order in quoting from the second reading debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was in another session of Parliament and a different debate, surely.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that it was the same Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Anyway, he went on to say that members on that side were not free to vote for an amendment to allow barmaids. Of course, their policy has changed since. I shall be waiting to see what the member for Chaffey does because, when I challenged him by way of interjection on this matter during his speech on the second reading, he made clear (he did not do it courteously, but that did not worry me) that he was strongly against the employment of barmaids. It will be interesting to see whether he votes according to his personal convictions as stated in March last, or whether he follows his Party's dictates and votes for the employment of barmaids.

This is a political decision by the Party opposite. It has got itself into a corner and it is still in a corner, because it was bound by a weak compromise: about the only way it could be permitted by its bosses outside to bring in a provision for barmaids at all. If this Committee does the sensible thing, it will accept the amendment to allow for the employment of barmaids in this State as they are employed, I understand, in every other State, without any strings.

The Hon. D A Dunstan: That is not true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, the Premier can give the exceptions to what I have said. My belief is that in every other State barmaids are employed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently that is true. What is not true in what I have said?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That they are not employed at equal rates of pay.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see. Are they on equal rates of pay in every other State?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, but in some States they are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This State was going to be the odd man out. I think that, when the Premier gives the exceptions, we ought to leave the matter of wages to the industrial tribunal, where it properly belongs. This is common sense and was stated in the report by the Royal Commissioner.

Mr. HEASLIP: We have recently heard from the Premier how necessary it is to keep down costs in South Australia if industry is to be attracted here. If this amendment is not accepted costs will immediately rise because waitresses, who have been serving drinks in lounges and dining-rooms, will not be able to do so in the future unless they receive the same pay as men receive. If the male rate is paid, the cost of meals in South Australian hotels will rise and women will be dispensed with.

Mr. Burdon: You have already said that you would sack them all.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am saying it again. I believe women are quicker and better than men in serving meals. Is the Premier sincere when he says that we must keep costs down in South Australia when, at the same time, he introduces a Bill that will immediately increase costs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that it is beyond my ability to straighten out the member for Rocky River, because he is talking about matters that are not contained in this Bill and are not the result of this legislation; he is dwelling in his usual area of fantasy land. The member for Gumeracha chided the Government for hypocrisy in

this matter and said that we did not believe in the things we were putting forward. I find it extraordinary that the honourable member can come into this House and now thunder for the rights of barmaids to serve in South Australian hotels. He was Premier of this State for 27 years! There were numbers of occasions when the Licensing Bill was before the House; there was the occasion in 1954 to which he referred. Where, then, were the rights of women to serve in bars? Why, he continued during the whole of that period to prohibit women from serving in bars unless they were the members of the family of the licensee or unless they happened to be antediluvian characters who happened to be on the original register of barmaids and who were tottering around South Australia in their dotage. Those were the only people to whom he gave any rights as barmaids.

Mr. Millhouse: What are you going to do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We say that women should be able to compete with men on equal terms. It is this Government's policy to provide equal pay for equal work of equal value, and these are the precise conditions that would obtain in work of this kind. The member for Gumeracha has said that equal pay does not obtain in South Australia. It is already obtaining in several areas, including some in the Public Service. This Government has moved in the direction of equal pay; it has provided that, over a period of five years from the time the original provision was made, teachers and public servants in South Australia will be brought to an equal pay position if they are doing equal work of equal value. We are saying that a similar position should obtain here, because there is no reason why it should not. The member for Gumeracha has said that this is not achievable. I suggest there would be no difficulty about the appropriate union agreeing to equal pay. If hotel keepers want to employ barmaids, there is no reason why they should not make a consent award, and if both sides agree to employ women (and I think they will) no difficulty would exist with the Government's proviso. The honourable member's suggestion that this is something that would be impossible to achieve is incorrect. He must know that consent awards are made in awards, and that several are in force in South Australia providing equal pay today: for instance, in the clothing trade and the breadcarters' unions.

Mr. Millhouse: How many of these have been influenced directly by legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say, but it is the principle of Government members that there should be no unfair competition by providing a certain class of people who can do equal work but at less pay than those already employed in that work. The honourable member cannot believe that if his provision were introduced existing barmen would not lose employment: they would. If employers could get the same work and pay 75 per cent of the wage for it, they would not pay the present wages for this work. I can imagine what the member for Rocky River would say if it were suggested that he would not do this. The member for Gumeracha has suggested a proposition that is not correct in law about the present position of employment of women in other than bar-rooms of hotels. I do not mind if the unnecessary provisions of the 1954 section are re-enacted (it may help to clear his mind: I am not unclear in mine), but his proposal goes further. It is a charter for the unemployment of barmen in this State, and to that extent I oppose it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Premier were concerned merely to protect the employment of barmen already engaged in the industry, he could have provided that women shall be allowed to serve in a bar but no barman shall be dis-employed to employ a woman, and that it should be an offence to do that. I would not object. The Premier has introduced other legislation that is much more absurd than that: we pass it almost every day. We have another Bill on file, and if anyone, including the Premier, can tell me what it means, I will give him a garden party. I am not sure whether I can afford it because the honourable gentleman now has fairly expensive tastes. The protection of men at present employed in bars could have been provided for, but the Premier seeks to place an embargo on people already employed. It is no use his saying that my interpretation of the law is fantastic: it was the result of two respected opinions that had been obtained.

The Hotels Association told the Government it had obtained an opinion in which it was pointed out that all females serving drinks in or about a bar-room were probably infringing the Act. As I was requested to examine the matter, I obtained an opinion, which stated that such people were undoubtedly breaking the law.

What is the meaning of "in or about"? It is as wide as it can be. I understand that it was designed to preserve a prohibition in the

original Bill. However, the effect now is to prevent any female from serving drinks in a hotel or licensed club. When the previous Bill containing the amendment to which I have referred was considered, the present Premier, as a private member, did not say that it was unnecessary. I believe the Bill went through unopposed.

The Premier asks why I have not seen to this matter previously, but I point out that I have had some experience of altering licensing legislation. The Premier is starting young and he will find that many issues will arise on which he will have to be cautious. He will have to provide for amendments that may be necessary, and not start fishing in deep muddy waters. The amendment to which I have referred met the opposition that was raised; we were not requested to widen the provision, although if such a request had been made I think the Government would have agreed to it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It safeguarded those who were employed at the time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. It is not correct to say that the Bill will not dis-employ people: it will directly dis-employ them, not by competition but by law. I suggest that the Premier hold over the amendment and examine it. If he does so, I promise not to debate it again. He should not lightly reject the amendment, because many people may be harmed.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, Stott, and Teusner.

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

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Constitution of Licensing Court."

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): The Bill does not contain a provision enabling anyone to petition against a decision of the Licensing Court. Under the Act, after a local option poll has been held and objection has been taken by a person or a group of persons to the location of licensed premises, an appeal can be initiated by way of memorial. Under this Bill, however, there is no provision for a local option poll and, so far as I can see, the only way a person could lodge an objection would be to go to the Full Court of the Supreme Court, which could be a very costly business. Therefore, this matter gives me some concern.

I believe that under section 62 of the Act an individual or a group of people can ask for a poll to be held. Many people have a genuine worry about this matter, and I know that this right has been exercised every time a local option poll has been held. The applicant for the licence goes to the court and hears the objection raised. At present, people can lodge an objection to an application for a licence. Even after the location of the licensed premises has been defined, people can appeal by way of memorial. I was never happy about the stipulation that this was limited to people living within half a mile of the proposed site, because that was hard to define. There is a real need for protection. No doubt many people would like to be able to raise an objection, and I believe they should have the right of appeal in some way to the Licensing Court instead of to the Supreme Court.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Act provides that when a local option poll has been passed in relation to the establishment of a new licence there can be a memorial against it. In that case, a somewhat complicated procedure had to be followed. It was an extremely difficult procedure to work.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The local option poll took place first.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Even with a local option poll, after a site had been fixed there could be a memorial against it. Then it was necessary to get a certified list of electors in the area and to make certain that those people were entitled to object. It was then necessary to take a survey to establish which places were within half a mile of the site. This was difficult because it was necessary to make sure whether the line went past the back door or the front door. The result often was an extremely difficult, expensive and inconclusive procedure. Indeed, I have known the business of working a memorial decision to take so long that the time for the removal of a licence had run out or the option on the premises had expired. True, under section 62 in relation to the removal of a licence from one place to another

a poll could be sought by 20 people. Again, these provisions of the Licensing Act relating to individual objections proved to be difficult of administration and productive of anomalies, and in many cases worked singular injustices.

The provisions that are now to be taken into account by the court are the provisions of Part III Division IV. Here, at the outset, the onus is on the applicant for a licence other than a packet licence to prove, when he first puts his application before the court, that the owners or occupiers of premises in the locality in which the premises are to be situated will not be unreasonably affected. Then an individual or group of people may object to the application. It is not necessary for there to be 20 people: one person can object. Therefore, anybody in an area can object or, where many people are affected, they can combine to lodge an objection.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Do they go to the Licensing Court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. They can take an objection to a new licence on the ground that the premises are near a church or other place of public worship or a hospital or school and would cause inconvenience to the people frequenting those places. Other grounds of objection are that the quiet of the locality in which the said premises are to be situated would be disturbed or that owners or occupiers of premises in the locality would be unreasonably affected if a licence were granted for the sale of liquor in the premises. Other grounds are that the premises are not suitable to be licensed or that the licensing of the premises is not required on the site shown in the application for the needs of the public.

Other grounds are that the site shown in the application is unsuitable or does not comply with the requirements of the Bill or that the premises will be situated within an area set aside by the competent zoning authority for purposes which exclude from such area premises of the kind desired to be licensed (that is something that is not included in the original Licensing Act). Another ground is that the granting of the licence would result in undue competition and economic waste. There are far wider grounds of objection than existed in the Licensing Act. It makes it perfectly competent for the tribunal to investigate every objection; there are considerable hurdles for any applicant for a licence to get over, in showing the court that people in the area are not going to be unreasonably affected, before he can get a licence granted.

If the decision of the tribunal, is adverse to the objectors they may appeal to the Supreme Court. True, appeals to the Supreme Court are not always cheap but I point out that the procedure through which one had to go in the case of a memorial was much more expensive than an appeal to the Supreme Court. I suggest that the matter is fully covered and that the requirements of citizens near the site of proposed licensed premises are adequately protected by the provisions of the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have some difficulty in this matter because I believe that, although the Premier purports to show (as he has tried to show) that there are safeguards against the position that the Minister of Agriculture has recited, it will not be as simple an operation as the Premier suggests. I am not sure either that the privileges that were accorded to members of the public under the previous provisions for a local option poll are likely to be repeated or preserved in this legislation. My first point is that although, as the Premier suggests, there is provision in the legislation for an objection to be lodged and it has to be lodged in person to the court by the objector, there are many people with strong views on matters of this sort who would express them at a local option poll but would not be prepared to make, or feel themselves capable of making, representations to the Licensing Court.

Mr. Casey: They could petition.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, but as a matter of hard fact, in dealing with the location of new premises not many people are involved. Possibly the immediate householders would be concerned but there would be a problem in a group of individuals getting together and organizing and circulating a petition. This is a valid point. Some people who would be willing to express their objections in private will not be able to under this legislation.

Secondly, this new Licensing Court will not be concerned with major matters only, as it has been in the past: it will be concerned with many minor matters. For example, the court must hear and deal with all applications for licences—and many licence categories are listed in the Bill. All of these will be heard and determined by a court—and not necessarily by the Full Court. Clause 6 (1) states that the jurisdiction vested in or exercisable by the court shall be exercised either by the Full Bench or by a single member of the

court. So that a single member of the court may be sitting in judgment on many matters and making many determinations on almost day-to-day matters, which will probably be heard and determined before the local residents are aware that an application has been lodged. Even if we accept the Premier's assurance that the onus of proof as to the desirability of the application rests with the applicant, this does not mean that a strong advantage does not lie with the applicant for a licence, location or whatever matter he has in mind before the court. In those circumstances the position of the complainant is much less to his advantage under the new legislation than under the old.

I am not defending the old position strongly, because I am well aware of its weaknesses. Although we have over the years as a Parliament from time to time amended the local option provisions of the Licensing Act to make them apply more strictly to the local circumstances in which they would apply, they had weaknesses, but they preserved the right of the individual to make up his mind and privately register his or her protest at the poll. This is denied him under this legislation, because local option polls will cease. These points have been in my mind since I first read the Bill. It is desirable that there should be some easier method for the individual to have his objection readily heard. Surely there ought to be some provision for the advertising of an imminent application so that local people will be alerted in case they have objections.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank the Premier for his explanation and assurances. I had seriously considered moving an amendment to enable a form of local option to be continued. I have much faith in the merit of a gathering of people making a decision. I am not trying to uphold the local option system as it was, because it had weaknesses. However, I also found weaknesses when I thought about an amendment that would cover the situation. At one time the provision entitled the electors of the whole electoral district to vote on an extra licence. A subsequent amendment provided for voting in the subdivision concerned, but this still presented difficulties.

As is the case in the Gawler and Chaffey Districts, it is difficult to get an expression of opinion of only those people who are directly interested. The situation at Mundoora is a case in point. That is why I had difficulty in wording an amendment. Nevertheless, I should like to have seen some say given to a local group about the extension of licences, and I am sorry that no form of opportunity has been given.

However, I can understand the Commissioner's recommendations, because I know the objections that were raised formerly. I remember when Mannum and Murray Bridge people, together with those at Tailem Bend, were eligible to vote on an additional licence for Tailem Bend. At that time, a licence was not granted. However, later, when the provision regarding the subdivision applied, a licence was obtained and it has been in operation for some time. There was a need for the additional licence but I doubt that there is a need for some of the licences that were granted under the old system. I am not completely happy about the fact that the court will make the decision even though, as the Premier has said, representations can be made by an individual or group of individuals. Although that helps somewhat, it does not meet all my objections.

Mr. HUGHES: I, like the Minister of Agriculture, had grave doubts about this new legislation when it was found that no provision had been made for local option polls. However, after hearing the explanation and assurances given by the Premier this evening, I consider that the interests of the various people will be protected. Usually many petitions are presented to me in relation to this kind of topic, but on this occasion that has not happened. Apparently the people as well as members of the Government are beginning to realize that local option polls do have their drawbacks and that the new provisions in this Bill will solve the problems. I received only one objection and that, strangely enough, came from a group of young people who asked that I move an amendment whereby local option polls could still be held. I have discussed this privately with the Premier and received his assurance, which he has repeated tonight, and consequently I am quite satisfied on this matter.

Mr. QUIRKE: This clause is something I have advocated for years. I have suffered under local option polls, and I think a more useless incubus in political life never existed, because one never got a really true result. One section was too indolent to vote, a minority would vote for the increase in facilities, and a highly organized group voted against it.

Mr. Clark: Sometimes they got together.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes; I had some experience of local option polls and I do not want to return to that situation. However, this does not mean that I do not think the people should have a say in these matters. They should, and they have it here. They can, I take it, attend the court during the hearing and register their objections before a completely impartial judge.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Will they be aware when the hearing is to take place?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know, but these things are usually advertised.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There is no provision for it.

Mr. QUIRKE: I think that it will be advertised, but even if it is not advertised it will be difficult to hide something like this. I would have no objection to the insertion of a provision that the time and place of the hearing of an application should be advertised so that interested people could attend the court. I think that is all that is needed. When I was a Minister I attended the Licensing Court to support an application for a licence on Kangaroo Island; a local option poll was held and we were told that it would be impossible to carry it, but it was carried. As a result, a very successful club is established in the centre of Kangaroo Island. If honourable members consider it necessary that the leaving of an application be advertised, I would support such a provision in the legislation. I support the clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I share the views of the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Wallaroo on this clause. For many years the public in various districts has had the right to determine the number of licences issued in that district. This right carries with it some problems, and on three occasions my Government introduced amendments to try to make the provisions more realistic. This legislation takes away the right of these people to determine the matter, but no better way of objecting has replaced it. Machinery should be provided to allow a person or a group of persons to object and to appeal against a proposal that could damage their interests. I agree with the Minister of Agriculture that under the suggested procedure the tendency will be for the court to go wild. In 1910 the excessive number of licences became a public nuisance and a poll was held to decide whether more, fewer, or the same number of licences should exist. The vote was overwhelmingly against any increase, and some districts voted for the number of licences to be reduced. People concerned, if not granted a licence, have a right of appeal, but an objector does not have an effective right to be heard.

Although I know that good reason exists for Parliament to fix the salaries of certain officers, I believe that the fact that Parliament should fix the Chairman's salary in this case is undesirable. Salaries fixed by Parliament can be altered only by legislation, and that is a constant administrative problem. Further, why is it necessary to provide an appropriation in respect of this particular officer, when the salaries of other senior officers, except those few fixed by special Acts, are fixed by and voted for in the annual Estimates? The Constitution Act defines an appropriation Bill as "a Bill for the appropriating of revenue or other public money". Under our new Standing Order this Bill should have been founded in Committee. I do not intend to raise the matter again but—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order in raising the matter now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We are making an appropriation in this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Gumeracha has just said that this Bill should have been founded in Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will take his seat. The remark I take exception to is that this Bill should have been founded in Committee. I point out that that matter was dealt with by the House last night and cannot be argued now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish to debate subclause (9), which provides:

> The salary of the Chairman shall be charged upon and be payable out of the general revenue of the State which is hereby to the necessary extent appropriated accordingly.

As this clause is before the Committee, I submit respectfully that I have every right to debate it. I believe that the subclause in that form is undesirable, and that the other subclause dealing with salary is also undesirable because of the administrative problems that will surely arise every time it has to be altered. I suggest to the Premier that this matter might be examined to ascertain the specific reason why it is necessary

to stipulate any salary at all and why we have to provide for an appropriation of this nature, which is quite out of line with the appropriations in respect of every other public officer of the State except perhaps the Governor and a few other officers whose salaries are fixed by Statute. I consider that both those provisions are unnecessary. In my opinion, the latter provision has some problem in it that will have to be examined, perhaps at another time. I mention it now because I do not accept that a Bill dealing with an appropriation can be founded otherwise than in Committee, and this Bill was not so founded.

Will the Premier consider, perhaps at some later stage, a provision for a right to lodge objections. If the Bill contains such a provision, I have not been able to find it, and apparently neither the member for Murray (Hon. G. A. Bywaters) nor the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has been able to find it, either. No doubt problems were associated with local option polls, but now we seem to be going from one extreme to another. I believe that the truth probably lies somewhere between the two courses. I would have thought that if an application was made to the court it would be reasonable for the court to advertise that it would consider that application at a particular time. It should be competent for any person inexpensively and without the necessity to engage legal advice to place a simple objection before the court. I oppose the new formula and the method by which it is being brought about, because we do not have an effective vote against it. I hope that subsequently the Premier will be able to show that the people who may be affected in one way or another by licences being granted will at least be able simply to put their views before the court.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Notices of applications are covered by clauses 40 and 41. A person is entitled to apply for a licence other than a packet licence in respect of previously unlicensed premises if he has, 28 days before the application is made, deposited plans and has within 21 days of the deposit caused notice of the deposit to be given by two advertisements in such newspapers as a member of the court prescribes. After the deposit of the plans the clerk has to insert a notice in the *Gazette*. What is more, a notice of the proposed premises must be attached to the site between the time the plans are deposited and the time of the hearing of the application. Therefore, there is already in the Act due provision for notice to the public of the proposed application to the court.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Does the Bill cover other than applications in respect of new sites?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are similar requirements in respect of removals to new sites.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What about other types of licence?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is in respect of every licence other than a packet licence. What is more, further notices, advertisements and the like can be prescribed by rules of court. Concerning the fixing of the salary of the Chairman of the tribunal, it is not intended that he be appointed under the Public Service Act. He is a senior judicial officer and in consequence it will not be a normal Public Service appointment for which applications will be called; he will be in the same position as a judge of the Local Court, the President of the Industrial Commission and the judges of the Supreme Court. In consequence, he cannot be appointed under the Public Service Act, section 6 of which provides that the Public Service comprises everybody in the Public Service of the State except any person whose salary or remuneration is fixed by Act of Parliament. Therefore, we have to prescribe it by Act of Parliament. In many cases we have to prescribe this by Act of Parliament and, when we have to amend these salaries every so often in that way, honourable members will recall that such Bills include quite a list.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But it is a nuisance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a nuisance but I am afraid it is in the general structure and we have to comply with it.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Disqualification in certain cases."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether personal interest in an application is sufficient to bar a member of the court from hearing that particular application? It seems to me to be unnecessarily restrictive, but I have no strong feelings on it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be normal for a member of the bench involved as a member of a club that had an application before the bench to want to disqualify himself. This is a simple statutory provision that he should do so.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Exceptions to application of Act."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In subclause (5) (i) to strike out "the Parliamentary refreshment rooms" and insert "Parliament House".

This clause gives a special privilege to members of Parliament. We are, apparently, to be the only body in the State to have a privilege like this but, although this is the wording that has obtained until now (I think it is a reproduction of the wording of section 13 of the old Act), of course it does not accurately set out what we do. To that extent, we, too, have been breaking the law in South Australia for many years. This has proved to be a moot point, however, because Parliament has the legal right to order its own practices. Nevertheless, this is literally wrong, because liquor is served not only in the refreshment rooms but also in the dining-room with meals, and in a number of other rooms in the building—for instance, behind the doors towards the southern front of the building. If we are to give ourselves these privileges, they should be given in such a form as may be observed by us without our having to break the law, as we have been doing in the past. The regulation of these matters is under the control of the Joint House Committee, which presumably is the proper authority, from the wording of the old Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 27, at 2 p.m.