HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HALL: As a result of the dry season, attention has been focused on the importance of the Chowilla dam to the future progress of South Australia. The estimated costs of constructing the dam have been greatly exceeded by the tender prices received, and the view is widely held that several of the State signatories to the River Murray Waters Agreement are re-assessing their attitude to this important scheme. Will the Premier say whether any tenderer was selected for possible acceptance as a builder in connection with the scheme and, if one was, whether the tender has expired or is still current?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of tenders is still current; tenders have not expired.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is normal, when tenders are called, for a closing date for tenders to be stated and for the tenderer to be given an approximate commencing date. Since tenders were called, various problems have arisen, as a result of which no tender has yet been accepted. I presume therefore that the tenderer would, of necessity, include an escape clause in his tender to meet contingencies regarding added costs resulting from new industrial awards and increased costs of materials. Can the Minister of Works say whether, when tenders were called, an indication was given to the respective tenderers when the work might commence and finish? Further, did the conditions of tender enable the tenderer to provide for contingencies such as increases in award costs of labor and increases in cost of certain specified materials? How long is the tenderer prepared to hold his tender open for acceptance under present circumstances?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I would have to inquire to ascertain the details of the tenders. Because of the hold-up in agreement between the various States on this project, arrangements have been made with the tenderers to keep tenders open until a specified date, which I cannot call to mind at the moment. However, it is hoped that finality will soon be reached in order to be able to signify to the successful tenderer when he can start work. Progress is being made, and there appears to be reason to feel a little more confident that satisfactory arrangements will be made. I will obtain the other particulars for the honourable member and give him a reply tomorrow.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Since tenders were called and received, two matters affecting industry have been announced, the first being the increase awarded by the arbitration court in the total wage case, and the other, the announcement by this Government, not by an industrial tribunal, that four weeks' annual leave is to be granted to all public servants. Although I have no quarrel with the industrial award made by a constituted authority, will the Minister, when he is obtaining the other information I have asked for, ascertain the added costs of construction of Chowilla as a result of the Government's announcement of an additional week's leave to Government employees, on the assumption that it will flow to employees of other industries and projects in this State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not think we should assume anything. However, I shall be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member, together with the other information for which he asked.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: When visiting the Chowilla dam site and part of the railway system at the weekend, I noticed that the builders (whether departmental or not, I do not know) were loading special railway trucks by front-end loaders. The vehicles then ran along the rails, and screws were loosened to enable the earth to be dropped on to the rail track. As the Minister is aware, grids are placed in paddocks to stop sheep from straying but, unfortunately, as a result of the method to which I have referred, all of the grids have been filled in to the top of the sleepers. As the grids are therefore ineffective in confining sheep, will the Minister of Works ensure that the grids are cleaned out properly, as was intended in the first place?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Appreciating the importance of these grids, I will certainly take up the matter with the department to see that they are made effective.

MIGRANTS

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Immigration is no doubt aware of an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, July 22, stating that the Department of Civil Aviation had rejected applications by two large British charter airlines (Lloyd International, and Caledonian) to fly passengers between the United Kingdom and Australia for $500 return. The airlines had planned to run 130-passenger Bristol Britannia turbo-prop airliners on London-Sydney charter flights. These flights were planned in order to overcome the homesickness of some English migrants by enabling them to visit their families and friends. Has the Minister received approaches regarding arrangements for such charter flights to the United Kingdom? It seems that a great saving in fares would be made by the use of charter flights, and many migrants would be able to take advantage of the concession; otherwise, it would be impossible for them to make such a trip.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the article to which the honourable member refers. Having received protests from individuals and groups on this matter, I took up the matter with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister. However, although my letter was acknowledged, I have not yet received a reply. Although the honourable member says that it appears from a press article that the Department of Civil Aviation has rejected the application from a British oversea airline company to arrange charter flights, I have received no official notification to that effect. If the Commonwealth authorities would allow charter flights to be conducted, the Tourist Bureau would be happy to make the necessary arrangements. I hope to receive a reply shortly and, when I do, I shall be happy to relay the information to the honourable member.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about repainting and maintenance work at the Port Pirie Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that difficulty has been experienced in obtaining a satisfactory response to the calling of public tenders for repairs and painting at the Port Pirie Primary School. However, he says that in response to a more recent call a tender has been received which will be recommended for acceptance. A contract for the work is expected to be let within the next two or three weeks.

ISLINGTON WORKSHOPS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question about the contracts for the Islington railway workshops, especially regarding work being carried out in relation to the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague reports that the current work being undertaken at the Islington workshops for the manufacture of standard gauge rolling stock for the Peterborough division is expected to be completed at the end of this calendar year. However, tenders have yet to be called for a number of additional projects, and it is hoped that the South Australian Railways will be successful in obtaining the orders. Consequently, the current level of employment at the workshops should be maintained.

MOUNT GAMBIER EAST SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: For some time past representations have been made to the Public Buildings Department about repaving the yard of the Mount Gambier East Primary School. Can the Minister of Education say when this work is expected to be carried out, as the yard is deteriorating fairly rapidly at present?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me that he would ask this question today, I have received a report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department stating that the resurfacing of the Mount Gambier East Primary School yard is to be incorporated in a group paving scheme for similar work at other schools in the area. It is expected that documents for this scheme will be completed towards the end of this month. The actual date of calling tenders will depend on the priority allotted to the work and the allocation of funds. Every consideration will be given to calling tenders at the earliest possible date.

CEDUNA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Last year I introduced to the Minister of Works a deputation of settlers from west of Ceduna regarding the

reticulation of water. I believe that, as a result of that deputation, the Minister and the Director and Engineer-in-Chief concluded that it would be best to extend the main for some distance and to construct a holding tank. As I have heard no more about the matter since, will the Minister obtain a report about the progress being made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I well remember the deputation and the matter discussed. I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have it tomorrow or Thursday.

COPPER

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to my recent question about the Western Mining Corporation's report on its investigations into the location of copper in the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My colleague informs me that the Western Mining Corporation Limited, in association with its partners (Broken Hill South Limited and North Broken Hill Limited), is continuing its exploration programme for copper in the Moonta-Wallaroo district. Some encouragement has been obtained in the diamond drilling results of the West Doora area where intersections of 36ft., averaging 2.04 per cent copper, and 30ft., averaging 2.77 per cent copper, were obtained in two drill holes some months ago. These intersections were reported to the Mines Department at the time. It is not clear yet whether there is continuity between these two intersections, and further drilling is proceeding. There are no plans for sinking a shaft in the area at present.

WARREN RESERVOIR

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a further reply to questions I have asked recently about the intake of the Warren reservoir as a result of pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide main?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The present storage in the Warren reservoir is 464,000,000 gallons, which compares with 316,000,000 gallons last year. Recent rains have caused no significant intake. However, the catchment is now becoming conditioned to a state where useful rains will result in good run off. Water is being pumped from the Mannum-Adelaide main at the maximum rate of 4,200,000 gallons a day, which over 12 months represents a quantity of more than 1,450,000,000 gallons, or a little more than the full capacity of the reservoir. Steps were taken last week to transfer some areas normally fed by the Warren trunk main to the Bundaleer trunk main, where adequate capacity exists during the cooler months, maximum flow to Budaleer being maintained from the Morgan-Whyalla main.

GLENELG PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Plans for the rebuilding of the Glenelg Primary School have been in existence for about two years but, because of the shortage of Loan funds, the project has been delayed. Can the Minister of Education give me the latest information about the likely commencement and completion dates for the rebuilding of this school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Being aware of the urgent need for the rebuilding of this school, I have had the matter in mind. I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member. It is expected that this work will be started during the next financial year.

X-RAY FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The matter about which I should like to ask a question is, I think, one of policy and, therefore, I think I should direct it to the Premier. However, it may be that the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, should answer it. I was informed last evening that a directive had been issued to the staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that for the first time every patient, both public and private, should, from today, pay for X-rays taken. Previously payment has been required from private patients only but now, according to my information, public patients are to be charged for all X-ray work. Apart from the extra financial burden that this will impose on patients at the hospital, it has been suggested to me that in a teaching hospital this is undesirable, because, some cases being used for research and others for teaching purposes, this often means that more X-rays than would otherwise be necessary are taken, and such X-rays will now apparently be a charge on the patient. Can the Premier say whether such a directive has been issued and, if it has, whether it is limited to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital or whether it represents a change of Government policy and requires that all patients at all Government hospitals are in future to pay for X-rays?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of these matters, but I shall inquire and let the honourable member have a reply.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question about widening Greenhill Road from Keswick bridge to Fullarton Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the section of Greenhill Road between Keswick bridge and Goodwood Road is at present being duplicated and will be opened to traffic at the same time as works at Keswick bridge are completed. Tentative arrangements are being made to commence duplication between Goodwood Road and Glen Osmond Road in about two years.

ELECTRICITY

Mr. HEASLIP: I refer to a report in today's *Advertiser* headed "Premier's Hope on Gas". When opening the Texas Mobile Trade Mission exhibition at the Hotel Australia, the Premier referred to the importance of the low-cost structure to industries already established and those wanting to set up here. Apparently, he was referring to the low-cost structure we have in this State. The Premier went on to say:

The South Australian Government will provide cheap land, provide houses for industry, and advantageous and competitive contracts for bulk users of electricity.

Can the Premier say how big the industry has to be to obtain these advantages of bulk use of electricity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Big enough, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEASLIP: I asked my question because there are so many small industries in South Australia that are all important—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking the same question? He cannot ask the same question.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know whether I am or not. The only answer I got was, "Big enough".

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot ask a question again, and he cannot comment on an answer given.

Mr. HEASLIP: Can I ask again?

The SPEAKER: No.

Mr. HEASLIP: Then I must be satisfied with "Big enough", but how big is that? Will the Premier explain the meaning of "big enough" and say how big a thing has to be to be big enough?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Big enough to effect economies to the Electricity Trust in regard to supply. In certain cases economies in supply can be effected by the trust and, therefore, prices can be advantageous to the consumer. These are being negotiated by the trust (as they have been previously), and negotiations are in the hands of the trust. No special directive as to size has been laid down by the Government.

KYBYBOLITE SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Education will recall that, when visiting the South-East last year, he visited, among other schools, the Kybybolite Primary School. I understand that progress has been made on plans for levelling, filling, and seeding the playing ground at that school. Concern has been expressed by members of the school committee whether this work will be included in the Estimates for this financial year, because the committee is anxious to have the work done in early autumn, which is the most effective time to have it done because the ground is too wet during the later months. Because of the progress that has been made with these plans, can the Minister of Education say whether a sum will be included in the Estimates for this financial year so that the work may be carried out by the committee early next year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to examine the points raised by the honourable member, and if we can comply with his request we will do our best to do so.

SCHOOL ASSEMBLY HALLS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 11 whether plans had been prepared for the construction of assembly halls and whether the department was accepting applications from schools in relation to those halls?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed by the Director of the Public Buildings Department that plans for standard assembly halls are at present being prepared. He expects that plans and specifications will be completed in about two months for distribution to interested school bodies.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS

Mr. QUIRKE: Included in the Physiotherapists Act Amendment Act, 1964, is the following miscellaneous section:

A person who is a registered physiotherapist shall not administer to any of his patients any treatment other than by physiotherapy unless he is qualified and entitled to do so by or under any Act.

During the course of the debate relating to that measure, in which I took an active part, an assurance was given that the clause I have

quoted would not have any impact on practising physiotherapists; nor was it intended to use the Act against such physiotherapists. I heard today that two people have been ordered not to continue that part of their practice concerned with the prescribing of vitamin pills, etc. As physiotherapists, generally, are concerned about this matter, will the Minister representing the Minister of Health ascertain why such action has been taken?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understand representations were made, during my term as Premier, concerning a certain physiotherapist engaged in practices that were not associated with physiotherapy. However, I will obtain a full report on the matter.

SCHOOL ATLASES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the availability of school atlases to grade 4 students?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The question of providing school atlases at grade 4 level was considered recently by the Primary Schools Advisory Curriculum Board. The board did not recommend the provision of atlases for grade 4 children at present for the following reasons:

(1) Suitable atlases are not yet available.

(2) Prior to the introduction of the free book scheme the majority of primary schools did not use atlases below grade 5 level.

(3) For most purposes, wall maps supplied to schools by the Education Department and simplified maps which are included in the social studies textbooks for grade 4 are considered to be more suitable than atlases of the type available.

(4) Until suitable atlases are available for children in grade 4, class atlases or atlases available in central libraries should meet most incidental needs.

(5) A new syllabus in social studies for primary schools is in the course of preparation. As it is probable that this new course will include sections on map skills and map interpretation, the Primary Schools Advisory Curriculum Board does not consider that atlases should be supplied to children in grade 4 until the new courses are available.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr. HALL: I have received a letter from a constituent living in an area west of Balaklava who has expressed concern at the extremely dry conditions existing in his area. He draws attention to the fact that stock transporters, who have been carrying numbers of sheep from the area to other States, particularly New South Wales, have been able to backload with stocks of hay from the Murray River irrigation area and irrigation areas in other States. My constituent says that that practice has resulted in offsetting the effects of the drought on dairy and beef cattle herds in the area. However, he is concerned that when most of that movement of sheep ceases (as is likely in the next several weeks) the ability to obtain hay by the convenient and relatively cheap method of backloading from other States will be removed. As a result, a farmer or grazier, with the nucleus of his herds left in this area, will be placed in a difficult situation. Will the Minister of Agriculture refer this matter to the committee that has been set up in South Australia to examine the effects of the drought?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. McANANEY: On Friday I inspected wind damage and drought distress in my area, and this morning I spoke to the Chairman of the Drought Relief Committee. I congratulate him, his committee, and the Minister of Agriculture on getting the application forms out so promptly. One or two people in the area have not the finance necessary to resow their crops and plants that have been blown out. In one case, a man had 2,200 sheep, valued by a stock firm at $8 a head, but he had borrowed nearly up to the amount of the equity. He had to sell 1,100 for only $1 or $2 each. The remainder are valued at $1 each, and he owes the stock firm more money than the value of that stock. I understand that an application for assistance is to be submitted to the Commonwealth Government, but that will be far too slow to help the man resow the crops that have been blown out. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has considered setting up the machinery whereby a person in these difficulties could obtain immediate finance to enable him, in the event of rain, to resow his crops and thereby produce what would be an asset to the State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: All aspects have been considered, and I ask the honourable member to advise his constituents to contact the district adviser at Murray Bridge and state their case. Every effort will be made to help these people cope with the situation. The banks and stock firms have co-operated with the committee in agreeing, in every case that has been presented to them so far, to make available carry-on finance to assist in the immediate situation. Representations to the Commonwealth Government need supplementary legislation by the States, and that is also being considered. The committee has

acted quickly on the motion that all members supported in this House last Thursday. A detailed application is being submitted, through the Premier, to the Prime Minister this week. In fact, the draft is expected to be ready soon. It is apparent that we cannot ask for a set sum at this stage, because we do not know how much will be involved. However, every piece of information regarding the present situation has been collated and will be conveyed to the Commonwealth Government within a day or two.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to enable the Government to make advances to supplement assistance that may be given by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is what we intend to do and what it will be necessary for us to do once money has been made available by the Commonwealth, as we hope it will be.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Does the State assistance depend on the Commonwealth assistance?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Not necessarily; possibly there will be need for State assistance as well. However, we hope that Commonwealth assistance will be provided, and that will be supplemented by the State. The matter will be dealt with at the appropriate time.

WILLIAMSTOWN SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 20 about the need to fence the playing area opposite the Williamstown Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports that a scheme has been prepared for the removal of all existing fencing and for the erection of new chain mesh fencing along the main Williamstown Road frontage, new post and wire fencing along the Yacka Creek Road frontage, and for the erection of sheep fencing along the remaining boundary. The priority of the work has been reviewed, and it is now intended to call public tenders in August.

INDUSTRIAL LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is reported in the *Financial Review* of July 19 that John Lysaght had bought a large tract of industrial land at Western Port in Victoria. The report states:

As reported last April, John Lysaght is considering both Western Port and a site at Port Adelaide for its new coal reduction mill. The South Australian Government has offered to sell the company a site and has made an attractive offer on services.

I have been informed this morning (I do not know how reliable this information is) that a decision has been made by the company concerned to establish at Western Port and not at Port Adelaide. Has the Premier any knowledge of a decision on this matter; has the decision gone against us; and, if it has, what reasons impelled the company not to establish at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision has been communicated to me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier follow this matter up to ascertain whether, in fact, a decision has been made, and will he then inform the House, whether it be favourable or unfavourable to us?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have certainly had some negotiations with the Chairman of Directors of this company and have been assured by him that, when a decision has been made, it will be communicated to me. No such decision has been communicated to me yet. I do not think it proper for me to give any undertaking other than that I shall conduct (as I have conducted) negotiations properly with him.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you let us know the result?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not the slightest doubt that, when a result occurs, it will be made public.

SOLAR SALT PLANT

Mr. COUMBE: A technical publication announced last week that yet another large contract had gone to the north-west of Western Australia, this time to the Port Hedland area where the Leslie Salt Company of America is setting up a solar salt plant. A year or two ago the Public Works Committee reported on a project in Spencer Gulf at Port Paterson, to undertake solar salt development. Can the Premier say whether this project will not proceed in South Australia, or will he undertake to see whether the facilities for development which are available at the top of Spencer Gulf can be used by another salt company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

COUNCIL FUNDS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Several councils in my district have expressed to me their concern at the way in which the Highways Department makes late allocation of funds for

expenditure on certain projects, virtually directing that unless the projects are completed before June 30 the money will not be made available. Unquestionably this results in unprofitable expenditure. I wonder whether an arrangement could be made whereby moneys allocated for works towards the end of a year could be placed in a council's trust fund for expenditure on the approved work. Alternatively, could the works be transferred to debit order in the Highways Department? I am concerned that money is being spent unprofitably, and I am sure that legislation could be introduced to provide that the work could be carried out more profitably to the advantage of all concerned. Therefore, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Local Government to consider possible improvements to the present scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

BIRDWOOD HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 25 about repainting of the Birdwood High School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Three departmental painters are currently engaged on the painting of this school. It is not possible to give an accurate date for the completion of the work as this will depend on whether additional painters who are currently engaged on other urgent works can be made available. Every effort will be made to complete the painting of this school at the earliest possible date.

FORESTRY

Mr. RODDA: Earlier this year I asked the Minister of Forests about the forestry planting programme. Can he now say what progress has been made, bearing in mind the extremely dry season we have experienced?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the honourable member said, this year's programme has been late in starting because of the dry season. However, as it has now started, I will try to ascertain the progress made and inform the honourable member as soon as possible.

RENMARK SEEPAGE

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Irrigation yet obtained information regarding the project at Renmark for the disposal of saline water?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The evaporation basin to be constructed by the Renmark Irrigation Trust is on Bulyong Island. This is not an island in the true sense of the word, but an area of land situated between the Murray River and Ral Ral Creek and is commonly known as Bulyong Island. I notice that a contract was let by the Renmark Irrigation Trust about a fortnight ago for the construction of this evaporation basin which is to be near block E of the trust area and is to replace the present block E evaporation basin which has insufficient surface area and volume to contain the extra water to be drained from area 5 of the trust's comprehensive drainage scheme. The present block E basin is in too close a proximity to some plantings within block E to enable the volume of this basin to be increased. The banks of the present basin, which has been in use for some years, were not constructed on sound engineering principles and could be in danger of bursting even with the present loading. This basin was the one which was the cause of the increased salt load in the river last year, but the breach was man-made, although inquiries did not result in ascertaining the culprits. Incidentally, only within the last week or so the trust had to take steps to make temporary arrangements to divert water from this seepage basin as the water in the seepage basin was brimming the banks and there was a danger that it would flow over the banks into the river.

The proposition to transfer this basin was placed before the Renmark Rehabilitation Advisory Committee (comprised of officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Lands Department, and Renmark Irrigation Trust), and the plans and specifications were examined by engineers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department before my approval was given to the trust to undertake the work. The soil in the area has the same general characteristics as all river flat areas and is expected to hold satisfactorily. However, no specific tests were carried out on this site. It is pointed out that it is of the same soil type as is in use for the curtain to seal off Chowilla dam, and also similar to that existing at the Disher Creek basin which was put in some years ago. River silts which comprise the soils in these areas are relatively impervious and, provided sufficiently well constructed embankments are made to contain the basin, very little, if any, of the saline water is likely to seep back into the river. The basins are designed so that they are not overtopped in times of high river level unless the flow is in excess of 10,000 cusecs, which is sufficient to absorb water from the evaporation basin without any significant increase in its salinity. It

is considered that the discharge from the evaporation basin is a much less potential danger than the uncontrolled movement of ground water below irrigation areas seeping back into the river and this problem is currently being investigated in relation to the disposal of seepage waters from irrigation areas by means of deep bores.

STIRLING BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about plans of the Highways Department for beautifying the area between Measdays and Stirling?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that Professor Spooner of the University of Sydney, who specializes in highway landscaping, and is consultant to the New South Wales Department of Main Roads, was engaged to prepare a beautification scheme for the south-eastern freeway. The proposal recommended by him for the Crafers-Stirling section has been adopted and is currently being implemented. It is intended to plant 25,000 ground cover plants and 5,000 exotic and natural trees within the next two months.

DENTAL HOSPITAL

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about what could be done to overcome the delays occurring at the Adelaide Dental Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not see the answer here, but I will ascertain where it is.

SULPHUR

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from the Minister of Mines what investigations are being made in South Australia about supplies of sulphur, which is an important component in superphosphate? Also, will the Minister ascertain from his colleague whether the Mines Department investigates what minerals may be contained in drill cores taken out during oil-drilling operations, because I understand that the cores are being taken out without any examination being made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall take up the matters with my colleague and get a report.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the Watervale water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The current overall proposal to serve Leasingham, Watervale, Penwortham and Sevenhill has been divided into three possible schemes, all taking water from the Warren trunk main. The following alternative schemes have been investigated—

1. Supply to Leasingham and Watervale;
2. Supply to Leasingham, Watervale and Penwortham; and
3. Supply to Leasingham, Watervale, Penwortham and Sevenhill.

Alternative routes have been considered, the chosen route being that supplying most properties and having good storage sites. The scheme to supply Watervale requires two pumping lifts to balancing storages with possible alternative pumping equipment in the first lift to allow for the large variation of the piezometric head in the Warren trunk main. The latter problem is, of course, common to each alternative. To extend the supply to Penwortham would require an additional pumping station and small tank just north of the town, while scheme 3 to extend still further to Sevenhill provides for a larger main from the third pumping station and a larger third storage tank to balance the demand on the system. Branch mains covering most properties that can be supplied by gravity from the trunk system have been included in each case. All schemes would be subject to investigation by the Public Works Committee.

MOUNT GAMBIER SEWERAGE

Mr. BURDON: I took up with the Minister of Works, on behalf of some constituents who lived in Cardinia Street, Mount Gambier, the matter of providing sewerage connections to Housing Trust houses in that street. Has the Minister a report on that matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Acting General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

All the Housing Trust's rental houses at Mount Gambier have been connected to sewers or are in the process of being connected, with the exception of 16 pairs of double-unit houses in the Cardinia Street area. The trust has concentrated on the connection of houses in those areas where considerable difficulty has been experienced in disposing of effluent considered to be a health hazard. Tenders for the connection of the remaining houses are to be called immediately and it is expected that work will commence within two weeks of the acceptance of the successful tender.

EASEMENT PAYMENTS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 25 about when payment for certain easements along the Whyalla to Port Lincoln powerline might be expected?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust has supplied the following information:

Payments for these easements are being made as surveys are completed and other documents can be prepared for settlement. Payment has been made in about half of the cases and others are in the process of being settled at present. It is expected that all payments will be made by the end of September.

BUSINESS DIRECTORY

Mr. McKEE: One of my constituents who conducts a business at Port Pirie complained to me at the weekend that he had received accounts from a publishing company operating in Victoria and New South Wales under the name of Park Enterprises. It seems that the company publishes business names in a directory and then forwards to those concerned accounts for this service, although the names are published without the authority of those concerned. Can the Premier, as Attorney-General, say whether the company, by doing this, is breaking the law, and can he comment on the company's activities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not seem that the company is breaking the law. On the other hand, it is endeavouring to induce firms and concerns to whom it sends accounts to pay those accounts, even though the service for which the accounts are rendered has not been contracted for. My simple advice to people who receive such accounts is to ignore them.

WATER PUMPING

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say what schedule is being maintained on pumping along the Mannum-Adelaide main?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We are pumping at full capacity for 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

ISLINGTON LAND

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier inform the House of any further decisions that may have been made about allocation of land at Islington that was at one time used for sewage disposal? I have in mind what I understand to be a decision to relocate the venue of the buildings to serve the new Institute of Technology. As this is now to be built at The Levels instead of at the former Islington sewage farm, can the Premier say how the land will be reallocated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, final planning decisions have not been made, but I shall ascertain what stage the matter has reached.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE

Mr. COUMBE: Last week, in a reply from the Minister of Local Government about the progress of the Torrens River Committee's investigations, I was told that the question of pollution was a matter for the Minister of Health and not for the committee, as the committee was not qualified nor was this matter included in its terms of reference. Will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain a report on investigations into pollution and what action will be taken to overcome the problem?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but as the Minister of Health is absent from South Australia I shall not be able to obtain a reply until next week.

CHLORINATION PLANT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although it was announced a considerable time ago that a chlorination plant was to be installed at the Happy Valley reservoir, I understand that this plant has only just started operating. Can the Minister of Works say whether the plant has commenced operating in the last couple of weeks and, if it has, why there was an apparently long delay before it operated?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: After approval was given to install the plant, certain equipment had to be ordered and to be supplied. I believe that it was installed at the earliest date, but, as I do not know how long the plant has operated, I shall inquire and inform the honourable member tomorrow.

ROAD GRANTS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Monday morning's newspaper reported that various sums had been allocated by the Commonwealth Government to the States for road-making purposes. As this sum must be known before the State authority can finalize its road programme for the year and then announce it, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether the road programme for the Highways Department is likely to be announced soon and, if it is, whether it will contain details of the sum allocated to each State district as set out by the Highways Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain that information from my colleague.

TRANSPORT COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Since the House sat last week a news item has appeared in the press that the report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services is likely to be available towards the end of the year. As it is desirable that senior public servants engaged on work associated with the Commission should return to their normal duties as soon as possible, and as the Government will want to mould its policy on transport services for the next election on the basis of the Royal Commission's report, has the Premier more definite information as to when the report is likely to be made public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, and I suggest to the honourable member that he do not make the assumptions that he is obviously making.

PANORAMA TRANSPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply from the Minister of Transport to the question I asked on July 20 about an extension of the Colonel Light Gardens bus service southward to Panorama Drive?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague reports that the housing development in the Panorama area is still confined mainly to the east of Goodwood Road, and the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust considers that an extension of the Colonel Light Gardens bus service along Goodwood Road to Panorama Drive cannot be justified at present. However, the trust is prepared to consider the provision of a bus service to Panorama via Eliza Place or Vancouver Avenue, but has been unable to obtain the necessary approval from the Mitcham council for the use of these roadways as a bus route.

BELLEVUE HEIGHTS SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the projected date for the establishment of a primary school at Bellevue Heights and the department's plans for the future establishment of a high school in that area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Very careful consideration has been given only recently to the provision of new works for the school-building programme. The need for new schools in a number of developing areas is fully recognized, but sufficient funds are not available to build all of them at present. It is, therefore, essential to allot priorities to enable those schools most urgently required to be built first.

New primary schools are required that have a higher degree of priority than the one to serve the Bellevue Heights area. Therefore, a request has not yet been made to the Director of the Public Buildings Department to prepare plans for a primary school in that district. On present indications, it will probably be some two or three years before a primary school will be available to serve the Bellevue Heights district. It is not intended to establish a high school in the Bellevue Heights area.

OLD BELAIR ROAD

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on July 25 about plans for the reconstruction of the Old Belair Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the Highways Department is aware of the deficiencies of this road, which is the responsibility of the Mitcham corporation. However, planning work is proceeding and the relationship of the Belair area to the Adelaide Plains is receiving consideration. No statement can be made at present as to when an acceptable scheme will be finalized, but it is possible that the position could be clearer at the end of this year.

PESTICIDES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What contaminating or side effects do pesticide residues have on water in—
   (*a*) the Murray River generally;
   (*b*) metropolitan reservoirs; and
   (*c*) streams such as the Torrens, Onkaparinga, Inman and Hindmarsh Rivers?

2. What are the pesticide residue levels both upstream and downstream of Murray River locks and weirs?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has not undertaken tests to ascertain whether there are any contaminating or side effects on the water supplies in this State owing to pesticide residues. It is intended to conduct such a survey soon, as pesticides may enter water supplies by run-off from agricultural land. However, careful investigations carried out by authorities in the United States of America, where the use of pesticides is on a far greater scale than in this State, have so far failed to record their presence at a level

of any public health significance. Furthermore, fish are extremely sensitive to the presence of organic pesticides in water at a level far below that known to be toxic to man. They may be used, therefore, with every confidence, as "guinea pigs" to monitor these compounds in water. There is no record of fish dying as a consequence of this type of pesticide in any waters under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Mr. FERGUSON (on notice):

1. What was the total number of employees in the Mines Department at June 30, 1967?

2. What was the total number of salaried staff who were classified at that date as—

(*a*) professional;
(*b*) sub-professional;
(*c*) general; and
(*d*) clerical?

3. What was the total number of weekly-paid employees in this department at June 30, 1967?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are as follows:

1. The total number of employees in the Mines Department at June 30, 1967, was 404.

2. The total number of salaried staff classified was as follows:

(*a*) professional, 79;
(*b*) sub-professional, 40;
(*c*) general, 21;
(*d*) clerical, 73.

3. The total number of weekly-paid employees was 191.

ROAD TAX

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (on notice):

1. What was the total amount received from the ton-mile tax?

2. How much of this has been allocated to district councils?

3. To which local government authorities was this money allocated and what was the amount in each instance?

4. Who allocates this money to the respective local government authorities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The amounts collected under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act since its inception have been:

	$
1964-65	1,426,200
1965-66	1,903,177
1966-67	2,070,118
Total	$5,399,495

Specific allocations to councils have never been made direct from the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Account. The Highways Department allocates the contributions to the various districts based on their road needs, bearing in mind the mileages of interstate highways, the traffic volumes, land development, and the population. The collections received under the Act are considered when determining the overall allocation of the funds for road and bridge works, including grants to councils.

POINT PEARCE

Mr. FERGUSON (on notice):

1. What is the total number of Aborigines employed at Point Pearce Mission Reserve?

2. What numbers are employed in—

(*a*) primary production; and
(*b*) other occupations?

3. What are the total wages paid weekly to Aboriginal employees at Point Pearce?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are as follows:

1. 65.
2. (*a*) 17.
(*b*) 48.
3. $1,796.

CHRISTIES BEACH NORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL

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

Ordered that report be printed.

LICENSING BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from July 27. Page 910.)

Clause 19—"Publican's licence."

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

In subclause (1) (*a*) to strike out "nine" and insert "six".

Bearing in mind an amendment that I shall move shortly, I am seeking to reduce the period during which publicans will be entitled to operate from 13 hours (as at present provided for in the Bill) to 12 hours. My main purpose, however, is to give members an opportunity to say whether they desire trading hours to be extended to 10 p.m. Personally, I should have preferred this matter to be the subject of a referendum. About three or four years ago, when the people of Victoria voted at a referendum against the extension of liquor trading hours, the Bolte Government

set up a Royal Commission that eventually recommended 10 p.m. closing, and legislation was enacted accordingly. If I did not intend to move an amendment to alter the closing time from 10 to 6 p.m., no opportunity would exist for members to debate the matter.

I believe that ample opportunity exists at present for people to obtain all the liquor they require; there is no need to extend trading hours, as the Bill seeks to do. Many people have written to me expressing opposition to an extension of trading hours. From what I observed when recently in New South Wales, I believe that such an extension will not remove the "six o'clock swill". Indeed, from what I noticed in Cairns some time ago (fighting, etc., in the street outside the hotel) there could well be a "10 o'clock swill". It seems to me that the Bill only extends the time for this to happen.

The Royal Commissioner in Victoria could not see any decrease in the swill situation by extending hours to 10 p.m. Victoria has not had 10 p.m. closing for long, and I think that in some ways South Australian people have enjoyed more extended hours than have other States. I recently attended an Agricultural Council meeting in Darwin and found that everything, including dinner dances and social functions, closed at 10 p.m. and that no drink was available after that. On the other hand, under the Act, drink can be obtained here until 11.15 p.m., so there is no need for an increase in hours. The increase in accidents and alcoholism which has occurred both in South Australia and other States will perturb members, and for this reason I will vote to retain the *status quo*. According to Dr. Birrell, the Victorian Police Medical Officer, half the accidents are caused by some form of alcoholic beverage being consumed. Therefore, if we increase the opportunities for the consumption of liquor, more accidents will occur on our roads.

According to the Road Safety Council, there has been an increase in the number of fatalities throughout Australia over recent years. In 1966, 3,149 fatal accidents occurred and, in 1967, 3,282 occurred—an increase of 133. In New South Wales, in the same year there were 1,141 accidents, compared with 1,153 in 1967—an increase of 12. In Victoria, 918 fatal road accidents occurred in 1966 (the first year of 10 p.m. closing), compared with 971 in 1967—a substantial increase of 73. In 1966, 248 fatal accidents occurred in South Australia, compared with 284 in 1967—an increase of 36. In 1963-64, 22,912 accidents occurred in South Australia and an increase occurred in 1964-65 when 27,038 occurred. In 1963-64, 8,363 people were injured, compared with 9,777 in 1964-65. It can therefore be seen that the number of accidents in Australia is continually increasing.

The police report shows that in 1964-65 there were 7,110 convictions for drunkenness and 620 for driving under the influence. I cannot see any reason why we should increase trading hours until something concrete is done to overcome the spate of accidents caused by people driving under the influence of alcohol. The following table shows details of accidents which occurred as a result of persons driving under the influence:

Year	Total accidents reported	Casualties	Persons Killed	Persons Injured
1962	218	76	3	100
1963	235	84	3	119
1964	248	67	2	88
1965 (for first 6 months)	80	18	1	22

I have figures showing the hours during which accidents have occurred in South Australia, and it is interesting to note that the greatest percentage of accidents from 1962 to 1966 occurred between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. If one examines the statistical statement of road accidents which occurred in New South Wales for the year ended December 31, one will see the percentage of accidents there is high between 10 p.m. and midnight. That State also has a fairly high preponderance of accidents between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. In fact, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. 15.3 per cent of their accidents occur; from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. 14.4 per cent occur, and from 10 p.m. to midnight 11.7 per cent occur. The number of road accidents which occur in South Australia between 10 p.m. and midnight is much smaller than that. If our trading hours are extended, our accident rate could increase. Both

individuals and organizations have expressed alarm at the proposed increase of hours to 10 p.m., and they have suggested that it would be even more difficult than it is now for young ladies to walk along the street at night because of people coming out of hotels under the influence of alcohol. Many people believe that, when men return from work in the evening, the right place for them to be is at home with their wives and children. Some people go out at night, taking their families with them. They visit places where entertainment is provided and where alcoholic liquor is served; no law of the State prohibits the sale of liquor in such cases. In fact, our law is probably more liberal than the laws of other States in this respect. In other States, often the main entertainment is not held in bars but is held in other places where liquor can be provided; and it can be provided in similar places in this State under the existing law. Therefore, it is unnecessary to increase trading hours in respect of hotel bars, saloons and lounges. I believe the people should be given the opportunity to decide about this matter as they were given the opportunity to decide about a lottery. Various sections of people have different opinions on this matter. I am speaking on behalf of constituents who have made representations to me.

Mr. Quirke: Most of them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not know. I have had representations from all sides of this issue, but I speak on behalf of those who have asked that the *status quo* be retained. I intend to use my opportunity in this place to vote on the matter. I shall call for a division on my first and second amendments, because my second amendment is more important and relates to whether hotel trading hours should be extended from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. My attitude to the rest of my amendments will depend on the result of the vote on my second amendment.

Mr. HUGHES: I support the amendment. In the second reading debate, I supported the Bill with certain reservations. I said that I would support the third reading if certain clauses were amended. I gave valid reasons for opposing certain clauses, especially in relation to those dealing with 10 p.m. closing. From time to time, some honourable members have said that 10 p.m. closing does not result in more drinking. However, during the second reading debate I quoted the following article that appeared in the financial pages of the *Advertiser* of March 17, under the heading "Late Closing Lifts Victorian Hotel Sales":

Melbourne, March 16—Carlton Brewery Limited's hotels had improved overall sales since the introduction of 10 o'clock closing, the chairman (Mr. J. M. Baillieu) said at the annual meeting today. A significant feature was that demand for bulk beer had increased while sales of packaged beer had declined, he said. Carlton Brewery is the largest shareholder in Carlton and United Breweries Limited and owns 13 hotels. Mr. Baillieu said that all of Carlton Brewery's hotels were in "good shape", and should help profitability in the future.

If those 13 hotels experienced increased sales of intoxicating liquor, surely other hotels in Victoria would have experienced similar increases. Referring to this, the member for Gumeracha said:

The extension of liquor trading hours will undoubtedly lead to an increase in the consumption of alcohol. There is clear evidence of that. The member for Wallaroo gave evidence on this matter that cannot be denied.

In fact, no argument was advanced during the second reading debate to refute the statement that later closing of hotels resulted in increased liquor consumption. I do not desire to tell my fellow men what to do and, likewise, I should not like them to tell me what to drink. Although many people of South Australia know how to handle liquor, a few who are not able to protect themselves must be protected. I do not know whether any other honourable member has had at his house at midnight or 1 a.m. families on the verge of being broken up because of the effect of intoxicating liquor, but I have experienced that.

I support the amendment because of the many personal representations that have been made to me by constituents. I want to protect not the man of the house but the wife and children who suffer because the man does not drink sensibly. I have tried to patch up many families that were affected by drinking. The report in the *Advertiser* shows that statements made about extension to 10 p.m. not affecting sales of intoxicating liquor have been incorrect. If my statement were not correct, Mr. Baillieu would not have said what he did about Carlton Breweries. I cannot support the clause as it stands and I support the Minister's amendment, which is needed even if it affords protection to only one child.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This issue was settled long ago in the mind of the public, who see our deliberations as centreing on whether we shall extend the trading hours for the sale and consumption of liquor. I am sure that they consider it a foregone conclusion that the hours will be extended to bring trading conditions in South Australia into line

with those in the other States. The people ought to have what they desire, and the amendments do not meet those desires. Despite the opinions that have been expressed by the Minister of Agriculture and the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), people are far better equipped now to avoid the dangers of over-consumption of liquor than they were years ago. The evils that have been referred to will exist regardless of whether trading hours are extended. At present modern hotels operate regularly on permits that are not affected by the provision dealing with 6 p.m. closing. I oppose the amendment.

I brought this matter forward first when I said I would move for an amendment of the Act to provide for 10 p.m. closing. Subsequently, the Government appointed a Royal Commission but did not accept the Commissioner's recommendation that the Act be amended immediately to provide for 10 p.m. closing and that other recommendations be dealt with afterwards. The Commissioner says, at page 28 of his report:

I cannot see any reason against the coming into operation as soon as legislatively practicable the recommendations under term of reference 1 (*g*) (the hours during which and the conditions under which intoxicating liquor may be sold supplied or consumed upon licensed premises or upon premises in respect of which permits may be granted) and of the recommendations under Driving of Motor Vehicles. The setting up of a new licensing court, and administrative preparations, will require some time—the exact extent of which might well prove impossible to forecast, and amendments effecting those changes and consequential upon them would appear to require proclamation of the date when actually ready.

I have read in the newspaper that the Premier has forecast when 10 p.m. closing may operate in this State and I am sure that he is ready to blame the Opposition if this forecast does not eventuate, the same as he has blamed the Opposition many times. However, the Government had this recommendation from the Commissioner and 10 p.m. closing could have been introduced much earlier.

Mr. CASEY: I oppose the amendment. This is the time and the opportunity to give effect to something that the people of this State have required for many years.

Mr. McKee: The Leader of the Opposition could have done something about introducing it when he was on the Government benches.

Mr. CASEY: I do not want to bring politics into the matter. The Leader of the Opposition can do that if he wants to. Later closing in this State is a must. It brings us into line with other States and, with transport between States more convenient today, many more people travel from one State to another. I agree with the member for Wallaroo that there may be an increase in the amount of liquor consumed, and that, if trading hours are extended, sales will increase. If a retail store opened until 10 p.m. its sales would increase, too.

Mr. Clark: That does not necessarily follow.

Mr. CASEY: Perhaps not, but it has been proved in other States that this is the case concerning liquor. This extension will enable people to drink in a more civilized manner.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They will become more civilized.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Are you suggesting they are not civilized at present?

Mr. CASEY: With the "6 o'clock swill" people consume too much liquor in a short time, but with extended hours this practice will not continue. I am sure this legislation will benefit the people of this State.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It may be suggested that, because of my views, I shall support the Minister, but I do not think I agree with that contention. Some of his submissions were accurate and I sympathize with them but, basically, the amendment is based on the assumption that an increase in trading hours will result in an increase in the amount of liquor consumed. Perhaps I would have strongly supported this amendment 12 months ago, but since then I have travelled overseas, and I am not sure that I am of the same opinion now. In most countries trading hours for liquor are more liberal than they are in this State, but some of the standards in those countries need not be held up as examples to us. However, the addiction to alcohol in a public manner was not greater in other countries than it is here.

Apparently, the South Australian public has satisfied itself that it wants 10 p.m. closing, and I think that opponents of this view have decided that it is inevitable. If we oppose this amendment there would be constant agitation to change the hour again. Today, the public wants to express an opinion on many things in the community. Some years ago I attended an Agricultural Council meeting in Sydney, and I told my counterpart in that State that I should like to see how 10 p.m. closing operated. He supplied a car, and that evening we did a pub crawl commencing at Woolloomooloo, through Kings Cross and Redfern, and through some of the more salubrious suburbs. We visited many hotels, spoke to

the barmen and the proprietors, and observed what was happening. We stayed until closing time, and then visited other hotels to see what was happening at 10 p.m. There were not many people in bars and saloons, but the cabaret sections of the hotels, where a floor show of lamentably low quality was in progress, were crowded. Many families were sitting at tables, the youngsters drinking something soft and the parents drinking something different, but the whole atmosphere was decidedly poor for a family gathering. I hope that the taste of South Australians is higher than was the taste of these people.

In some hotels in the industrial suburbs the people in the bar could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Several hotel proprietors told us that the longer trading hours were a disadvantage, because they increased costs without an offsetting financial advantage. I saw no evidence of undue addiction to alcohol at 10 p.m., although in the suburbs I visited I had a good opportunity to observe what was happening. I believe that the hotel trade in South Australia, in the main, does not desire 10 p.m. closing. Those to whom I have spoken say that, although two years ago (when the matter first became an issue) proprietors of licensed premises favoured a change, the general attitude is now somewhat different as they realize what the change will entail. I believe it is feared by many people connected with hotels (particularly country hotels) that they will be involved in long hours, with no benefit to themselves, financially or in any other way.

Had this question of 10 p.m. closing been posed in isolation from any other extensions, I would certainly have voted for the amendment. However, I believe that to shut hotels down at 6 p.m. and to allow all other licences to operate is not fair to the people whom we expect to provide a service and whom we tax heavily in their provision of that service. As the effect of the amendment may well be to divert people from hotels to some other place (a club, restaurant, cabaret, or theatre, etc.), I shall probably not support the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON: When 10 p.m. closing was first suggested, it was said that there would be much opposition to it by the churches. However, that opposition has not eventuated, probably because, when a percentage of the people constituting a particular church acknowledges that it is in order to consume alcohol, that percentage decides the attitude to be adopted. I previously said that the churches (the Methodist Church in particular) were not opposed to the extension of trading hours. That statement was confirmed by what the General Secretary of the Methodist Conference later told me. In fact, he said that the church had decided to take a neutral stand on the matter. Lack of opposition by the churches is further evidenced by the following document:

CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INC.

To all ministers and church secretaries: The subcommittee appointed by the executive committee of the union to consider provisions in the Licensing Bill currently before Parliament brought its report to council, and recommended that no action be taken in respect of the provisions of the Bill. It further recommended that information be sought from the Director of Christian Education of the Congregational Union of New South Wales regarding a current school programme of family life education in New South Wales. In receiving this report, the council invited the subcommittee to send a statement thereon to the churches.

The members of the subcommittee are aware that there will be differences of opinion among our people regarding the Bill generally: there are some who will welcome legislation to regularize more effectively the sale and distribution of alcoholic liquor, and there are some who are averse to any legislation which would seem to provide increased facilities for such sale and distribution. Any decisions of our churches, however, should be based on facts and evidence, and not mere emotion. The subcommittee took into account the report of the Royal Commissioner in South Australia, the report of the Royal Commission in Victoria, and the recommendations of the Temperance Alliance, and these were studied alongside the provisions of the Bill. It is of the opinion that our churches should themselves consult these documents which are obtainable from the Government Printer.

For example, the attention of our churches is directed to evidence given in respect of altered trading hours, and to the results of such as far as they can be ascertained in the experience of other States in the Commonwealth. It should also be noted that some of the clauses of the Bill enable regulation to be made of practices already in operation in our society, which practices are at present illegal, but which society generally, including the Police Force, considers reasonable and inoffensive. Concerning the two points most frequently raised in relation to the proposed legislation, viz., the consumption of alcohol and road accidents, it seems from experience in other States that: (*a*) the total consumption of alcoholic beverages has not noticeably increased with lengthened hours; and (*b*) road accidents attributable to alcohol tend now to occur mainly between 10 p.m. and midnight rather than between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. as formerly, but have not increased in number.

In coming to its conclusions, the subcommittee recognized that social legislation was designed, and must be designed, both to safeguard the rights and to regularize the behaviour of the whole community. The subcommittee is of the opinion that the Bill seeks generally a credible way of achieving these ends in relation to alcoholic beverages . . .

The lack of organized or personal approaches to me have suggested either that people generally are not opposed to extended hours or that they are indifferent and unconcerned about this matter. I therefore oppose the amendment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I cannot support the first amendment of the Minister of Agriculture, which has been so enthusiastically supported by the member for Wallaroo. Generally, 10 p.m. closing is accepted by South Australians. I have received only one or two representations from my constituents on this matter. Everywhere I go I find that 10 p.m. closing is no longer an open issue: in the minds of most people it is settled. The member for Wallaroo and I have something in common: we both represent barley-growing districts; so we have a vested interest in the liquor industry (certainly in the barley-growing industry); and it is our responsibility to promote the interests of barleygrowers in our districts. I was interested to hear him say that 10 p.m. closing would encourage more drinking, to which the member for Frome agreed. However, that does not seem to be the Victorian experience, and I refer to statements in an article appearing in today's press. Perhaps it will cause the member for Wallaroo to support the 10 p.m. closing provision. There is, first, a statement by the Secretary of the Victorian Temperance Alliance (Rev. E. S. Sanders), who said that late closing had brought a better approach to drinking. He also said:

There is more mixed drinking, more drinking sitting down, more food being eaten with drink. But the same amount of liquor is being drunk, with the result that there is less drunkenness and fewer immediate problems.

Further on in the article, Mr. Ron Aitken, Managing Director of the South Australian Brewing Company Limited is quoted as having said that it was very difficult to estimate what late closing would mean to hotel trade. He said:

Experience in other States has shown there is an immediate and fairly substantial increase in the sales of draught beer. This reflects in the sales of bottled beer, which drop commensurately.

I hope the honourable member for Wallaroo heard that. The article continues:

After a few months the demand tapers off and trade settles down to only a slight increase in the sales of draught beer, and a very slight drop in bottled beer sales.

Earlier in the article it is stated that the Victorian Royal Commissioner on licensing (Sir Philip Phillips) said:

People are not drinking any more now than they did before late closing was introduced.

The article goes on to make further comments favourable to late closing which are alleged to have been said by the Victorian Chief Secretary (Mr. Rylah). I hope the member for Wallaro will see the light and oppose the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: When I leave this place (which will not be long delayed) and take to heart what the member for Wallaroo said, I think I will set up as a consultant, with the proviso that my clients provide the necessary means of practice. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I support the amendment for two or three reasons. We frequently hear that the public wants 10 p.m. closing. However, since the Bill has been before Parliament I have received a number of letters, some of them petitions, not one of which has requested me to support 10 p.m. closing. In fact, they have all requested that I oppose it. I noticed that at the last election neither Party was prepared to put 10 p.m. closing as a plank of its platform. Why not? At the time of the election, hotel trading hours were said to be a social matter that should be viewed by each person as he saw fit. However, if 10 p.m. closing was wanted so strongly by the people and if it was to become the subject of a Government Bill, it is rather strange that these facts were not stated at the time of the election. In fact, none of the provisions of the Bill was referred to at the time of the election. I agree with the member for Flinders when he says that the great increase in the number of outlets for the sale of liquor will deny to hotels, if they are not provided for, an opportunity for fair trading. I go further than that: I do not believe it is desirable to increase the number of outlets.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not advocate that, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I realize that. I think the Premier will agree that, as a result of all the changes in the Bill, there will be social consequences. However, they will not be felt for some time. I believe they have not been fully felt in New South Wales or Victoria, although I speak with some

difficulty on this matter because I do not drink alcoholic liquor. All members must realize that it is not desirable for the community to encourage the consumption of alcoholic liquor. On a recent television programme, I heard expressed the views of people associated with the liquor industry. One person said that he thought that the consumption of alcohol at his hotel might not increase immediately but that, when young people acquired the new social habit, we would see the true effect of this legislation.

We should consider the long-term view. Undoubtedly the Bill increases the opportunities available for the consumption of alcohol and provides many more avenues for the sale of alcohol. It removes restrictions that have operated for many years. Strangely enough, the restriction of 6 p.m. closing was the result of a direct vote by the people of South Australia. After having experienced 11 p.m. closing for many years, the people, with alternatives open to them, voted for 6 p.m. closing. That is one factor I cannot overlook. What use will be made of increased trading hours? If we allowed the Early Closing Act to lapse, immediately many people would find it convenient to buy all sorts of articles after 6 p.m. An example of this is the enormous business done by self-service petrol stations after 6 p.m. When 10 p.m. closing has been instituted, there will be an immediate demand for 11 p.m. closing, and then for closing at midnight.

I support the amendment because, first, 6 p.m. closing was introduced as a result of a direct vote of the people and should not be removed without a direct vote of the people. I doubt whether most people want it removed; housewives would prefer to see 6 p.m. closing remain. Secondly, I believe 10 p.m. closing will result in increased liquor consumption, despite the statements made that it will not. If it were not going to mean increased liquor consumption, why would those associated with the industry be so anxious for the hours to be extended? Hotelkeepers will be involved in employing extra staff or in paying overtime and they will not do this at a loss, as honourable members know. Many hotelkeepers in not particularly favourable localities (such as country areas with restricted trade available) are concerned about 10 p.m. closing; I believe this led to the Premier's including in the Bill a provision enabling certain hotelkeepers to close their hotels if they wished.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was in the Commissioner's report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and I am pleased to see that at least one of the things recommended in the Commissioner's report is included in the Bill. I support the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Gumeracha said that it was necessary to retain 6 p.m. closing to protect young people. However, I have observed extended drinking hours in many States and in other countries. Generally speaking, few young people were in hotels in the later hours. The only young people I saw entering were two who bought some bottled beer. It is the middle-aged people, not the young people, who frequent hotels in the late hours and who invest money in lotteries and with the Totalizator Agency Board. My six children have been allowed to drink whenever they want to and I think that it is better to have people happy and enjoying themselves dancing in a cabaret than to see them drinking in cars as far as a mile from a dance hall, as they did years ago. I think drinking should be conducted leisurely and, if we are to be civilized in our drinking habits, the first thing to do is to ensure that bars at which people have to stand up are not open after 6 p.m. The hotel keeper at Langhorne Creek, who is happy about the Bill, says he will be able to bring the television set into the bar. He tells me that this is the best thing that could happen to him.

I do not agree that a referendum on this matter is necessary, because members of Parliament are elected to make decisions and to accept such responsibilities as this. A referendum would be desirable were we considering the abolition of capital punishment, because the people ought to make up their minds about the taking of life. I think greater safety on the roads will result from the introduction of 10 p.m. closing, as this has been the case in Victoria. Anyone who goes too far can have the book thrown at him. I oppose the amendment. Taxi drivers in Melbourne have told me that the extremely busy period about 6.15 p.m. or 7 p.m. has disappeared and that men now take their wives to the hotels in a leisurely way. This is good for family life.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) was critical of my statement about representations made to me by my constituents on this matter. However, I can produce many petitions that have been presented to me by organizations and individuals and, I emphasize, by young people.

Mr. Clark: Does anyone doubt that?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently the honourable member doubted it and I am now justified in making this statement to members. The honourable member has allowed politics to influence him in a debate that I would have considered to be a study of what drinking laws would best benefit the people. Young people are vitally concerned about the matter. The member for Frome agreed with me that the extension of trading hours would increase the quantity of intoxicating liquor consumed, but he also said that he could find no evidence that this increase had had a detrimental effect in any other State.

Members opposite tried to imply that the churches in South Australia were neutral on this matter. However, that is not true. I shall refer to a statement by the Rev. Alan Walker, who was for some years attached to the Central Methodist Mission in Sydney. It has been emphasized this afternoon that the extension of trading hours in New South Wales made no difference in that State. I have great respect for the member for Flinders and I do not doubt the statements he has made about his tour. Rev. Alan Walker would be more fitted than any member of this Committee to make a statement, because he was at the nerve centre of these things, not for one night but for every night of the week. He said:

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

Continuing, he said:

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

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

That is sufficient reply to the member for Frome, who agreed with me that the introduction of longer trading hours would mean an increase in the amount of liquor consumed, but who disagreed with me about whether it would make any difference to the conduct of the people. I do not disbelieve anything the honourable member has said in good faith this afternoon, but I have great respect for the Rev. Alan Walker, who is greatly concerned with what takes place and with the social consequences affecting the people of New South Wales.

Mr. McKee: Can you suggest anything that might prevent this?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am replying to what has been said by other honourable members and trying to prove that there are other highly respected men with great experience of the effect of extended liquor hours. People who examine the question for a day or two cannot understand the problem as well as those who spend seven days and seven nights every week in the community. The Rev. Alan Walker has had much experience of this problem.

Mr. McKee: Do you think he would favour abolition?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know. I have great respect for him, and I know that he is greatly concerned for the people affected by this legislation. It has been said that churches in this State are becoming neutral on this matter, but I assure the Committee that the position is not quite as some honourable members would have us believe. An article in last Saturday's *Advertiser* states:

Grim Result of Liquor Predicted—It was a fairly safe prediction that, as a result of extended drinking hours, South Australia would reap some "grim" results, the Vice-President of the Temperance Alliance of South Australia (Rev. M. C. Trenorden) said yesterday.

Most honourable members know that the Rev, Trenorden was for some years the General Secretary of the United Churches Reform Board in this State, and that he is highly respected. The article continues:

At the opening of the annual fair of the Temperance Alliance of South Australia, Mr. Trenorden said that much more than the mere extension of four hours' trading in liquor bars was involved. There would be an increase in club and motel licences, restaurants and cabarets, storekeepers, and many others, with, in most cases, longer hours in which to consume alcohol. He predicted that in 10 years, there would be significant increases in broken homes, alcoholics, and road accidents, which the "sophisticated" of the day would say were caused by every other reason than the obvious.

That is my point: I am greatly concerned, as are the Rev. Alan Walker and the Rev. Trenorden, for that section of the people which cannot look after itself and which will suffer because of the effects of this legislation. That

is why I strongly oppose the clause and support the amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture that 6 p.m. closing should be retained.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is a pity that the member for Wallaroo quoted opinions of people outside this Chamber. He has quoted the opinions of church members, but other church members will have an opposite opinion. So many opinions are available that it is foolish to quote them; it is better to ascertain the facts for oneself, and to live with and understand the problem. The Rev. John Westerman, who has lived with and knows the problem equally as well as the Rev. Alan Walker, is the President of the Methodist Conference of Victoria, and he said:

On the whole, I think 10 o'clock closing has worked out reasonably satisfactorily. The road toll has remained pretty much the same, but there has been increased police activity in this field. I think the later closing is definitely to blame for the increase in car thefts. There has been no increase in drunkenness as far as I can gather. If people are going to drink, it is better they drink in this way than in the 6 o'clock manner—against the clock and on an empty stomach.

He should have a clear understanding of what is happening in Victoria. The Secretary of the Victorian Temperance Alliance (Rev. E. S. Sanders) said that late closing had brought a better approach to drinking. I do not always agree with the opinions of others, and I do not blame people if they disagree with my opinions. However, I have travelled and seen what goes on in other States and in other parts of the world, and I have formed by own opinions on this matter. Eighteen years ago I was in Western Australia, which was one of the first States to introduce 10 p.m. closing, and I saw how late closing operated. I was not impressed with it. I saw some horrible things in Western Australia but now, 18 years later, that State has prospered and progressed as much as any State in the Commonwealth, while the morals of the teenagers in South Australia are as bad as the morals of teenagers in other States that have late closing.

Mr. Casey: You mean they are not worse.

Mr. HEASLIP: They are as bad. Honourable members should not say that 10 p.m. closing will be calamitous to South Australia, because it will not be. If this State is to progress with the other States and the rest of the world, it will have to live and progress with late closing such as exists in those other places. In many cases the other States have made more progress than we have here. I do not oppose 10 p.m. closing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are one or two things that have been said by honourable members in the course of this debate on which I should say something. While every member of this Committee respects the sincerity and the beliefs of the Minister of Agriculture and the members who have supported his amendment, I cannot agree with their view that 10 p.m. closing is likely to have undesirable results in South Australia. It was clearly established before the Royal Commission that the people of South Australia required this as a facility and that, once 10 p.m. closing was introduced, new patterns in relation to the service and supply of liquor in hotels were likely to evolve. The member for Gumeracha has said that we can only take what comes in the short term with a grain of salt because, after all, new patterns will be established in the future, but the patterns already evident as becoming established elsewhere under 10 p.m. closing are much more desirable patterns of drinking and behaviour than the present pattern of drinking in the somewhat barely furnished bars, as we now know them.

The idea that there will be a 10 p.m. swill has not been borne out elsewhere. Undoubtedly, the swill of a considerable amount of liquor between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m. under conditions where often one would expect the people to concentrate on the drink in order to be oblivious of their surroundings, is something we should get rid of in South Australia. With a more leisurely pattern of drinking and surroundings that people can thoroughly enjoy, we shall have a different attitude towards the rapid consumption of alcohol in a short time. So I do not think there will be the difficulties envisaged. I remind honourable members that this provision for 10 p.m. closing is allied to the provision relating to drink of a .08 per cent alcohol blood test. In Victoria, this test combined with 10 p.m. closing has shown a reduction in the accident toll and in the incidence of driving under the influence of liquor. Wherever this provision has been tried elsewhere it has worked, and I think it will work well in South Australia.

The Leader of the Opposition chided the Government for not putting into effect certain portions of the Royal Commissioner's report about the early introduction of 10 p.m. closing. I point out to him that, while a section in the Commissioner's report suggested that the provision of general licensing amendments would take very much longer than has, in

fact, proved to be the case and he therefore suggested that the alteration in hours be introduced immediately, the report provided also for a flexible provision for hours. It provided, too, for alteration in the hours not only of hotels but of clubs and restaurants. We need the new provisions for clubs in order to cope with this.

If we are to have the new licensing system under which flexible hours are possible for licensed premises, then in this situation we need the new licensing tribunal, the methods prescribed by which applications for those flexible trading hours may be made, and the new provisions for objections by local citizens before the licensing tribunal to the applications that may be made by licensees. Precisely how that was to be coped with was not clear from the report, because the Commissioner did not deal with it. The Leader of the Opposition has never suggested how it could be coped with. All he has done is to try to make a political point about this and suggest, as a matter of politics, that we could have had 10 p.m. closing very much earlier. In fact, this was not a practical proposal. We looked at the Commissioner's report and immediately set to work to draft the provisions in order to bring them before this Parliament as soon as possible.

We published these provisions to the public. We had representations made to us that led me to the conclusion that there were certain provisions in the Royal Commissioner's report that were unworkable as far as licences were concerned and, therefore, there had to be major amendments. But there has been no delay by the Government in giving effect to these proposals to see to it that we had an altered licensing system, effective in providing the public with a service it required. Nobody can say that the Government has in any way delayed this licensing reform. We proceeded with the Royal Commission most expeditiously; we introduced a measure as soon as possible after the Commission's report; and we had this measure before Parliament at the beginning of this session to see to it that it was carried into effect as soon as possible.

If there had been a great demand by members of the Liberal Party for a reform of this kind in South Australia, it is strange indeed that there was not one single move during the 27 years that that Party was in office by any member, on the back bench or on the front bench, to bring it about, and that the only time this matter was raised by the Opposition in this Chamber was after it was well known in the liquor industry of South Australia that the Government was having discussions with it about the terms of reference for a Royal Commission to investigate the whole matter.

Mr. McKee: They tried to get on to the gravy train.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have had from the Leader of the Opposition, first of all that the Royal Commission was a waste of time, a great expense and of no use to the people of this State; then, when the Commissioner reported, the Leader said, "It was all my own work; I achieved this". No doubt, this is some way of playing politics, but the people of South Australia will give credit in this matter where credit is due, and will appreciate that it was this Government, and this Government alone, that was prepared to grasp the nettle in this matter. It was the attitude always of the previous Premier, the honourable member for Gumeracha, that we should brush out of the way any difficult matters about licensing; that we could make one or two amendments from time to time but, otherwise, we could get into too deep waters politically in this matter. However, the system in those circumstances went much too far and the Licensing Act, as it is at present on the Statute Book, has been widely ignored. Therefore, we had to do something effective. We have now brought this matter before Parliament. I believe that members are in support generally of the change to 10 p.m. closing and the change to a flexible licensing system that will give the people what they require.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank honourable members who have spoken to the amendment. I have received letters from people criticizing the South Australian Government for introducing this measure. The Premier said he respected the views of those who opposed the Bill. Had that not been so I, as a member of Cabinet, would not have been able to move this amendment. Cabinet's attitude is that this is a non-Party issue. The Premier, as Attorney-General, who is in charge of the Licensing Branch, accordingly introduced the Bill. In this case, politics should not be uppermost in our minds, and I am gratified that, in the main, members have not treated my amendment as a political issue. Honourable members have referred to statements made in Victoria by both the President and Secretary of the Temperance Alliance concerning the present Victorian situation.

When the Victorian Royal Commission was in progress, both Mr. Sanders, who is a personal friend of mine, and the Rev. Westerman, whom I also know quite well, adopted the sensible attitude that if trading hours were to be increased some other balancing factor should be introduced. Those two men held out for a particular provision to be included in the legislation, as a result of which the blood alcohol test was introduced. According to the Royal Commissioner who investigated the South Australian licensing system, our situation is a little different from that of Victoria. Whereas an alcoholic content of .05 per cent was recommended in Victoria, .08 per cent was recommended in this State. However, as that will be the subject of another debate I do not intend to elaborate on it now. Referring to the Victorian Royal Commission, the South Australian Royal Commissioner's report, at page 115, states:

The Victorian Royal Commissioner extracted certain hypotheses from a paper prepared by the Chairman of the Traffic Commission of Victoria setting out the results of researches into the circumstances surrounding motor accidents on public roads in the Melbourne metropolitan area in 1963. These hypotheses were:

(i) The peak accident rate during the very early hours of the morning in proportion to traffic density at that time reflects excessive speed on relatively empty roads together with the effects of the consumption of alcohol by drivers and fatigue.

(ii) The relatively low accident rate in proportion to traffic density during the 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. heavy week day traffic reflects the absence of fatigue and the relative absence of the alcoholic factor.

(iii) The peak of accident rate in proportion to traffic density between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m. reflects a combination of fatigue and alcoholic consumption.

(iv) The peak of accident rate in proportion to traffic density on Saturdays between 6 p.m. and 7 p.m., exceeds that on Mondays to Fridays due to the greater consumption of alcohol in turn due to the greater time available on Saturday afternoons for its consumption.

(v) The very marked peak in accident rate in proportion to traffic density in the early hours of Saturday morning (lasting till nearly 6 a.m.) is due to the greater consumption of alcohol than on other week nights related to social activities late on Friday nights and extending into the early hours of Saturday mornings.

(vi) The astonishing peak in accident rate in proportion to traffic density between 2 a.m. and 6 a.m. on Sunday mornings is related to social activities late on Saturday nights and extending into the early hours of Sunday mornings, and a tendency of drivers to forget the demands upon their physical and mental skills made by the control of modern motor vehicles.

(vii) The levelling out of the accident rate in proportion to traffic density for the remaining hours of Sundays is related to the more limited availability of alcohol on Sundays.

The facts outlined in those paragraphs are my main concern, and I know that the member for Wallaroo also is concerned at the fact that increased trading hours may result in more accidents. Although that has been denied by certain members, I quote the Royal Commissioner's report at page 6, as follows:

This observation suggests to me some shift in emphasis in licensing laws so as to induce the consumer to accept his share of responsibility for the safe use of a potentially dangerous commodity.

It seems, from what has been said during the debate this afternoon, that the numbers are against me. In view of that fact, and as 10 p.m. closing therefore seems inevitable, I point out that it is up to us to ensure that the loss of life through accidents caused by people who drive whilst under the influence of alcohol is not increased. As the Victorian Police Doctor said that 50 per cent of accidents that occurred in that State resulted from driving whilst under the influence of liquor, we must adopt every precaution and carry into practice the slogan: "If you drink, don't drive". If necessary, I shall call for two divisions in this matter: the first will apply to the amendment that had to be moved because of the second and more important amendment to be moved. I trust that I shall have some support in this matter.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (3).—Messrs. Bywaters (teller) and Hughes, and Sir Thomas Playford.

Noes (33).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, Stott, Teusner, and Walsh.

Majority of 30 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS moved:

To strike out "ten" twice occurring and insert "six".

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (3).—Messrs. Bywaters (teller) and Hughes, and Sir Thomas Playford.

Noes (33).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, Stott, Teusner, and Walsh.

Majority of 30 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I can take the hint and I do not intend to pursue the matter further. Therefore, I will not move the other amendment I have on the file.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) (*c*) to strike out "shorter" and insert "other"; and to strike out "between the hours mentioned in this paragraph" and insert "ending not later than half past eleven o'clock in the evening".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (2) after "rules" second occurring to insert "of court".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (3) to strike out "the following:—".

Mr. QUIRKE: I think it would be fitting for the Premier to give some reasons for his amendments.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (3) to strike out "(*a*)"; after "areas" to insert "and such of the following as the court thinks fit:—"; and to strike out "(*b*)" and insert "(*a*)".

In other words, these are drafting amendments which take the previous paragraph into the head sentence of the clause.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved to strike out paragraph (*c*) of subclause (3) and insert the following new paragraph:

(*b*) the sale and disposal of liquor for consumption by persons taking *bona fide* meals on the licensed premises with or ancillary to such meals;

Mr. HALL: What is the definition of *bona fide* meal?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One that the court considers to be a meal. It is something more than substantial food: it is a meal in the ordinary course of the view of a reasonable man, and is not something that is just put up for the purpose of obtaining liquor—not a sham.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (3) to strike out "(*d*)" and insert "(*c*)".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether this is merely a drafting amendment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is merely to renumber the clause.

Mr. Freebairn: Is it purely a numbering change?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (4) before "publican's" to insert "full"; and to strike out "granted or".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I am endeavouring to follow the effects of these amendments, can the Premier say what is their purpose?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These are further drafting amendments to correct an error which was not picked up in the original *pro forma* Bill as a result of our incorporating new licences—a full publican's licence and a limited publican's licence—as part of the schedule of licences.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 20—"Limited publican's licence."

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

In subclause (1) after "specified" to insert "being premises specifically constructed for the service of the itinerant public".

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that these limited publicans' licences, which are essentially for motels, should be limited to premises that are in the nature of motels. It is possible that the other forms of publican's licence come under the full publican's licence that can be granted for all facilities or subject to conditions, but a limited publican's licence is for the conditions set forth in clause 20. It was considered by the hotels association that if we kept the clause as it stands in the Bill, it could give rise to places, such as boarding and lodging houses and the like, applying for what is a limited publican's licence. There was nothing in the clause directing the court to see that those people were not the people who were being provided for in the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: This amendment does not help much!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It helps to a certain extent. A boarding or lodging house is normally not a place that has been constructed for the itinerant public. In his report the Commissioner states that it is extremely difficult to define "motel". The only attempt I have seen to do this is in the A.C.T. ordinance that spells out the lengthy conditions under which motels may be granted licences; they have to have a certain number of rooms and certain facilities. I thought it was inappropriate to spell out that kind of thing in the Bill.

If this clause is written in, it directs the court as to what was the purpose of this kind of licence, and the Australian Hotels Association is satisfied with that further safeguard which, I think, is valid and reasonable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not oppose the amendment, but I do not think it means anything. One should remember that hotels are places built for the travelling public (which has always been the phrase in the past), but the Premier has now changed it to the itinerant public. This is the purpose of having hotels: so that people who travel can get accommodation. Motels have bitten into the trade of hotels. Originally they were for people travelling in motor cars and staying overnight. We all know that the longer motels are established the more they take on the same character as hotels, and people stay in them during the whole of their holiday in Melbourne, Adelaide or anywhere else. They are treated not as overnight accommodation but as accommodation for a period of time, the same as hotels. This growing practice, which is already firmly established, makes nonsense of the amendment: it makes it nugatory. It is a good lawyer's amendment and will, like nearly every other clause and subclause in the Bill, create an enormous amount of litigation. It does not add anything to the clause, nor does it achieve the object the Premier has explained to the Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I appreciate what the Premier is trying to do, and I appreciate the motels' position. Can the Premier assure the Committee that by this amendment we will not be providing these facilities to coffee houses, boarding houses, and the like? As the member for Mitcham explained, this matter will be argued in the court.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the amendment, together with the matters which the Licensing Court must consider, will in effect preclude any boarding house or coffee house from obtaining this kind of licence. It is only about them that we are concerned: the fact that hotels are constructed also for the itinerant travelling public does not enter into the matter. Hotels will apply for a full publican's licence, either with or without conditions. It is only here that we are trying to rule out premises for which we had no intention of providing any kind of licence. This amendment, together with the provisions in the applications section, will do that.

Mr. COUMBE: The court cannot read *Hansard*: it must read the Act. I do not want the court to get the idea that it is being prevented from granting a licence by this condition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member reads the other matters that are contained in this licence, it makes it clear what kind of premises the licence is for.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I appreciate the Premier's amendment, and I strongly support the limited licence for motels. I regret, however, that Sunday is a day on which motels will not be able to supply liquor with meals to their guests at normal hours.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier has a number of amendments on file, but he does not seem to have all the amendments that he is moving. In a complicated Bill such as this, it would be fair if the Committee were able to see the provisions under discussion. The member for Mitcham has been able to pick up somewhere the words the Premier wishes to insert.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments being moved by the Premier are on file.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot find them, Mr. Chairman. Every premises would be constructed to give service to the public. I do not agree with the Premier if he thinks that this is restrictive. Can he explain how these words achieve what he intends?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Boarding and lodging houses are not places that have been specifically constructed for the service of itinerant members of the public. Indeed, it is against these places that this amendment is being written in, to ensure that they are not in a position simply to licence a dining room and supply their boarders and lodgers with liquor. It is extremely difficult to provide suitable wording: the Commissioner found it difficult to provide a definition. I do not think this is a complete definition that the court can use to draw a dividing line, but it gives sufficient guidance to the court about what the Legislature intended

and, together with the provisions in the applications section and the objections that those with a full publican's licence will be able to take to boarding and lodging houses in this regard, there are sufficient safeguards, as the Australian Hotels Association thinks there are.

Mr. Hall: Will it cover a guest house?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may not cover a holiday guest house at the seaside, and difficulty may arise because of that, but I think the applications provision covers the matter. The Australian Hotels Association asked for certain provisions and we tried to provide, at any rate a guide to the court as to the intention of the Legislature.

Mr. CASEY: I am thinking of the time when overnight stopping places at some of our tourist resorts will cater for the travelling public who wish to obtain accommodation and meals. This establishment would be a type of motel but would not be conducted on the same scale. It seems to me that people operating these establishments will have to satisfy the court that the establishment complies with what the court requires. If a building is established in a town where some full publicans' licences are held, will the court be likely to grant even a limited publican's licence to people conducting these establishments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it could, because a limited publican's licence would allow service only in the dining room and in the rooms of occupants. There would be no drinking lounge and none of the facilities of hotels. I draw the attention of the member for Light to the later clause at which he was looking.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (2) after "rules" second occurring to insert "of court".

This is purely a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Subclause (1) (*b*) refers to a supper permit. What is meant by that term and for how long will such permits be issued?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A supper permit is one for the consumption of liquor in a supper room. A person will be able to go on with supper as long as the consumption of liquor is with or ancillary to substantial food. The same provision is available in relation to a full publican's licence.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: What is substantial food?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A *bona fide* meal, not a sham. Ham and eggs would be a *bona fide* meal. One has to have sufficient food with the drink.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: To satisfy the requirements of the person consuming the liquor?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, to satisfy the court that the person has had what we call a bit of blotting paper with what he was drinking at that hour of the night. The court will decide what is substantial food and will doubtless lay down general standards. It will not say, "You must have sandwiches or sausages." It will say, "You have to have something more than a mere sham." It would be no good having soup taken around and saying that someone was having food.

Mr. Heaslip: What would be a sham?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If some cold soup was taken around in an endeavour to evade the provisions of the Act and the soup was not ancillary to the intake of drinks, not something genuine, I would have no doubt that the court would find that that was not substantial food.

Mr. Heaslip: Would a plate of biscuits placed on the counter be substantial food?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should not think so.

Mr. McANANEY: The Swedish people were required to have so much food before they had wine. That probably still applies. The people sometimes gave the food to the dog. I think it would be better to have a definite provision rather than something vague.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These matters were considered by the Commissioner and the phrase used was his suggestion.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 21—"Wholesale storekeeper's licence."

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

To strike out "one dozen reputed quart bottles, or two dozen reputed pint bottles" and insert "two gallons".

It is simpler to refer to gallons, and this amendment will make it clear what the quantity is.

Mr. QUIRKE: What is meant by "fermented liquor"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A drink of some kind which has been produced by a process of fermentation.

Mr. QUIRKE: The first process of making brandy is fermentation, and then it is distilled. Is there any clash there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This refers to wine. You cannot make brandy unless it is

fermented. I think the honourable member can refer to the *ejusdem generis* rule of construction: the general import following on words of specific import. Consequently, "one or other fermented liquor" means other liquor following a similar process of fermentation for wine. It is not other fermented liquor of a similar nature to wine.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is extremely difficult to find one's way around the Premier's amendments, as there are three or four sets of them. Might I suggest to the Premier that, when he moves an amendment, he gives us the reference to the particular set of amendments he is using. This would be a help for members to follow what he is trying to do, and we would not be acting merely as a rubber stamp to what he calls "drafting amendments."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be happy to assist the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure what the effect of the amendment is. Does it mean liquor has to be sold in gallon containers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Why alter it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To say that one can get a gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor without being restricted to particular classes of containers. The point is that, if the containers under the Act are containers of a kind that we will not be dealing with anyway in the future, it is pointless restricting the provision to particular classes of containers.

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

Mr. HEASLIP: I cannot follow all the amendments on file, and I suggest to the Premier that the details of the amendment be given slowly and distinctly so that all members can follow them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The effect of this amendment is to eliminate the limitation of number and container and to replace it with an amount specifying quantity. If the amendment is carried the two-gallons limit will not be restricted to a form of container, as long as it is two gallons of wine or fermented liquor, or one gallon of spirits.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not oppose the amendment, but the enormous number of amendments is confusing to anyone trying to find the one the Committee is considering. Can the Premier do something about it so that we can follow the amendments being moved?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): The Premier has said that he is prepared to state the references as they appear on members' files, including those of additional amendments.

Mr. HEASLIP: We want time to look them up. This amendment provides for two gallons in quantity instead of one dozen reputed quart bottles or two dozen reputed pint bottles?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is right.

Mr. HEASLIP: Could the wholesaler sell or supply five-gallon, 10-gallon or 15-gallon kegs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He could. He can sell any quantity in excess of the minimum quantity prescribed.

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier has met most of the difficulties here, because he now gives us an opportunity of buying what we want at the cellar-door, with a minimum of two gallons, in any form of container.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a cellar-door sale: this is a wholesale storekeeper's licence. We are providing for cellar-door sales in a new class of licence, the vigneron's licence, which occurs in a later clause.

Mr. Shannon: I am sorry; I misunderstood the position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the provisions recommended by the Commissioner there were to be wholesale licences and retail licences. There were no restrictions on wholesale quantities. One could sell as little as a bottle wholesale but one had to sell to a licensed retailer. We have removed the provision that a wholesaler has to sell to a licensed retailer, and have provided for the minimum amount that the wholesaler can sell.

Mr. Shannon: Which is two gallons?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor or one gallon of spirits.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 22—"Retail storekeeper's licence."

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

After "grant" to insert "renew or remove".

This is a drafting amendment that makes certain that in each case where there is an application the appropriate action may be taken by the court.

Amendment carried.

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

(2) A retail storekeeper's licence shall not, during a period of three years after the commencement of this Act, be granted except to the holder of a storekeeper's Australian wine licence in force by virtue of subsection (6) of section 3 of this Act and, after the expiration of such period, a retail storekeeper's licence shall not be granted to any applicant therefor unless the court is satisfied that the public demand for liquor cannot properly be met by other existing facilities for the supply of liquor in the locality in which the applicant proposes to carry on business in pursuance of the licence.

(3) Nothing in subsection (2) of this section contained shall be deemed to limit the power of the court to declare a storekeeper's licence granted under the repealed Acts to be a retail storekeeper's licence under this Act pursuant to subsection (5) of section 3 of this Act.

At present the holder of a wholesaler's licence is not permitted to sell wine or beer in quantities of less than two gallons, or spirits in quantities of less than one gallon (a similar provision to the one outlined by the Premier concerning a storekeeper's wholesale licence). The amendment will permit the storekeeper's retail licensee to sell any quantities of liquor of any description (in other words single-bottle sales, which I think is the common term). At present, about 50 holders of a storekeeper's retail licence will be catered for under the Bill. In addition, 63 holders of a storekeeper's Australian wine licence will be catered for by an amendment moved by the Premier to clause 3. These licensees will therefore be permitted to convert their licences to a storekeeper's wholesale licence or a storekeeper's retail licence, as the case may be. From information that has been obtained, I think it is likely that of the present 50 storekeeper's wholesale licences, 23 will remain as such and 27 will convert to storekeeper's retail licences.

In addition, the holders of the 63 storekeeper's Australian wine licences will be permitted over the three-year period to convert the licences one way or the other. If that is not done, I think I am correct in saying those people will lose the storekeeper's Australian wine licence. The effect of my amendment is that the court will not be permitted for three years to issue any new licences over and above the 90, which it seems can be converted to either a wholesale or a retail licence during that period. Because a retailer's licence is fairly attractive, there will be a flood of applications to the court, and it will be extremely difficult for the court to consider those applications in addition to fulfilling all its other functions.

Although a course of objection is open to those wishing to object, I believe that the cost to be borne by each person wishing to object to the granting of a licence to a particular storekeeper will be astronomical. With the 90 licences likely to be converted, I think a sufficient number exists in the State at present to plug any holes that may exist in this regard. It is only reasonable that those already engaged in this particular activity should be given the opportunity to gear themselves to providing this type of service to the public.

I am fully aware that the court must take into account the provisions that already exist. However, I refer to the hotelkeeper who has gone to some expense to provide a drive-in bottle department; he could lose a great deal of his trade if one of these licences was established in the vicinity of his hotel. The trade was not aware until recently that this type of licence would be available, and so it is only reasonable that it should have the opportunity to gear itself to provide the type of service that a storekeeper's retail licence would permit a storekeeper to provide.

In addition, a storekeeper would not have to incur the added cost of supplying meals and accommodation that a hotelkeeper is obliged to incur. Also, the court will have time to settle down during this period. It may be flooded with applications of this nature, and after three years the court will be in a position to go ahead and grant new licences where it finds they are needed.

Mr. HEASLIP: One of my objections to this is that we are handing over our rights to a licensing court to decide what will be done. The Minister's amendment takes power out of the hands of the court to do the very things that this Bill seeks to give to it power to do.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No. It has to deal with 90 licences for a start, and after three years it will be open.

Mr. HEASLIP: It still takes power out of the hands of the court for three years. The Minister is not being consistent in his amendment. I think this Parliament should be making the laws instead of leaving it to a licensing court.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I support my colleague's amendment and I fail to see that it takes power out of the hands of the court; it merely states that

the court shall not exercise this particular power for a certain period. It is merely a question of timing. The court has a number of restrictions on it; it has to do certain things in a certain manner in respect of other aspects of licensing and there is nothing strange in telling the court to delay its operations in respect of this matter. Obviously problems will arise, and many adjustments will be necessary when this legislation is enacted. I think it is reasonable that we should provide this breathing space so that the problem can be viewed in the light of other happenings in relation to the Bill. The three-year space suggested in the amendment will be valuable, as it will enable the situation to settle down and the court will be able to see far better what are the ultimate effects of the legislation. At the moment it is impossible to predict precisely everything that will happen.

What of the new areas in which development is taking place? Obviously other ways exist to supply the needs of the new areas. Here again, the settling down period will be valuable because the whole picture in the newly developing areas will be much clearer than if we had at once many applications for storekeepers' licences, in addition to those to which the Minister of Lands referred. It would be of great benefit if this three-year period were provided whereby a stocktaking could be made of the situation before new licences of this type could be granted.

Mr. SHANNON: Up to a point, I agree with the amendment and with what the Minister of Education said. However, South Australia is in a state of flux regarding development. The Premier says that we will have development, and we can well afford to have it. If a large industrial undertaking were established, the period of three years, to which the amendment refers, might be too long for people in that area to wait. Eventually the matter will be decided by the court but, for three years, the amendment will prevent the court from deciding.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: This amendment applies only to new licences.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, and it is with new licences that I am concerned. Although the court may realize that a new licence is desirable in a certain area, its hands will be arbitarily tied for three years. We are aware of some of the problems that have arisen regarding people who have come to this country from overseas. They enjoyed certain privileges in their own country that are denied them here. They make all kinds of complaints and, unfortunately, some of them return to their native land. That is a costly exercise for the State. I suggest to the Minister of Lands that perhaps a 12 months period would be long enough.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's comments on this matter. There are 90 of these licences in the State. Regarding the developing areas, I am positive that when this Bill becomes law there will be sufficient scope in some other form of licence to cater for them. This particular licence exists, for instance, at Andamooka, Coober Pedy, Para Hills and Port Augusta. I have stipulated three years as I am certain there will be a flood of applications to the court for this particular licence. This could involve the interests that are intending to oppose these applications in astronomical costs. The period of three years will enable the people already in the industry to establish themselves in such a way that it will not be necessary to issue a great number of these licences in the future.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must oppose this amendment. I find that this is a case in which things are not always what they seem on the surface. On the surface, the arguments put forward by the two Ministers who are trying to amend the Premier's Bill seem reasonable, but I have a brewery in my district which could be ruined if this amendment were carried.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am talking now of Williams Beverages Proprietary Limited at Mitcham. At the present time it brews a little alcoholic cider and a great deal of non-alcoholic cider and makes soft drinks. Its business consists of this manufacture, also the sale by retail of ales, spirits, etc. The company holds a brewer's Australian ale licence, which it has held for over 40 years, and I am informed that that is the only licence it has under the Licensing Act. This allows it to carry on its business. Under the provision as at present drawn, a holder of a brewer's Australian ale licence cannot hold any other licence. That being so, this company will have to opt whether it will go on manufacturing alcoholic cider under the brewer's Australian ale licence or whether it will concentrate on retail sales. Because the greater part of the company's business is retail selling, it has decided that, if the Bill is passed in its present form, it will apply for a retail seller's licence, but in terms of the Minister's amendment it could not do that.

Mr. Shannon: It would take three years before the company could get it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister's amendment is cutting the company out, because it has not held a storekeeper's Australian wine licence. If this amendment is carried, the company will be barred for three years from applying for a retail seller's licence. This is the sort of thing that would not have occurred to us if Mr. Short, the manager of this company, had not been to see me on another point that I intend to discuss later. Mr. Short is concerned about having to give up the brewing of alcoholic cider but he will accept that in order to hold the greater part of his business. If I am correct in what I have said, I cannot support an amendment designed to cut out floods of applications. It means the ruination of a long-established business that is a significant employer of labour, employing seven married men and 14 other employees.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Apart from that, the company provides an outlet for apples.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, about 50,000 bushels a year. If the amendment has the effect I have mentioned, I hope it will not be persisted in.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure that I understand the effect of the amendment, because the effect is complicated to someone not closely associated with the industry. The provision requiring a local option poll to decide the number of outlets in any area is being taken away and this amendment takes from the Licensing Court the power that Parliament has given it, but the power is taken away in respect of only one class of licence. Will the position be that a person may not apply for a storekeeper's licence but that a motel alongside an established outlet can apply immediately and thus be in competition? If that is the position, undoubtedly this amendment will require further consideration.

The honourable member who moved the amendment knows that I do not favour extending the outlets of liquor to an extent that would encourage greater consumption. However, there cannot be two systems, one of which restrains the Licensing Court in respect of certain licences while there is no restraint on the court in respect of competing licences, which is the position here. The court can grant competing licences to whomsoever applies to establish where competing services may not be desired. Logically, we have to decide the system of licensing and, having done so, we must have confidence in it. It does not speak well for the Bill if, before we get it off the ground, we have to tell the Licensing Court that it should not do certain things. I would have thought the court would not provide outlets which were not required by the public at a particular place. If it did, obviously we have the wrong sort of control.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept this amendment, as it has considerable merit. Three matters arise from it. First, a retail storekeeper's licence is to be confined to existing single-bottle licences or those who convert from an Australian wine licence to a single-bottle licence, for a period of three years. Therefore, the existing group of bottle licences will be converted into single-bottle outlets. There are a considerable number of these, and they will change from selling only single bottles of Australian wine to selling any class of liquor at retail prices by the single bottle in any quantity.

One of the most important points of the Commissioner's report was that, in changing the system of licences, one thing must be remembered: we are requiring of those who hold a full publican's licence a greater service than they are now giving, thereby increasing their costs to give that service without getting a great overall increase in returns. In consequence, we have to see that, in requiring a standard of service from them, we maintain those who gain their whole livelihood by giving this great extension of services. We could not have inroads from people, who did not have to undertake a similar outlay, to be able to provide sales to the community.

The honourable member is correct in saying that there could be an enormous bevy of applications to the court. However, the court will be reluctant to grant additional single-bottle outlets in retail stores. The application section has been carefully written to ensure that much has to be overcome. It must be obvious to the court that the service is needed, and that the service is not going to make existing licences uneconomic. Also, the court must overcome a possible objection, in a developing area, that by the granting of this licence the provision of full facilities (in the granting of a full publican's licence) would not be made more difficult. Generally, we have provided a transitional period of three years for people to change from an existing licence to the new one, and it is reasonable that there should be a settling down period

before any increase is considered in single-bottle outlets in retail stores. I agree with the Minister of Lands that this is sensible.

Secondly, the amendment provides that, in future, when the court, despite the restrictions written into the application clause, considers granting single-bottle retail outlets after three years, it should grant them only if it is satisfied that the needs of the public cannot be met by other forms of licensed outlets. That is desirable. The most consistent representation that has been made about this Bill is against any proliferation of single-bottle retail outlets in retail stores. The people who have been disturbed about the provisions of this Bill have been most disturbed about this possibility. In Victoria, there was an undesirable increase in single-bottle outlets.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The present number of licences would decrease.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is unlikely. It could happen if people gave up the business. All existing licences have to convert within the three-year period: there is no question of applications coming in after that time. New applications for new outlets will be received, where the court would have to be satisfied that other existing facilities could not meet public demand. It is useful to have that further provision to make it clear that we do not believe there should be a general proliferation of retail single-bottle outlets, and that the other forms of licences provided in the Bill are preferable in order to maintain a profitable service that would, at the same time, provide an adequate service generally to the public in the facilities that we are demanding from publicans. I do not agree that there is a difficulty here. It would be unlikely that any developing area would be inhibited during the three-year period. The member for Onkaparinga should remember that before further retail outlets are permitted in this State (and they would be restricted ones), there would have to be a local option poll next year, and applications made to the court thereafter. It would not be likely that there could be under the existing law additional retail outlets anywhere in South Australia, even on the present restricted licence, before the end of next year.

Mr. Shannon: Would there be a sufficient guarantee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because as we are bringing it in now the court, ahead of the time when otherwise there would be additional single-bottle outlets and at the very time when it was bearing the heavy load of all the applications arising from the transitional provisions, could be flooded with applications for additional single-bottle outlets. There is already evidence that that is just what would happen. The chain stores have been circulating their people and saying, "Put in your applications as soon as the Bill is through." It was never the intention of the Commissioner, nor was it my intention in introducing this Bill, that there should be a great proliferation of single-bottle retail outlets. The Minister's amendment is wise. The other subclause makes it clear that nothing in this provision disturbs the conversion of an existing wholesale licence to a single-bottle retail outlet.

Another point has been raised by the member for Mitcham, who objects that Williams Beverages Proprietary Limited, which has a brewer's licence at the moment, is prepared to give up that licence but it wants the right to continue to sell to the public quantities of liquor not manufactured by it. Apparently, the honourable member's view was that the only way it could do it was to get a single-bottle outlet. With great respect, there is nothing in this amendment to prevent such people from applying for a wholesale storekeeper's licence. It is as wholesalers that they are operating at the moment. For the new wholesale storekeeper's licence they could apply immediately. They have a brewer's Australian licence, and that could continue; but they can convert from that to a wholesale storekeeper's licence.

Mr. Quirke: And then they give up the brewing!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but this company said it would do that anyway. The brewing is only of a small amount of cider with alcohol content. There is not a great sale for Williams alcohol cider in South Australia.

Mr. Shannon: That could grow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Conceivably it could. If the company wants that business it will have to form another concern to get it, but apparently the company is interested not in that but in having a brewer's licence for wholesaling liquor that it does not manufacture: in other words, it is acting as a wholesale agent. In that case, it can convert to a wholesale storekeeper's licence. It can substantiate a demand for it because it has a proven trade. I do not think it would be interested in applying for a retail licence. I

do not see that the objection of the member for Mitcham is valid as regards this amendment which, in all the circumstances, I think is sensible.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the Premier whether, in the construction of this amendment, we have not taken away the right of the person concerned to a renewal at the end of the three years. Apparently, the prohibition on granting after three years is not limited to new licences; it applies to any licence the court may be considering. It is not clear whether the licence granted for three years is one that the court may grant, even if plenty of facilities exist in the district concerned.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The grant refers to an original grant. If we are referring under the Bill to a renewal we are, in fact, referring to a renewal; if we refer to a removal we refer, in fact, to a removal. They are two different things. Therefore, when talking about a grant, we are talking about the original grant of a licence.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think a time limit should be imposed. Although it would be undesirable to have a proliferation throughout the State of single-bottle licences, I think that the court would receive such a flood of applications at the end of a period set by Parliament that it would not be able to give those applications adequate consideration. I believe that three years is too long.

Mr. HALL: I agree with the member for Onkaparinga. With the Licensing Court to be established, we cannot have a clause in the Bill expressing no confidence in the court's functions. Why should we consider this particular licence? Let us look at the reasons the court may consider: one is that an outlet is not required for the needs of the public, and another is that it will provide undue competition and cause economic waste. Surely these reasons apply to the various licences. The member for Mitcham has raised a doubt in my mind that some person in some way may be penalized during the period of the stay of operation. Surely there will be many applications from businesses or individuals to establish further liquor outlets, and I see no reason to pick on this type of licence. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Committee will appreciate the difficulties I am experiencing because I did not see the Minister's amendment until just before dinner and I did not appreciate its possible impact on Williams Beverages Proprietary Limited until we started to debate the amendment after dinner. Therefore, I have not been able to consult with the company to make certain that its position is safeguarded, and consequently I am in the dark to some extent. However, I would want to know that the company is satisfied that it is protected before I would consider agreeing to the amendment.

I am not yet happy with the picture the Premier paints. I think I had better read out parts of the document presented by Williams Beverages to the Royal Commission in order to show this company's exact situation and in order to show why I am afraid it will still be in difficulties. It certainly will not get all that it wants if this amendment goes through and it has to carry on with another sort of licence. Mr. Short, the Manager, came to me because under clause 66, as it is framed at present, the company's business will be knocked rotten, and therefore I have put an amendment on the file to safeguard its position. The company will be hit anyway because some of its clients will get licences themselves and therefore cease to trade with the company.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What sort of clients?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Golf clubs and bowling clubs; the company has had a big business with such clubs, which have been trading illegally for many years. The company has been supplying and making deliveries for many years on a retail basis. These people had an Australian ale licence, but that was the only type of licence they had. One of the golf clubs has independently come to me and said, "We still want to be able to deal with Williams Beverages because that company has given us good service." The following is part of the company's submission to the Royal Commission:

The company is the holder of a brewer's Australian ale licence, and this licence was issued to it over 40 years ago. The present management is of the opinion that the licence was originally issued to the company for the purpose of making apple cider, which was being made from apples purchased by the company from various orchardists in the Adelaide Hills.

It then states the relevant names, and continues:

The company admits that during the term of the present management (16 years) no alcoholic ale has been brewed, although much of the plant and equipment necessary for its production is still on the premises, and is in fact being regularly used for the production

of a "non-alcoholic" or "temperance" beer sold through delicatessens under the name of "Boshter Beer."

I believe we have all heard that name even if we have not tasted the product. This company may have been carrying on illegally but, if it has, it has not been an orphan in the community. Illegal practices have been notorious in the matter of licensing and I do not think the company should be penalized now or in the future because of what it has done in the past with the tacit consent of everybody concerned.

Mr. Quirke: Boshter beer was not illegal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but in fact it has not been brewing alcoholic beer although it has a licence. The statement continues:

The company's balance sheet for the past financial year will show figures that prove, contrary to popular opinion, that we are firstly "resellers or storekeepers" and secondly "manufacturers". The said balance sheet will show that the company sold $215,000 worth of spirituous liquors, and of this amount $12,000 worth, or 5.5 per cent of the total, was apple cider, of its own manufacture. The company feels that this proves its claim to be, as far as the Licensing Act is concerned, 94.5 per cent storekeepers and 5.5 per cent manufacturers. The company admits that during this same period it also sold non-alcoholic beverages of its own manufacture to the value of $190,000, giving a total combined turnover of $405,000. The goods sold under the provisions of the licence represented 53 per cent of the company's total turnover. These figures could be considered as the results of over 60 years trading as soft drink makers, and 15 years trading as resellers of spirituous liquor.

The company states that it has built up its business on the basis of service to customers and so on.

Mr. Quirke: It had to sell two gallons of cider.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the point. The affidavit does not state specifically the amounts in which the company sells but my impression, from talking to Mr. Short and from reading that document, is that the company will sell, and has been selling, to its customers in amounts less than two gallons. No harm has come from that. The Premier asks why the company does not obtain a wholesale storekeeper's licence. As far as I can see, from a quick look at that provision, the company can do so, but that would mean it could not sell less than a gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor. I am fairly certain (although I am not absolutely sure because I have not had an opportunity to check) that that would cut into the company's retail trade to some extent at least because it has been selling in quantities less than that to individual customers.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It has been breaking the law.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What point does the Minister take from that?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You say the company is entitled to something because it has been breaking the law.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not say that: I say that the company wants to continue to sell in the retail trade as it has done in the past. As the Minister will agree, in the Bill we are allowing people to go on doing things that they have been doing illegally in the past.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are looking after only those people who had reason to hold a retail storekeeper's licence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Minister saying that this company has been doing something that is so deserving of censure that it should be penalized?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Not at all, but it is not making out a case to say that because a company has been doing something it is entitled to go on doing it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister to remember that this company says its business will be knocked in any case and that it will have to be reorganized. The company is anxious not to go out of business. It employs a number of people now, and if we are going to knock its business about any more there is a real danger that the company will go out of business altogether. I do not know whether the Minister is prepared to take that risk by insisting on his amendment in its present form. I am afraid that that may be the position if the company is obliged to take a wholesale storekeeper's licence and not a retail storekeeper's licence which, of course, would allow it to sell any quantities with no lower limit. The brewer's Australian ale licence the company now has (although technically I think it should not have this, because the company has not been brewing) also gives the limit of not less than two gallons of spirit or one dozen reputed quart bottles. This would cut out the company's small retail sales.

I have little doubt that this amendment will, in fact, affect the company injuriously at a time when it is already being hit by the amendments to the legislation. The company has been breaking the law, but so have so many others in the community that it does not matter. This has been acknowledged on all sides. I ask the Minister to have another

look at the amendment in the light of what I have said. I think it could probably be put right if other classes of licence, such as the brewer's Australian ale licence, were included in the amendment, which would then allow the company to apply for a retail licence. I do not know how many holders there are of brewer's Australian ale licences. I do not think that there would be many who would want to apply for a retail storekeeper's licence. If the Minister is agreeable to this, I think my difficulty would be met. Is he prepared to amend his amendment in the exception in the third line of his proposed subclause (2) by changing "holder" to "holders" and insert after "storekeeper's Australian wine licence" the words "and brewer's Australian ale licence"? If I could consult with the Draftsman to see if this could be put in somewhere, I would be happy.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has made out a great case for this company. It has had an opportunity over the years to apply for a storekeeper's Australian wine licence but it has not done so. He says that this does not matter now.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It was doing all right; it did not have to.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is no question about that. I am not concerned that it was doing this business. In view of the doubt that may exist, I am prepared to see that the company has the opportunity to apply for a storekeeper's retail licence if it so desires. I ask leave to amend my amendment by adding after "and" the words "or to a person who has held a brewer's Australian ale licence within a period of six months prior to his application for a retail storekeeper's licence".

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That will permit any persons such as those that the member for Mitcham has mentioned to apply for a retail licence. Even if my amendment were accepted, as was pointed out by the Premier, these people would have been able to apply for a storekeeper's wholesale licence, but they did not want that.

Mr. Millhouse: Why have you provided a period of six months?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because both cannot be altered simultaneously. I hope that that meets the honourable member's desires.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Do you know how many storekeeper's licences there are in existence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: About 50 and it is understood that 23 of the holders, because of their trade practices, will convert to storekeeper-wholesale licences and 27 will convert to storekeeper-retail licences. In addition, there are 63 or 64 storekeeper's Australian wine licences that will have to be converted within the next three years to wholesale licences, retail licences, restaurant licences, or something similar. If that is not done, the licences will no longer operate. If all applicants were successful, 90 licences could be issued by the court in this period for single bottle outlets.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: How many of those licences would be affected by your amendment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The only one I can think of is the one referred to by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Are you making a special case of that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Not particularly. The reference is to the holder of a brewer's Australian ale licence. Any holder of such a licence who desired to convert could, despite the amendment, convert it to a wholesale licence. If the amendment were carried, he could convert it to a retail licence.

Mr. HEASLIP: When speaking to the original amendment I tried to draw attention to the fact that we were doing something piecemeal. This is not legislation at all. The member for Mitcham has brought up one case which affects him and his particular area, and now we are amending an amendment to a clause merely to satisfy that case. Surely to goodness we must be broader than that; surely we are here to legislate not for just one case that has been brought to our notice but for all the people of South Australia. What about the hundreds of cases we do not know about?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Can you name one of the hundreds?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, but I think we should legislate for everybody, and because we do not know about other cases we are not providing an opportunity for them to be covered by the legislation. We would not have known about this case if the member for Mitcham had not bought it forward.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If I had refused the request you would still have said I was wrong.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not saying that anybody is wrong, but I do say that Parliament should legislate for the people and not for just one particular case. If it is right to have this amendment in this clause, it is right to have it

in all the other clauses dealing with the other types of licence. Why are we legislating to prevent the court from issuing for three years any licences apart from those that are now issued? What about the other types of licence? This Bill is so badly drawn that we are not legislating properly.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is just your inability to understand.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand the troubles of the people outside, and I am not prepared to legislate for just one section of the people. If we do not legislate for all the people, we are falling down on our job. I think it is quite wrong for us as members of Parliament to be taking this action for just one section of the community. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the Minister's amendment. With respect to the member for Rocky River, Parliament does take into account single cases and it should always consider whether it is doing an injustice to anyone. This complicated Bill has probably a record number of amendments, but we are learning of its effects as we proceed. The firm referred to by the member for Mitcham is a good one, and is not acting for itself only but is doing a service for many organizations. This Bill is trying to make legitimate many activities that have been carried on, and there is every justification for changes to meet varying situations. This amendment can do no harm to anyone but can save considerable injustice being done to one firm, which we acknowledge has done a good job for many years.

Mr. QUIRKE: I support the Minister's amendment. I would be sorry to see this firm victimized by this legislation. The company has a brewer's licence but does not brew, and it would be possible for the court, upon application, to refuse to renew this licence. The company has sold on a retail scale but would be denied a retail licence for three years and its business would suffer. It would have to sell on the wholesale scale of two gallons or more. I cannot see what harm can be done to this reputable company by accepting the Minister's amendment.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The effect is only temporary.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. I am not happy about three years, which is a long time. At least 12 months has to elapse, and a further 12 months should be sufficient. Surely all the existing licences could be transferred to different licences within two years. At the appropriate time I shall move to amend the Minister's original amendment by striking out "three" and inserting "two".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept that amendment at this stage.

Mr. Quirke: No, but I will write it out and hand it to the Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the Minister of Lands has already been amended. Therefore, the honourable member cannot further amend that amendment at this stage.

Mr. Quirke: Yes, I know that, but I shall so move after the amended amendment has been dealt with.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I like neither the Minister's amendment nor his amendment to his own amendment. The proviso to clause 22 states:

Provided further that the court may grant a retail storekeeper's licence subject to such conditions as the court, on the application of a person applying for such licence or of its own motion, thinks fit.

That is how we should leave it, because the whole purpose of our work tonight is to set up a court, for various reasons, to handle this type of thing. Now we are trying to limit it and make out a special case for one individual. That is going too far. I am prepared to accept this type of licence set out in clause 22 without any amendment or further amendment to be moved by the member for Burra.

The Committee divided on the amended amendment:

Ayes (25).—Messrs. Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan, Freebairn, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Nankivell, Quirke, Rodda, and Walsh.

Noes (10).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Ferguson, Hall (teller), Heaslip, Millhouse, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Shannon, Stott, and Teusner.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 23—"Wine licence."

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

In subclause (1) after "otherwise" to insert ": Provided that if the court is satisfied that substantial food would be available on the premises specified in the licence for consumption by any person who might resort thereto and the premises and the service provided by the licensee are of such a high standard that it is proper to extend the hours beyond

six o'clock in the evening, the court may authorize the licensee to sell mead, wine, cider or perry as aforesaid during a continuous period not exceeding thirteen hours and ending not later than nine o'clock in the evening".

The Commissioner recommended that wine licences should be allowed to continue for five years and then should convert either to retail licences or to restaurant licences. For most existing wine licences, I think it would be an eminently suitable end for them to continue in the way they were going. However, it has been shown already in Adelaide that a wine licence need not to continue in this way. There has been an establishment in Adelaide which has a wine licence and which is operating in a way which not only is satisfactory to its customers but should be encouraged, because it can be of inestimable benefit to our tourist trade and it can give a high-class standard of service.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you speaking of Chesser Cellars Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It is therefore my view that we should provide that there be no more wine licences and that the future for wine licences should be what the Commissioner recommended unless they be converted to the kind of premises, facilities and activities at present exemplified by this establishment. For this purpose I had amended the original Bill in accordance with the *pro forma* Bill which is in front of members. However, it was then drawn to my attention that there were certain difficulties still outstanding; one is that, if we keep the clause as it stands, these shops will have to close at 6 p.m. and (bearing in mind the kind of tourist trade for which they are catering and the facts that they are serving substantial food and that they have a satisfactorily high standard of premises) there is no reason why that should take place. Consequently, I am moving this amendment.

These shops do not want late hours but in some cases they do want to go rather beyond 6 p.m. Not all of them are interested in going beyond 6 p.m.; probably the most famous establishment of this kind in Melbourne is Jimmy Watson's, which retains the old wine licence and does close at 6 p.m. There are aspects of this trade that make it desirable for that to happen, but that is not so for an establishment like Chesser Cellars. After consultation with the court officials, it has been agreed not to provide further wine licences in South Australia but to endeavour to induce existing wine licensees to change over to the kind of service that has been given by Chesser Cellars, and it would be of inestimable advantage to the people of South Australia if it was more readily available.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased that the Premier has moved this amendment. I had difficulty in trying to reconcile my views regarding the wine shops as the clause read in the Bill, which provided that they had to shut at 6 p.m. as they have done for many years. However, a full publican's licence would have enabled a hotel to sell the same product until 10 p.m. The Commissioner definitely advocated that wine saloons should not operate for more than another five years. Some wine saloons are run well although others are not. I believed that the Chesser Cellars might have some difficulty. The provision for a restaurant licence states that a person must have a *bona fide* meal. I do not believe this provision will apply to many places. Maybe one or two of the better types of place with which the State can well do will be affected, whereas the places about which we are not so keen will probably have to go after five years anyway, and this will be a good thing.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 24—"Brewer's Australian ale licence."

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

In subclause (1) to strike out "one dozen reputed quart bottles, or two dozen reputed pint bottles" and insert "two gallons".

This is a similar amendment to that moved in respect of another licence.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (2) to strike out "either" and insert "any".

This is purely a drafting amendment. Members will see that a number of licences are referred to in the subclause; therefore the word "either" is inappropriate and must be replaced by the word "any".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 25—"Distiller's storekeeper's licence."

Mr. QUIRKE: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "of spirits, or one dozen reputed quart bottles, or two dozen reputed pint bottles of wine or other fermented" and insert "or one dozen reputed quart bottles or two dozen reputed pint bottles of".

This type of licence is now held by all wineries that operate a still for the purpose of making spirit. Section 15 of the Commonwealth Distillation Act provides:

No person who is licensed to retail spirits in less quantity than two gallons shall be licensed

under this Act, and if any person licensed under this Act shall be licensed to retail spirits in such quantities his licence under this Act shall thereupon cease.

That has been irksome and ridiculous in its operation in South Australia to every winery that had a still for the manufacture of spirits, mainly brandy. Approaches were made to the Minister for Customs and Excise as far back as August 26, 1966, to see whether that condition could be deleted from the Distillation Act. The Minister's reply dated August 26, 1966, to Mr. G. O'Halloran Giles, M.H.R., states:

I find that section 15 was apparently designed as a protection to revenue and to simplify administration of distillery controls when the Distillation Act was first framed in 1901. In view of modern administrative methods I feel that the section now serves no useful purpose in so far as this department's controls are concerned and could well be repealed. In the circumstances I would be prepared to sponsor an appropriate amendment of the Distillation Act. The repeal of section 15 would not of course solve the problem on the State side.

When the Minister's attention was drawn to his original letter, he replied on March 2 as follows:

I refer to your letter of February 14 inquiring as to my feelings on the question of a proposal that section 15 of the Distillation Act be repealed. As previously advised in my letter to you of August 26 I am prepared to sponsor such an amendment. Preparatory work is proceeding on this matter in conjunction with other matters involving legislative amendments. However, I am unable to indicate at this stage the timing of the amendment which you seek.

The clear intention is for the Commonwealth Government to remove that irksome section in the Distillation Act. It is irksome to any winery that has a distiller's storekeeper's licence. The conditions in the Distillation Act have for years been in the distiller's storekeeper's licence. I submit they should not be, unless it is the will of this Parliament. Under this clause a winery with that licence can sell two or more gallons of spirits and it can sell not less than two gallons of wine. This means two gallons of wine and two gallons of spirits, but who wants to purchase two gallons of brandy? The wineries pay the same licence fees as the hotels pay. Under this Act a licence fee for a licence to sell is 5 per cent, based on the total quantity of wine brought from the bulk stores to the sales department; in other words, the wholesale price. Any average winery pays a greater licence today than the finest hotel in Adelaide paid before 1963.

It is a heavy impost, but these people were not forced to pay it. They applied for that licence, because under the Act it was held that a co-operative company sold wine that was the produce of the co-operative's growers. No licences were needed and many co-operative wineries sold without licences for many years. Many people, including me, thought that the provision was unjust and asked to be licensed and taxed in that way. It would have been unfair for a hotel to pay a licence and for a winery not to pay a licence. We pay a licence fee on the same basis as hotels but we are restricted to the sale of a minimum of two gallons, both wine or spirits. I think that that is an obsolete provision for a manufacturer of wine who has always had a close relationship with the people who like to purchase his wares. Many people think that better wine is obtained from a big bulk container than from a bottle. That is completely erroneous but that method of selling wine is traditional.

I do not propose that we sell less than two gallons and the words I desire to include are "two gallons of liquor". The Premier has an amendment to strike out the words "one dozen reputed quart bottles or two dozen reputed pint bottles", and I agree with that. If the words I propose to insert are then inserted, the clause will provide " . . . in quantities not less than at one time two gallons of liquor . . . " That would enable a winery to sell two gallons in total of wine and brandy.

The small brandy manufacturers have no market here in South Australia. If a person was asked to select a bottle of brandy from a row containing all the well-known and highly advertised brands and one bottle from an obscure winery, which one would he select? Naturally (and quite rightly) hotel keepers select the best advertised lines. There is no chance whatever of the brandy from the obscure winery being sold in any other way than under this amendment, for there is an agreement between the spirit merchants under which we undertake not to sell at a cut price. I do not think there is any reason why this amendment should not be granted. We have had to suffer under the provision for far too long. I do not know how the brewer in the member for Mitcham's district gets on, but we have the Customs and Excise people sitting on our doorstep. One has to put up a building and an office for that department's representative, and all the spirit lines have to be locked. A charge of distillation wine is tested for spirit strength as it goes into the still, and when it comes out again one must get the same amount of spirit out of it.

Mr. Casey: Heaven forbid if you don't.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, you are on the mat if you do not get that amount out. Distillation is an art. Anyone with a couple of biscuit tins, running a tube through a bottle from one tin to another, could make spirit out of anything that had sugar in it. However, the distilling of brandy is so complex today that it is an entirely different thing. Incidentally, the brandies of South Australia are amongst the best and purest in the world, and probably this is due in a large measure to the rigid control exercised by the Customs and Excise Department. I have no objection to this control. However, the average cost to the consumer of a bottle of brandy is $2.20. Of that, $1.25 is paid to the Commonwealth Government as excise and, in addition, 12½ per cent sales tax is charged. From the remainder the winery has to pay all its costs. I want some freedom to sell a bottle of brandy, not only because of the value to the industry but also the value to many growers, the general public and the Customs and Excise Department.

I draw the Premier's attention to the word "specified", which should be struck out. A winery has a cellar-door trade in which people sample before they buy; it has a boardroom where people are entertained; another room where at harvest time the carters have a drink; and it has a canteen or lunch room where the employees can have a drink. No one place is specified, because the whole of the premises is licensed. Why not let people drink in any part of the premises? I hope that this Bill will remove many of the old obstructions that are embodied in the present Act and will allow a measure of freedom so that people will not have to worry whether they are breaking a Commonwealth or State law. We should get rid of the idea that because the product is wine it should be hedged with restrictions. I support the clause with my amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that what the member for Burra wants can, to a certain extent, be achieved, but he will have to rephrase his own amendment rather than that I should then try to do something to a clause that he has amended. I am in difficulties in accepting outright what he suggests. I acknowledge there should be some movement in this matter but we ought not to put a distiller's storekeeper in a better position than a wholesale storekeeper. A wholesale storekeeper can sell one gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor. I see no reason why a distiller's storekeeper should have to sell two gallons of spirits. I agree he should be able to sell the same as a wholesale storekeeper sells—one gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor—but I think we are creating a difficult position for a wholesale storekeeper if a distiller's storekeeper is in a postion to sell one single bottle of brandy and the rest of the liquor in wine. This is not fair as regards the wholesale storekeeper's licence.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That is because of the Commonwealth legislation affecting the distillers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; I appreciate that, but I see no reason why we should not amend our legislation. If they are still bound by the Commonwealth Act, that is all right until it is amended but, if there is to be movement within the State sphere with the eventual agreement of the Commonwealth or if, as the honourable member suggests, we amend our position in South Australia and then the Commonwealth removes its restriction altogether, I believe the limitation on the distiller's storekeeper should be the same as on the wholesale storekeeper. In the Commissioner's report none of these wholesale licences provided for sales to the public. Under the Commissioner's proposal the wholesaler could sell only to a retail outlet. The only conceivable exception to that was a sale to one's own employees. We have allowed the situation to return in which wholesalers are selling direct to the public, but in order not to intrude on the hotel or retail trade we must have a limitation on the amount sold in any one sale. That, of course, applies not in the case of a vigneron but in the case of what are basically the old wholesale licences (not something that previously acted under an exemption).

I believe that we must retain some sort of reasonable restriction, as against ordinary retail sales. With a distiller's storekeeper's licence, I do not think that restriction should be any different from a wholesale storekeeper's licence. If the honourable member were prepared to alter his amendment so that the clause would read "in quantities of not less at one time than one gallon of spirits or two gallons of wine or other fermented liquor", I should be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. Quirke: I'm the greatest compromiser in the world.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then I suggest the honourable member amend his amendment in that way.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I support the amendment. As the honourable member has pointed out, we are not dealing with a vigneron's licence or the usual cellar-door type of licence: this licence may be granted only to a distiller and that, of course, limits the field. Members may recall that in 1954 the section in the Licensing Act dealing with a distiller's storekeeper's licence was amended. Up to that time it was necessary for a person to sell at least two gallons of one kind of spirit and that, of course, restricted distillers' activities much more than they will be restricted under the present clause if it is passed as amended. Under the 1954 amendment, it became possible for the first time for a distiller to sell two gallons of spirits, not necessarily one kind: he could sell two or three different varieties of spirit, although a minimum quantity of two gallons was stipulated, or "one dozen reputed quart bottles, or two dozen reputed pint bottles of wine or other fermented liquor". A person buying liquor from a distiller should be entitled, if he so desires, to have mixed varieties. Under this clause, such a purchaser will be able, if he requires, say, only one bottle of brandy, to make up the two gallons by purchasing in addition, 11 bottles of wine. The amendment of the member for Burra would make it possible for him to take home a mixed bag. It does not matter whether there is a half a gallon of wine and 1½ gallons of brandy or half a gallon of brandy and the balance in varieties of wine. I support the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: As the member for Angas said, I want a mixed bag. I can see the point raised by the Premier that if this provision is passed no action will be taken under the Distillation Act (I cannot say who told me this, but it is authentic). I shall compromise in connection with what has been suggested by the Premier. My compromise will simply mean that, instead of having to purchase two gallons of brandy, one can buy one gallon. It is a matter of six bottles of brandy as against twelve bottles. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted.

Mr. QUIRKE: I move:

In line 19 to strike out "two gallons" and insert "one gallon"; and in lines 19 and 20 to strike out "one dozen reputed quart bottles or two dozen reputed pint bottles" and insert "two gallons".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept that.

Amendment carried.

Mr. QUIRKE: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "specified" second occurring.

I have previously given my reasons for this amendment. In a winery there is a board room where people sample wine; a place where people marketing grapes have a drink; and also a little room where others have a drink. Therefore, the word "specified" in this connection makes it extremely difficult. If the whole winery is licensed there should be no difficulty about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have difficulty in agreeing to the honourable member's amendment because this a standard law of exception for various licenses to do something that the previous Licensing Act expressly forbade. Under the previous Act, people could not be given liquor by way of sample when they went to buy from a winery or distillery.

Mr. Quirke: Why specify one particular place?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that in respect of some places the honourable member's amendment would be reasonable. However, as some licensees want to go in for wine-tastings, the court will want to be satisfied that proper provision is made. I do not think the honourable member would say that any winery would really run into particular trouble in having to provide an area where it could supply samples to people.

Mr. Quirke: What about grapegrowers' employees who deliver grapes with their tongues hanging out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not being supplied liquor by way of sample.

Mr. Quirke: They let you know if it isn't good.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The point is that this is an exception to the prohibition included in an earlier part of the clause regarding drinking on the premises liquor that is to be taken away.

Mr. QUIRKE: All right. I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

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

In subclause (2) after "of" first occurring to strike out "either" and insert "any".

This is merely a drafting amendment, as there is a number of licences specified in the first sentence of the subclause.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

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

After "perry" first occurring to insert "on any day except Sunday, Good Friday and Christmas Day, between the hours of five o'clock in the morning and six o'clock in the evening,".

This is to provide for hours in accordance with other licences. When this clause was drafted it did not provide for hours in the same way as other licences have been provided with hours. This provision for hours is the same as in all the other licences except the publican's licence and the wine saloon licence. This amendment will make all the licences uniform.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I move:

Before "gallons" to strike out "imperial".

When speaking to clause 13 of the Bill, I pointed out why I proposed to move this amendment, which was for the sake of uniformity. Sometimes in the Bill the words "imperial gallons" are used and at other times just the word "gallons" is used.

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

Amendment carried.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I move:

In paragraph (ii) after "centum" to strike out "produced or"; and to strike out "from honey or fruit produced or grown" twice occurring.

Clause 26 deals with cellar-door sales and it will enable these to be continued once a vigneron's licence has been granted. Provision is made for carrying on cellar-door trade and practice as heretofor, but a vigneron will be expected to take out a vigneron's licence to enable him to conduct cellar-door sales. The present provision in the Bill makes it necessary for a vigneron, before he can qualify for a licence, to satisfy the court that the mead, wine, cider or perry is first the produce of honey or fruit produced or grown within Australia; and secondly that it is to the extent of at least 70 per cent produced or made from honey or fruit produced or grown by him and is to the extent to which it is not made from honey or fruit produced or grown by him used only for the purpose of blending with mead, wine, cider or perry made by him. This clause, if carried in its present form, will take away the livelihood of many wineries, particularly the smaller ones, in my district. They do an extensive cellar-door trade but only a few of the more than 20 wineries within a radius of 10 miles of Tanunda grow the grapes from which 70 per cent of the wine sold at the cellar door is made. In many cases the percentage of such grapes grown by them is much less than 70 per cent. A provision such as this has not been considered necessary in previous legislation and is not needed now. Indeed, to my knowledge it has never been necessary for the winery or the vigneron to make any quantity of wine from the grapes that he grows. However, the right of the vigneron to sell wine made by him dates back to 1863 and section 73 of the Licensed Victuallers Act of that year provided:

Nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to apply to the sale of ginger beer, or spruce beer nor to the sale by any person—the occupier of a vineyard of not less than two acres—of wine of his own manufacture, from fruit grown in the Colony, in quantities of not less than one imperial gallon, upon the premises where such wine was manufactured, to be delivered at one and the same time.

In the 1864 legislation that right was continued, the minimum quantity to be sold being one gallon. Section 13 of the present Licensing Act, under which cellar-door sales take place, does not make it necessary for the vigneron to grow any portion of the grapes from which he makes the wine that he sells. Indeed, the section exempts cellar-door sales from the operation of the Act, and the New South Wales legislation contains a similar exemption.

I think the Premier will realize that, in view of the long-established right vignerons have had in South Australia regarding the sale at the cellar door of wine that has been made by them, they have a right to ask that they be allowed to continue that practice. My amendment is designed to ensure that, provided the wine is made from fruit grown in Australia by the vigneron, and provided the wine is manufactured by him as to 70 per cent thereof and the remaining 30 per cent is wine purchased by him and used by him for blending purposes, he comes within the category which would enable the court to grant him a vigneron's licence. In view of the importance of this matter to the viticultural industry, I ask the Premier to accept these amendments.

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

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This matter affects my district. One winery at Watervale is producing wine in its own right, and this winery could accept the 70 per cent restriction imposed by this clause. The particular class of producer that the clause does not cover is the co-operative. I am thinking of my grape producers at Cadell who sell their grapes to the co-operatives on the Murray River. Under the wording of this clause, a co-operative would not be able to sell certain quantities of wine at the cellar

door. The co-operative does not grow any grapes itself, but it does produce wine. I am very sorry that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) has not made any contribution to the debate on this clause.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Light is somewhat astray. As all the co-operatives on the river hold distiller storekeeper's licences, this clause does not apply to them.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 27—"Club licence."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) after "sale" to strike out "and"; and after "supply" to insert "and delivery".

Mr. HALL: Liquor would be delivered off the premises?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Mr. HALL: Why does the word "deliver" need to be in the clause?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was to make clear that delivery had to be on the club premises. Where there are off-licence sales by clubs, it is not intended that there shall be any home delivery service. We wanted to make certain that whilst there could be a sale or supply, the delivery must take place on the club premises.

Mr. HALL: I accept that explanation, but I asked a broader question. Does the Government intend that clubs already licensed (and there are 40 of them) will have the right to sell liquor off the premises? That is, they can deliver to members on the premises for the purpose of taking it away, and that new clubs will be able to do this. I understand the Government intends to generally limit the number of clubs in this regard, because no doubt clubs will proliferate, and without limitation this will be a widespread form of sales. I have spoken about the club at Parndana: no doubt similar clubs would be established, but how would they operate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I intend to provide that, where a new club seeking registration is remote from an existing supply, the court may grant a licence for off-licence sales, but these licences will be restricted to new clubs of this kind.

Mr. HEASLIP: I strongly object to this clause. When read in conjuction with clauses 84 and 66, it is unrealistic and impracticable. It will mean that, if a member of a club visits another club, he will not be able to buy a drink there: he will have to be invited by a member of that club, who will have to pay for all his drinks. Although the Premier says he recognizes the importance of the tourist trade to this State, he proposes continuing that state of affairs. A carnival is held in South Australia to which about 1,000 bowlers come from other States. Under this provision, a visiting bowler will have to go without a drink at any club unless a member of that club pays for him. This has not happened previously but will happen now. Honorary membership is not provided for here. If these 1,000 bowlers come from other parts of Australia to play at South Australian clubs, they will all have to be signed in as honorary members. When visiting other clubs subsequently, those bowlers will have to be signed in again each time as honorary members. Surely, the provision can be made more reasonable than that. No other State in the Commonwealth inserts such a provision in its licensing laws. Visitors to clubs should be able to buy drinks in return for those bought for them.

Mr. Hall: This won't be observed.

Mr. HEASLIP: Why make a law that will not be obeyed? Surely, we must enact legislation that will be not only obeyed but enforced as well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter was simply and clearly explained to the honourable member last week. To say that the provisions of clause 27 are unusual in licensing legislation is nonsense. They are not unusual. It was clearly pointed out by the Commissioner that we could not simply have licensed clubs, licences for which will now be obtained with little hindrance, as the clubs will not have to face local option. It will be possible to have many more clubs in South Australia than exist at present, and we cannot simply have a provision that will allow anybody off the street to wander into these clubs and obtain a drink. We must have a restriction to provide that the clubs exist only for their members.

Mr. Millhouse: Last week I put up a perfectly sensible amendment that was knocked back, and it wasn't open to the objections you are raising now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's amendment was not "perfectly sensible"; in fact, it was useless. The Committee decided on the matter, and it did not agree with the honourable member; it had every reason not to agree with him. The position concerning visiting members of other clubs can be perfectly and simply covered in the constitution.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not perfectly simple at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is. Let me point out what happens in the case of constitutions already registered by clubs in South Australia. I am an honorary member of the Norwood Club by virtue of its rules. I am also a member of the Democratic Club, not by virtue of its rules but because I have been duly proposed and accepted as a member and have paid a subscription. Members of the Democratic Club are, under its rules, honorary members of the Norwood Club, and *vice versa.*

Mr. Heaslip: This Bill does not allow you to be an honorary member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It allows one to be an honorary member if it is provided in the club's rules and if they have been approved by the Licensing Court.

Mr. Heaslip: The Bill does not say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does say that; it is as plain as a pikestaff to anybody who cares to study it.

Mr. Millhouse: You are laying it on when you say it is as plain as a pikestaff.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham is simply trying to get something into this measure regarding bowling clubs which is entirely covered already. There is no difficulty whatever about visiting sporting club members obtaining honorary memberships as between the various registered clubs that will take out licences under this legislation. Most of the sporting clubs are likely to get conditional licences but they will need to have their constitutions accepted and registered with the court, and in those constitutions they will be able to provide that members of visiting clubs are honorary members on the occasions of their visits to the sporting clubs licensed under this legislation. This is not new in licensing procedure; it is widely accepted today among the various clubs.

Mr. Heaslip: No other State provides for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What we have provided here in relation to sporting clubs in South Australia fully covers their existing unlawful procedures and will enable them to continue to act in a reasonably controlled manner.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am worried about one or two aspects of this matter and I am confused about the Bill. I challenge anybody here to give evidence of a more complicated Bill. We have discussed an earlier clause dealing with bowling clubs, and I want to ask what the position is of certain types of club, particularly bowling clubs and golf clubs. In my opinion they are in a special category because many of their members want to drink on Sundays. Am I correct in assuming that no clubs will be able to sell liquor for consumption on Sundays without meals? Except for the provision of permits, that is as I understand the clause. It will be hard on these types of club if they have to provide meals in order to sell liquor. The members of these clubs are not spectators but participate in sport. The case of golf clubs is different from that of bowling clubs. However, in both cases people want a drink when they have played their game or drink while playing. Some of the clubs undoubtedly are not interested in Sunday drinking. However, some bowling clubs have a custom whereby tournaments are played on Sundays and the need for a liquor supply exists. Probably all golf clubs arrange for Sunday sport. However, under the clause they will not be able to sell liquor without providing meals. Will the existing clubs be assured of receiving a permit on the days they want it? Will they have to apply for a permit for each particular day? What will be the position regarding new sporting clubs formed in districts without clubs at present?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding licensed clubs, if they want to have drinks on Sundays other than with meals they will have to apply for a permit under clause 66. Under that clause it will be possible to get periodic permits in relation to sporting clubs: that is, for a number of specified occasions. It will not be necessary to apply on every occasion, provided that the tribunal is satisfied. This will not apply to clubs not in existence at the time of the passing of this legislation. They will not be able to get permits for Sundays. The point about it is that clause 66 is designed to be a holding clause to endeavour to hold the present situation in relation to Sundays. Up until now every one of these activities of club members drinking on Sundays has been illegal. The question is whether we are going to open the door generally to any form of Sunday drinking by organizations.

Should we provide that anybody can go along in the future and obtain a permit for any Sunday occasion? The hotelkeepers' attitude, which is not unreasonable, was that if we were not going to accept the Commissioner's recommendations regarding Sunday trading, and open up the hotels, then nobody should have any facilities on Sundays, otherwise there would be a proliferation of activities outside the licensed trade where there was a

sale and supply of liquor. Therefore, we had to design some means of endeavouring to hold the present situation for the time being without altering significantly the pattern that had been established before the Commission of what were the existing unlawful activities in South Australia, which the Commissioner did not find to be in themselves harmful. That is why the amendment has been designed as it has.

I agree that clause 66 will last in its present form only for a limited period until we have had a complete re-examination of Sunday activities in South Australia. At the moment we could not possibly open the door to all future clubs that might be formed in South Australia for the sale and supply of liquor on Sundays, or it would become a completely open slather and, justifiably, the hotels and licensed clubs would want the kind of proposals the Commissioner wrote in. The Commissioner's proposals were for a restricted period on Sunday, and having no entertainment of any kind, which would have removed some of the existing activities of clubs on Sunday. The amndment has therefore been designed as a holding operation, in an endeavour to guard the activities of clubs on Sunday, to which the Commissioner did not find at this stage any great objection. Licensed clubs wanting Sunday activities will have to apply for permits. These will be limited to clubs in existence now, although licensed or unlicensed clubs can apply.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am not in a position to move an amendment to the clause. After the Premier's explanation, I am most dissatisfied with the situation as it applies to some clubs. I know of one bowling club, which is not licensed and which will not be eligible for a permit. It is a registered club.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: An unlicensed club can obtain a permit.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The club I am thinking of may or may not get a permit. I shall get in touch with it tomorrow and find out its position. I also know of a golf club which, as far as I know, has completed most of its arrangements. It is physically established, but it has not applied because it has been awaiting the new Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: As long as the club is formed—licensed or unlicensed, registered or unregistered at the passing of this Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am pleased about that. The Premier said that this is an interim provision, or something of this kind. Will the permit system continue until some more permanent provision is made?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Members of a golf club will want to drink at the club on Sundays after playing golf but they may not want to eat there. Can the permits be issued on a weekly basis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a matter for the tribunal, which will have to deal with applications made to it, but it will be in the power of the tribunal to grant periodic permits. I shall explain the structure designed in the amendments in regard to clubs. Clause 27 provides for a club licence of the kind now granted to registered clubs in South Australia. In addition, in clause 27 there will be provision by a later amendment spelling out subclause (3) and that will provide for a club licence subject to conditions that are particularly apposite to sporting clubs obtaining licences.

The honourable member will see that upon an application for a full club licence there will, naturally enough, be an objection from the local publican if a club licence is to be granted to enable purchases to be made wholesale. However, many sporting clubs are happy to buy retail. If a sporting club has conditions imposed by the court as to limited trading hours apposite to the sporting functions of the club and the licensee shall purchase all the liquor he requires for the purposes of the club from a person holding a publican's licence in the vicinity of the club premises, this will overcome the objection of the publican licensee in the area. He will be happy to have in his area a customer who is not intruding on his own retail sale and is at the same time providing a club licence necessary for sporting clubs that will not be making available the full range of facilities that a registered club has been known to provide.

In addition, these conditional licensed clubs, which will comprise most of the sporting clubs, golf clubs, bowling clubs and the like, could apply for a permit under clause 66 in relation to special occasions or Sunday activities. It would be likely, if the club had already been granted a conditional licence by the court and unless there was something untoward about the club, that it would be granted a licence that would accord with the general purposes and activities of the club.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not concerned about Sunday trading, although I think we would be better without it. Bowling clubs hold many tournaments on week nights and the games do not finish until about 10 or 10.15 p.m. In terms of this provision, a *bona fide* meal will have to be provided if persons wish to drink after 10 p.m. Under what terms would it be possible for the club to obtain a permit to supply drink after that time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Under clause 27 (1) (*e*), they could get a supper permit. This would allow them to serve drinks with, or ancillary to, substantial food; it would not be necessary to serve a *bona fide* meal. So long as a club is providing a reasonable supper (some blotting paper, in effect, for the drinkers) at that hour of the evening, it is able to get a permit for the specified portion of the club premises where drinks and supper would be served. A club does not have to apply periodically for that permit: only the one application would be needed.

Mr. Heaslip: Once a club got it, it would last for 12 months?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would last until the club had to renew its licence.

Mr. SHANNNON: We seem to have reached a peculiar position. We are regularizing what was obviously a breach of the law, but we are doing that for a limited group of people, namely, the clubs that will be in existence at the passing of this legislation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: As far as Sunday trading is concerned.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. We are making fish of one and flesh of the other. The time will inevitably come when someone will say, "If it is good enough for Seaton Park to do it, why can't Flinders Park do it?" We will then have again a similar set of circumstances to what the Commissioner found when he investigated the problem recently. We are trying to set up an artificial barrier for a certain group of people who have not yet come into existence. Without doubt, that group will come into existence. Will it then carry on in exactly the same way as are the people who at the moment we are regularizing by giving them our imprimatur in this Chamber?

It appears to me that either we should or we should not grant these facilities to all groups, whether they exist now or whether they are to be formed later. The principle we should be considering is whether clubs are entitled to these privileges. If they are not entitled to the privileges, no sections of the community should have them. What is suggested is that only those who form their club before the passage of this legislation are to be granted the facilities. I cannot understand this approach. It does not seem to me to be the type of legislation that is likely to meet with general approval. On the contrary, I think we will find that the legislation will be brought into disrepute by the clubs that are formed after it is passed. No matter when a club is established, it will expect to receive the same privileges as will be enjoyed by the clubs now in existence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Acting Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I was asked earlier to explain the provisions relating to clubs, which I had to do to explain this clause. It seems to me that the honourable member is quoting clause 66 *in toto*, and his argument relates to that clause. We should debate the matter specifically before the Committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: As clause 27 is closely related to other clauses I have allowed much latitude in the debate, and I have allowed members to refer to those clauses. I shall allow the debate to continue on those lines, but not in any other form.

Mr. SHANNON: This is involved and difficult legislation, but it should provide equal terms for clubs not only existing today but also for those to be established in the future.

Mr. RODDA: As members of the Naracoorte Club discussed certain matters with the Premier and were assured by him that those matters were covered in this legislation, will he indicate the points raised by the club and how they are covered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have the particular submissions with me, but the Naracoorte Club was interested in off-licence sales, which were provided for in the *pro forma* Bill. The club's representatives submitted that it could not continue effectively without these sales, because it was the only way it could finance its activities. The Bill provides that existing registered clubs can continue off-licence sales provided they do not have home deliveries. I had a discussion with the Naracoorte Club about the desirability of clubs providing a drive-in bottle department for their members, because my original view had been that we should provide that no club should have one of these. However, the

Naracoorte Club pointed out to me that it already had one and it would be unfair to take it away. Accordingly, I provided the amendment, and there is no difficulty about the club's continuation of that drive-in bottle department.

Mr. Rodda: What about a full publican's licence?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The club does not have to go to a retailer. Under clause 27, a fully registered club can buy wholesale.

Amendments carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 2, at 2 p.m.