HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 2, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Agriculture make available to the House a copy of the application he has made to the Commonwealth Government for drought assistance for the severely affected agricultural areas in South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A draft letter containing the submission to the Prime Minister is with the Premier. I will discuss the matter with him and let the honourable member have a reply.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the application made to the Commonwealth Government for drought assistance has indicated that the State Government is prepared to make available a certain sum for this purpose? Does the application request the Commonwealth Government to match the sum that the State Government is prepared to make available for this relief?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The submission came to me this morning. Only on Monday I had a discussion with the committee about what it wanted me to do. It submitted a lengthy draft letter containing recommendations to be sent to the Prime Minister. Naturally, the application will be sent to the Prime Minister by the Premier, who has not yet had the opportunity of seeing the recommendations. I think I ought to discuss the matter further with the Premier before saying anything more.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year, when Queensland and New South Wales were in the throes of drought, the Governments of those States spent much money and made considerable concessions before approaching the Commonwealth Government for assistance. Also, in Victoria, where certain drought-affected areas have been declared, much State money is being used to assist those concerned. Can the Minister say whether the South Australian Government is prepared to contribute State money now to help the people affected?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: If the situation warrants it, yes.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is an accepted practice in this sort of negotiation between the State and the Commonwealth that the State is prepared to make a grant to at least match any grant that may be made by the Commonwealth for drought relief, and that the State says it is prepared to do that. Therefore, it seems essential that, in such an application to the Commonwealth, the State make a specific statement to this effect. Can the Minister say whether the application that has been prepared contains such an assurance to the Commonwealth, whether any assessment (even a preliminary one) has been made of the sum that may be required for this purpose, and whether the State has given an undertaking that it is prepared to meet its share of the total amount involved?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I cannot see what is the purpose of all these questions. The Government has done everything possible to try to help people in a difficult situation. The matter is difficult at this stage, because assessments are being made. The committee, set up less than a fortnight ago, has heard from people in the community about various aspects of the matter. Individuals have been referred to the department to state the merits of their own cases, and the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) has been most co-operative in this respect. The need of these people to have temporary finance to carry on is being investigated. Banks and stock firms have been most co-operative in all cases that have been referred to them. We have no knowledge at present about money being made available by the State. The submission to the Premier about the application to the Commonwealth was signed this morning and would not have reached the Premier yet. I consider that the time to make a statement will be after the Premier has considered these submissions. After all, this matter will be dealt with between the Premier and the Prime Minister. The application, as it has left my office as a recommendation to the Premier, is similar to that adopted in the past by the Liberal and Country League Government and to that submitted by New South Wales and Queensland last year. I hope that reply suffices.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This House last Thursday unanimously supported a motion moved by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) that an immediate approach be made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance on account of the drought conditions in this State. As I understand the answers given by

the Minister so far this afternoon, no application has been made as yet by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government, even though the matter was debated in the House six days ago. As I also understand it this is because of some delay between the Minister's office and the Premier's office. When did the Minister send the draft from his office to the Premier's office? If, in fact, the Premier is sitting on it, will the Minister use his good offices with his colleague to make certain that this application is forwarded to the Prime Minister at the first possible moment?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is perfectly obvious that the Opposition is trying to make a political issue out of a very serious situation.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense; you're the one doing it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to maintain order while the Minister replies.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: There is no suggestion of any undue delay caused by the Premier. Following the debate that took place last week, a *Hansard* pull of the report of the debate was sent to the Drought Relief Committee on Friday. On Monday last members of the committee saw me in my office and, after discussing the matter, we agreed on a submission to be made. However, further particulars were still required. I believe that the written submission alone, without the relevant statistics accompanying it, runs to about 14 foolscap pages. This is not something that can be finalized in five minutes. Immediately I received the docket this morning, I signed it and sent it to the Premier's Department. The honourable member knows that at 11 a.m. today the Premier was obliged to attend a Party meeting. To suggest that there is any undue delay in this matter is pure poppycock.

Mr. McANANEY: I assure the Minister that, in asking this question, I am not playing politics: I am interested only in his constituents and my own. Can he say whether Cabinet has decided on any action to assist, before Commonwealth aid is received, farmers affected by drought conditions, as other States have done?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not know to what lengths I have to go to explain the position.

Mr. McAnaney: Well, just answer the question.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although this matter has been discussed by Cabinet, it has not been the subject of a Cabinet decision, because we are relying on information from the committee as to the best method of assisting people in need. We have said previously that individual cases of hardship will be considered on their merits and that assistance will be made available accordingly. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McAnaney: Not as the other States have done?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: In New South Wales and Queensland assistance was given a long time after the effects of the drought had been felt. It was in 1966, following a drought in 1965, that any action was taken. The situation in South Australia is being dealt with as quickly as possible and, in order to assist the people concerned, we have made available two officers of my department to go to the honourable member's district and to my district to advise people who have suffered loss because of soil erosion. I assure all members that the Government will make every effort to ensure that people are given the opportunity to stay on their properties. However, this is a matter of where lines are to be drawn and, because I am not an expert, I am relying on the advice of the committee in that regard.

IRRIGATION

Mr. CURREN: Recently the matter of licences to divert water from the Murray River was investigated by an inter-departmental committee, the report of which was tabled in the House some weeks ago. Can the Minister of Works supply any further information about the issue of these licences?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has now informed me that the inter-departmental advisory committee on irrigation has examined all current applications for licences to divert water from the Murray River. In some cases the committee has considered that the application covers a clear commitment and is of an extent that can be met from our resources. For these it is proposed to make an immediate issue of the required licences. In some major areas, and where the committee feels that further information is necessary, an early discussion with the applicant is being arranged. The committee will be visiting along the river about the middle of August and should be in a position to submit further recommendations for the issue of licences immediately after.

Before the committee goes to an area, applicants in that area will be informed when the committee will be able to interview them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister of Irrigation ask the Minister of Mines to arrange for all ponding basin sites to be examined by officers of the Mines Department before basins are constructed? I believe increasing difficulty will be experienced with regard to seepage in irrigation areas, and some of the problems to be solved will be associated with the ponding basins. Therefore, could the sites of all new projects be examined by the Mines Department to ensure that no fault runs through the area concerned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to ask the Minister of Mines to provide a report on any area that may be considered as the site for an evaporation basin. The Renmark Irrigation Trust is responsible for the construction of evaporation basins on Bulyong Island. This is a matter of urgency, and the completion date of these evaporation basins is causing great concern because of the existing basin at block E. However, that is not why specific tests were not carried out in this case. As I pointed out in reply to a question by the honourable member yesterday, the soil types in the area of the new evaporation pond are similar to the soils being used in the Chowilla dam and at the Disher Creek basin, and these are relatively impervious. As there is no doubt additional seepage from these we shall be happy to take whatever steps we can to prevent seepage in future.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 20 about the omission of streets from the Hope Valley-Highbury sewerage scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has reported that the streets mentioned by the honourable member cannot be included in the Hope Valley-Highbury sewerage scheme and must be drained southerly towards the Torrens River. Consideration will be given to sewering these and other allotments in the area when sufficient development takes place.

JOURNALISTS

Mr. HUDSON: This morning members of the Australian Journalists Association employed by News Limited held a stop-work meeting and, at present, they are not working. This followed the action of News Limited management in downgrading certain journalists and the wholesale cutting of margins of journalists, thereby defeating, partially, the effective wage increases granted under the new journalists' award. Honourable members will remember that prior to the introduction of decimal currency about 18 months ago, newspaper prices in this State were first increased from 4d. to 5d., and then from 5d. to 5c (or effectively 6d.)—an increase of about 50 per cent. At that time I questioned the previous Premier, and was told that an investigation had been undertaken and the matter discussed, I think, by the Prices Commissioner with officers of the newspapers in Adelaide; that the Commissioner had been informed that the newspaper proprietors expected to face substantial salary increases for their journalists; and that the price increase was necessary for this reason. About 18 months has passed since that increase in newspaper prices before the newspaper proprietors have had to pay increased salaries. In view of this set of circumstances, will the Premier ascertain whether a new inquiry into the price of newspapers is justified in view of the explanation given 18 months ago when the price of newspapers in Adelaide was increased to 5c?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly examine the matter. I was aware that journalists employed by certain undertakings in this city (and, as far as I am aware, journalists employed on all metropolitan newspapers in Sydney) had gone on strike as a result of the decision of certain newspaper proprietors to downgrade journalists. This is an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Millhouse: The court said this could be done, did it not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen the court's decision, but it is certainly—

Mr. Millhouse: I think it did.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —a somewhat strange procedure to deprive journalists of existing grades in order to see that they do not get the increased salaries provided by the award. However, profits of newspapers in South Australia, as shown by their balance sheets, are not small, and in these circumstances it would be normal to expect that they would pay their workers, as other enterprises in South Australia are expected to do, the appropriate rate awarded by an arbitration tribunal.

STREAKY BAY SLIPWAY

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked earlier this session about the slipway at Streaky Bay?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of Marine and Harbors has advised me that arrangements will be made to extend the wings of the cradle of the slipway by 2ft. 6in. on either side at an estimated cost of $350. This will enable vessels other and slightly larger than the *Rossandra* to be accommodated on the slipway cradle. The Director has pointed out, however, that the amount of widening proposed is the maximum possible, consistent with safety and minimum expense. Any increase beyond the 2ft. 6in. extension would involve very costly redesigning of the cradle, assuming that the slipway rails could take the added weight.

GRAIN CHARGES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I referred to the removal of oats and other grain from railway property because the department was charging 83c a ton for such storage. As the grain was stored in silos on railway property the department considered that it was entitled to collect that sum, although the grain had been removed from the silo by farmers' own trucks (picking up the grain in bulk out of the silo), in respect of which no rail freight was involved. Much of this grain from Bordertown and other silos has been taken as feed for starving stock. As this must be treated at Government level (because the matter is apparently outside the scope of Railways Department finance), has Cabinet considered waiving the charge per ton when the grain is not moved by rail? The railways would not carry only a couple of hundred bushels in their big trucks; that amount could be carried in a farmer's truck. Also, there are many places to which the Railways Department could not deliver. Will the Premier consider my suggestion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the suggestion examined immediately.

BUILDING TRADE

Mr. LANGLEY: In an article which recently appeared in the press it was stated that an increase had occurred in the number of new houses and flats that were being, or had been, built in the three months to June 30. As this sharp increase in building activity can be of great benefit to many sections of the community and must have a far-reaching effect on retail sales, can the Premier say whether this indicates that building activity is showing an upward trend and that there is confidence in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been a significant improvement in building figures in South Australia. Information regarding long-term building plans which has reached me from other sources shows that a significant recovery in the building industry is under way in this State. I thank the honourable member for his question. I think this is of importance to business and commerce generally in South Australia, and I note that, for the first time for some months, I have not received a question from members of the Opposition about building figures in South Australia.

GLADSTONE RAILWAY STATION

Mr. HEASLIP: I have received complaints from people who use the Gladstone-Adelaide railway that, when they arrive at Gladstone late at night they have to cross over several railway lines (which are not illuminated) to get to the station. Because of this, people, particularly older people, have difficulty finding their way in the darkness. This applies not only to Gladstone but also to a number of other country stations and sidings. Will the Minister of Social Welfare take up the matter with the Minister of Transport to see whether better lighting could not be made available for railway travellers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up the matter with my colleague, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I recently asked regarding the work of the Clean Air Committee?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am informed that the Clean Air Committee has made great progress in the long-term tasks of assessing air pollution in South Australia, and preparing draft legislation to supplement existing requirements of the Health Act. Draft regulations have now been prepared, and will be discussed by the committee at its next meeting on August 17. In the meantime, much has been done by consultation, advice, and voluntary action by both private industry and Government instrumentalities to reduce air pollution. The clay products industry has been prominent in introducing new fuels and methods of firing in many member companies, with resulting major reduction in pollution from brick, tile and pipe factories.

The Electricity Trust, the South Australian Railways and the South Australian Gas Company (each represented on the committee) have

all taken a number of steps to reduce or eliminate pollution from their numerous undertakings. The cement industry has introduced improvements in dust suppression in a number of premises. The list could be extended further. These actions have been stimulated both by departmental officers and by members of the Clean Air Committee themselves. The addition of specific regulations will enable similar action to be taken where it is not already being taken on a voluntary and consultative basis. It will also ensure that future industrial development does not add to the problem of pollution in ways that are avoidable.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Last year, the Minister of Education announced that a new high school, to be known as the Glengowrie High School, was to be built at Glengowrie. As I understand that recently tenders were called for the contract to build this school, can the Minister of Works say whether a contract has yet been let for the construction of the school and, if it has, how long the construction of the school will take?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that a contract has now been let to A. H. May Proprietary Limited of Dunorlan Road, Edwardstown, for the construction of a new high school at Glengowrie. The time for completion of the work is 60 working weeks from the date of acceptance of the contract.

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday about increased costs and tenders in relation to the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has supplied me with the following information:

The increase awarded by the Arbitration Court in the total wage case is estimated to add $400,000 to the cost of the Chowilla project. The four weeks' annual leave proposed to be granted to public servants will have a very small effect indeed on the cost of Chowilla and only affects the supervisory staff. It is standard practice in writing specifications for major works, the execution of which will take a considerable period, to include clauses inviting the tenderer to include provision for costs resulting from industrial awards and of increased costs of basic materials. This was done for the Chowilla project.

The specification for Chowilla required the tenderer to nominate both starting and finishing times for the work in relation to a date of acceptance of tender. The specification also required the tenderer to provide a reasonably detailed programme of all operations that could be analysed to test the practicability of his proposals. This was also proposed for consideration in the analysis of tenders as the speed of work could have a large bearing both on budget expenditure and on the costs of supervision. The specification required tenderers to hold tenders open until mid-July. As there had been some delays in discussion of the project within the River Murray Commission, two tenderers were requested to extend their offers to September while the others were advised that their tender could not be accepted. The two tenderers applied some conditions to the request but both are still available for consideration by the commission. The next meeting of the River Murray Commission is scheduled for August 11.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Works say how much money has been allocated this financial year for construction of the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Premier said earlier that tomorrow he would introduce the Loan Estimates, and an allotment for this work will be recommended to Parliament for approval. It is a substantial sum, and provision will be made to continue with this work after the Loan Estimates have been approved.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that a big problem concerning the Chowilla dam's construction has been the possibility of seepage occurring under the dam structure that would involve heavy excavation costs as well as all sorts of problems in excavating the river bed. Although I ask this question with some diffidence (I have not the necessary qualifications, really, to make such a suggestion), I ask the Minister of Works whether sheet-piling the difficult parts has been considered and whether that method would lessen the cost of the structure.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The previous Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan), who went overseas to study this problem, considered it fully. He assured me that every aspect of the prevention of seepage had been considered, and his final conclusion (and that of his advisers) was that the method of bitumen sealing to be used was the only method that would be satisfactory in the area.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Was sheet-piling specifically looked at?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, as well as every other aspect.

TEACHERS' INSURANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 28, I asked the Minister of Education a question about the desire of an insurance company, specializing in a cover for school teachers, to arrange

for deductions from teachers' pay to be made to cover premiums on policies taken out. I quoted from a letter written to the company by the South Australian Institute of Teachers and supporting the proposal. I said that I had been informed that there was physically room on the computer for the deductions to be made. The Minister was kind enough to obtain a reply, which he gave on July 5, to the effect that any application for this should go through the Chief Secretary but that no application had been made, and he implied that it should be made. On applying to the Chief Secretary, as suggested by the Minister, the company has now received a reply from the Assistant Under Secretary, as follows:

With reference to your letter dated July 7, I am directed by the Chief Secretary to inform you that the payment of insurance premiums by deduction from salary sheets of the Education Department cannot be approved. It has been found necessary for several years to impose a limit on the number of deductions from salaries of South Australian Government department employees made on behalf of outside organizations.

As this reply is a refusal of the request, as the reason implied in the letter is that there is no room on the computer, and as this is contrary to the information with which I was supplied, will the Minister, in the interests of those members of the teaching profession who want to avail themselves of this cover and have the convenience of deductions from their pay, be good enough to take up the matter personally with the Chief Secretary to see whether the decision that has apparently been made cannot be reversed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will examine the matter and discuss it with the Chief Secretary. I point out, however, to the honourable member that teachers in this State are particularly pleased that the Government has been able, for the first time in history, to send out teachers' cheques with all deductions noted—something for which teachers had been asking for many years.

ROAD TAX

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yesterday, in reply to my question about the allocation of money under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, the Minister of Lands said:

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.

Can the Minister representing the Minister of Roads say how much of the total collected in road maintenance tax is allocated to the various district councils?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain the information required by the honourable member and to bring down a report as soon as possible.

BRUCE BOXES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago, when referring to the accumulation of timber stocks at South Australian forests, I asked the Minister of Forests to ascertain whether it would be possible to devise a box manufactured from our local timber that would be satisfactory to the citrus industry. Has the Minister taken any steps in the matter and, if he has, with what result?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I referred this matter to the Agriculture Department and to the Woods and Forests Department, and I have had discussions with the Conservator of Forests as late as this morning. One of the honourable member's suggestions was that the plywood for the Bruce boxes should come from our forests rather than from, I think, the Philippines. However, this timber can be obtained from only the best logs grown in our forests, and these logs command a high price. Because of this, our timber is not competitive with the veneer from the Philippines, despite freight charges. It is not as easy as one may think to supply timber from our Woods and Forests Department. The matter of the type of box used in the industry has exercised my mind as much as it has exercised the mind of the honourable member. I point out that the type of box being used is the type that the packing shed operators want. The packaging committee comprised packers and an advisory officer from the Agriculture Department.

Mr. Quirke: What about New Zealand timber?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: We have taken this matter up, too, but I imagine that the position in regard to New Zealand timber would be much the same as applies to our own. I have asked that inquiries be made about whether timber could be brought cheaply from New Guinea, which is under Australian caretakership.

Mr. Clark: Is that timber reliable?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, extremely good timber is obtained from New Guinea. However, I have not yet had a reply to this inquiry. It is difficult to do much

when an industry asks for a particular type of box. As yet, I have not received information about whether a type of box that would be competitive with the Bruce box could be made.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Recently, packing sheds have been using cardboard cartons almost exclusively for the packing of apples. In my opinion, these cartons are not as satisfactory to the fruit industry as are the timber cases. In addition, they are more expensive and are not so highly regarded by the retail trade because they have no resale value after being used. However, the industry appears to have adopted their use mainly because there is no active programme to bring forest products to the notice of the industry and to see that these products are properly regarded. Will the Minister of Forests suggest to the Forestry Board that the time has arrived for an active campaign to popularize our timbers so that we shall not have such surplus stocks as will ultimately affect employment in the forests and mills? Could a selling programme be instituted in order to avoid the position of accepting inferior substitutes for what I believe is a fine timber case that could be provided by the State's forests?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This is done now: salesmen are actively engaged in visiting packing sheds in the Adelaide Hills and the Murray River districts. They accept orders from co-operatives but do not deal with individuals, although I believe the private casemaker deals mainly with individuals. The campaign is continuous. We have ample supplies of case material for those who want it, and we try to sell it. Why packers buy something that is more expensive and inferior is beyond my comprehension. Not only must this article be sold by the Woods and Forests Department and by private casemakers but also members of co-operatives and other purchasers should have thoughts about the container they wish to use. I am informed that merchants prefer the wooden box in many instances.

The co-operatives are controlled by the producers who should consider whether they are paying too much for the cardboard carton and whether it is as good as other boxes. I am not taking sides in this matter: we benefit by people using the carton because of the pulp that we supply with chips. However, we receive no benefit from the Bruce box in this regard. People using these boxes should make up their minds whether they think the cartons are more costly and not up to the standard of the pine box.

CHLORINATION PLANT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Works about the delays that I understood were taking place in the installation of chlorination plant at the Happy Valley reservoir. I understand that the Minister now has a reply. Will he give it, and also say whether the Government intends to install such chlorination equipment in other reservoirs serving the metropolitan area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has reported that the new outlet tunnel and pipeline from Happy Valley reservoir was commissioned on November 24 last, in time to improve distribution for the approaching summer demand. At that time delays in the completion of the chlorination building contract and in the delivery of certain equipment (and in particular the 68in. diameter magnetic flow meter, which is one of the largest in the world) prevented the commissioning of the permanent chlorinating station.

Temporary chlorinating facilities were, however, provided and, together with the existing permanent chlorinating stations, have ensured complete and continuous protection of this important supply. It is emphasized, therefore, that any delay in the completion of the permanent chlorination station and in obtaining the necessary plant has not affected the safety of the water supply to the metropolitan area. Installation of the permanent chlorinating plant is well advanced and is expected to be completed in about six to eight weeks' time.

In reply to the honourable member's further question, the reservoirs are continually watched, water checks made, and necessary recommendations submitted on the provision of chlorination plants. These plants will be provided where they are considered necessary.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have received a letter from a lady in the South-East. The Minister of Education may be aware of this matter, because the writer states that she has also written to him. She writes to inquire whether assistance can be obtained for her son, who last year won an Australian Wool Board scholarship entitling him to attend the Gordon Institute of Technology in Geelong, which, according to her, is the only school in Australia providing the course. The son appears to be

an apt student from his scholastic record, although his secondary education was interrupted when the family house was destroyed by fire and all the possessions were lost. The letter to me indicates that the Minister's reply to an earlier letter states that, as the son would not be attending the Institute of Technology, or either of our universities, he would not qualify. As I am sure the Minister would be as anxious as I am to help in this case, I ask him what the position is where a student can obtain a desired course only at a school outside South Australia. For many years veterinary science students who have been sent from this State to the University of Sydney, which has the only veterinary science degree course in Australia, have had substantial assistance granted. If the Minister, because the boy is not attending a South Australian school, institute or university, cannot help, will he make representations to the Victorian authorities to see whether they will help? As some provision must obtain for a person living in one State and attending an education establishment in another, will the Minister re-examine this case if I give him the details?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Although I do not recollect this case, I shall be pleased to re-examine the matter.

RED SCALE

Mr. QUIRKE: As I have seen instances of red scale in country towns (in one case the fruit on a lemon tree was completely covered with this pest), will the Minister of Agriculture say whether its eradication is compulsory throughout South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Act provides for the control of various pests, and districts, which are controlled by committees, are declared. I know of no legislation that controls house gardens, and this is a problem associated with infestation. However, as the honourable member has raised this point, I will obtain further information for him.

MATRICULATION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. HALL: A constituent of mine moved from Queensland to South Australia about two years ago. At that time his daughter was studying a secondary course of education in Queensland equivalent to the Leaving standard in this State. On inquiring at the highest level there, he was told that his daughter would have no trouble in matriculating here. After coming here and studying at the Leaving Honors level, she obtained an extremely good pass in five or six subjects, and proved herself to be an excellent student. Upon applying to the university she was told that, as she had not matriculated, she would not be accepted at the university, although she had obtained an excellent pass in the required subjects at the Leaving Honours level. Although my constituent made all the inquiries that he could at the time, he was unable to reverse the decision that had been made. I have since heard that this decision applies in respect of admission to the university: although one may have an extremely good pass in Leaving Honours under the old system of matriculation, one is not admitted to the university, on the grounds of not having matriculated. That seems to me to be completely unjust not only to the child of my constituent but to anyone else who may be affected in this way.

Although my constituent told me that he thought a reversal of decision was too late in his case, I have been asked to raise the matter in the hope that some change may be made in policy in order to reverse the present decision that has proved in this case to be unjust. Will the Minister of Education therefore ascertain whether the decision to which I have referred is a common one and whether something cannot be done about it to lessen its impact, especially on students from other States?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of course, if such a decision was made, it was made by the university authorities. However, if the Leader will give me a letter setting out all the facts, I shall have the matter examined.

LAW REFORM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Law reform in this State has been proceeding (as the Attorney-General will be quick to say) at quite a pace since this Government came into office. I have several times drawn attention to the rather haphazard nature of the procedure such reform has followed and suggested that it would be a good idea if some committee were set up that could advise the Government on matters of law reform, both in substance and in detail. However, so far, nothing has been done, although an *ad hoc* committee has now been set up to consider the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I remind the Attorney-General that section 16 of the Supreme Court Act provides for the judges to meet (annually, I think) and tender advice on certain matters of this nature, but for many years this has been a dead letter. Is it in the Attorney-General's mind to request Their Honours the Judges to meet pursuant to section 16, and is

it also in his mind (either in addition to that or as an alternative) to set up any more regular machinery for the review of the law of the State and recommendation for reform?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not. I have had a careful look at the Lord Chancellor's Law Reform Commission and also the Law Reform Commission set up in New South Wales. So far, reports from those commissions show that they tend to have so much on their plate that long-term issues of reform occupy them, and not as much work is done in practical law reform as occurs where *ad hoc* committees are appointed, comprising people specifically interested in one particular area of the law. I believe that in South Australia we have a flexible means of providing proposals for law reforms. The Law Society itself has occasionally set up specific *ad hoc* committees on various areas of the law that have been very useful.

The judges have occasionally initiated proposals for amending the law. Other proposals have also come forward, either from the Attorney-General or from the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and these have been investigated by groups of people whose appointment is arranged either by the Attorney-General or by the standing committee. In my view, we get much more effective work done in this way, provided there is a constant move for reform in various areas of the law, concerning which complaints come forward from one section or other of the profession. That is what we are doing. The honourable member may look back on the last two years and see that the judges prepared a proposal, which came before this House and which had his support, for amendment of testators' family maintenance legislation, but the honourable gentlemen in another place, who had more wisdom than the profession, the judges and this House combined, laid aside the Bill!

Nevertheless, it was a good move for law reform. We have had the proposal from the judges for the interim assessment of damages examined by the profession and this House. This has been a major reform in the area of our general administration of civil law and, indeed, interest has been expressed in it in every part of the English-speaking world.

Mr. Millhouse: It was not very well handled; that's what I had in mind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member never finds anything introduced from this side very well handled and, no matter what happens on this side, he thinks something different should have been done. In fact, we got something done that was ahead of what had been done by every other common law country. It was a proposal drafted by a judge, supported by all the judges, and duly investigated by the Parliamentary Draftsman, and although certain amendments were carried in another place which, in the view of the judges and in my view were unnecessary—

Mr. Millhouse: The Law Society didn't think they were.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will not have a debate in Question Time. It is not fair to other members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —we got the work done effectively. In the area of criminal law we have appointed a committee that will investigate matters concerning not only the Criminal Law Consolidation Act but also the Police Offences Act and the Justices Act, and those Acts providing for dealing with certain offences summarily. The committee will examine criminal law in substance and in procedure. It is better to have an *ad hoc* committee well qualified in that particular area than it is to have a general law reform commission that will deal with the whole area of law reform. Indeed, some of the measures that have come forward in law reform in South Australia have been so good that they have been copied in England ahead of reports of that country's Law Reform Commission and proposals made by the Lord Chancellor to the Parliament. I believe the flexible way in which we are proceeding with law reform is, in fact, getting far more effective work done than would occur with a general law reform commission to which every aspect of law reform would be referred.

BEEF ROADS

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns beef roads, which are very important in South Australia. I am prompted to raise the matter because a press report that appeared in a Victorian newspaper at the weekend referred to the proposed route of the Gidgealpa-Adelaide gas pipeline and the construction of an all-weather beef road alongside it. Can the Minister of Lands say whether such a road will, in fact, be constructed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the matter to my colleague and obtain that information for the honourable member.

MATRICULATION COURSES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last weekend the Chairman of the Waikerie High School Committee approached me regarding the introduction of a matriculation course at the Waikerie High School. Apparently, of about 20 fifth-year students in that area, some have to travel to Nuriootpa to attend school, while others go to Glossop. This causes much inconvenience to Waikerie parents because their children have to board away from home. Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether a matriculation course can be provided at the Waikerie High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will examine the matter. However, I point out that it is impracticable to have matriculation courses at every high school.

Mr. NANKIVELL: About 19 students have indicated their intention to attend the matriculation course at the Bordertown High School next year, should it be provided, and I understand, from discussions with the headmaster, that that number can be sustained. However, Bordertown has not been listed as a school at which a matriculation course will be provided next year. As the school is virtually able to meet the required quota of 20 and can sustain that number, will the Minister ascertain whether, in the interests of the students concerned, any decision that might have been made on this matter could be reviewed, particularly as I understand that the present staffing is such that this course could be provided without the appointment of additional staff?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have the request examined.

WINDY POINT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have, on a number of occasions over the years, raised with both the immediately preceding Government, and the Government preceding that, the matter of the development of Windy Point as a first-class tourist attraction and something that could be enjoyed by local people. In the last couple of years, the area has been cleaned up and paved, and a wall has been built. That was done during the period of the Hon. Frank Walsh's oversight of the Tourist Bureau. Although I appreciate what has been done, it is not nearly enough to make this a first-class resort. Now that we have a new Minister of Immigration with new ideas, I ask him whether he will have another look at Windy Point (I am sure he will enjoy it) with a view to undertaking major improvements to turn it into the area and the resort that it deserves to be.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has mentioned the efforts of my predecessor.

Mr. Millhouse: Credit where credit is due.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is very unusual. However, one of the problems in the improvement or establishment of facilities at Windy Point is the lack of sewerage in that area at present. Some time may elapse before sewerage is available. The honourable member is shaking his head.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I have asked members repeatedly not to debate answers to questions. I consider that the Chair has been lenient during Question Time, and we want to preserve that for the sake of members. The Minister of Immigration.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Whether or not the honourable member agrees, the lack of sewerage has caused difficulty. Since becoming the Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau, I have not discussed the development of this area. As a result of the honourable member's question, however, I am prepared to examine the possibilities and, bearing in mind the other requirements in this field that exist throughout the State, to consider whether something cannot be done to improve this area.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Second reading.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1965 I moved a motion in this House to appoint a public accounts committee and in the same year the Government introduced a Bill for this purpose. However, although the Government said that its Bill was in keeping with the long-established policy of the Party, it did not proceed with it beyond the second reading stage. Again last year I introduced a similar motion to the one I had introduced in 1965. In this case the motion was substantially amended to bring it into line with the

terms of reference as set out in the 1965 Government Bill. Again, the Government did not proceed with the matter. Therefore, I believe it is necessary for me to introduce a private member's Bill in relation to this matter. I am mindful of the fact that, as a private member, I cannot move any business that involves the expenditure of money. Therefore, it must be understood that my Bill provides for an honorary standing committee.

There is nothing unique about establishing a public accounts committee; a similar committee was established in the House of Commons in 1861. In 1866, when speaking during the second reading debate of the Exchequer and Audits Department Bill, Gladstone said that the last portion of the circle of Parliamentary control of finance remained incomplete until the Committee of Public Accounts had done its duty and that it was not until then that it could be fairly said that the office of the House as the real, authoritative steward of public money had been discharged. The New South Wales, Victorian, Tasmanian and Commonwealth Governments have introduced similar committees. This State has had a long history of attempts to establish a public accounts committee. When I have moved motions in this connection in this place I have been asked why Liberal and Country Party Governments did not introduce a public accounts committee. Actually the first person to attempt to introduce a Bill to establish such a committee was the then Leader of a Liberal and Country Party Government (Hon. R. L. Butler), who, in 1933, introduced a Bill that passed the second reading stage in this House without opposition. However, after passing the second reading of the Bill, the Legislative Council finally defeated it because it did not provide for a joint committee but only for a committee of members of the House of Assembly.

Perhaps the present Government will raise an objection to my Bill, because I have provided for a joint committee on Parliamentary accounts. However, it must be recognized that the Legislative Council considers Appropriation, Supply and Public Purposes Loan Bills but does not consider the amounts of the Estimates of Expenditure of Revenue and Loan Accounts. Although it does not consider the amounts, in fact it considers the actual Bills and, as we know, under the Constitution it can recommend amendments to those Bills although it cannot insist upon them. I know that similar committees in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania consist exclusively of members of the Lower House but, in the case of the Commonwealth Government (where we have a similar bicameral system), provision is made for general membership on this committee. Therefore, it is not unique for me to suggest a joint committee in this instance as we already have a precedent at the Commonwealth Government level. Also, there is nothing unique in this type of committee because similar committees exist in other States and, as I have pointed out, a similar committee was considered as long ago as 1861 to be an integral part of the financial circle regarding the consideration by members of Parliament of the Estimates of Expenditure.

As members know, when Bills are introduced in this House to appropriate money for expenditure, the House votes certain moneys. We admit that provisos exist on the voting of the expenditure of moneys beyond a certain figure, such as $200,000 unless the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works has inquired into and reported on the matter or unless the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee has investigated and reported. Notwithstanding that, there is no protection for the private members in the oversight of any other expenditures that come before the House. We vote moneys but we cannot be certain that they are ultimately spent for the purpose for which they were voted. As members know, provision exists in the Public Finance Act for a Governor's Warrant authorizing an excess expenditure of revenue money. This is provided to meet contingencies. However, Supplementary Estimates must be ultimately approved in relation to such expenditure.

I am also well aware that, in 1947, the Playford Government amended the Public Purposes Loan Act and included section 5 (3) which enabled the Treasurer to vary the several amounts to be spent on the various Loan projects, provided that the total amount authorized to be issued from the Loan Fund was not exceeded. Therefore, provision exists within our financial structure to enable additional expenditure to be made, or changes in expenditures to be made, without reference to this House. In the first instance, reference must be made to the House when Revenue expenditures are involved. In the case of Loan expenditures this need not be so unless, as I have said, the amount exceeds the total amount voted. However, there are other bodies or trusts outside the control of this Parliament to which we vote money, such as the Housing Trust and

the Electricity Trust. We also have the Highways Department, which is financed by special Acts, and the House does not have any oversight of the way in which this money is spent. True, a Minister is answerable for this department but it is not easy for members to extract information from Ministers unless the Ministers wish to make the information available. This they do not always necessarily wish to do. That does not apply only to this Government; it applies to any Government.

This reduces the effectiveness of individual members in obtaining information on financial matters. This is an acceptance of Executive control. Even though Ministers are answerable to Parliament, there is Executive control and individual members are unable to get information, except by way of questions. I repeat that this information is not always made available. However, a committee of this sort would enable this information to be available, because a Select Committee of both Houses is empowered to call witnesses, to inquire into certain matters and to report to Parliament. In such a way individual members would be able to obtain extra information, subject, of course, to a reference being made by Parliament to this committee. Any questions of malpractices that may arise will be investigated, as will any deviations from accepted practice.

We have heard suggestions by the present Treasurer that he balanced the Budget and, although the method adopted is perfectly legitimate as far as I can ascertain from a study of financial measures, it is a departure from the accepted practice of the House. It might well have been a matter into which a public accounts committee could have inquired and reported to the House about, thus allaying any doubts in the minds of members about whether the practice was proper. By way of a question yesterday I drew attention to what I considered to be wasteful expenditure by the acceptance of annuality in Government accounting. I drew attention to the fact that in the Highways Department frequently substantial amounts of money are allocated at a time when it is not practicable to spend these moneys effectively and that, consequently, wastage occurred. I have grave doubts about whether this practice of annuality need be insisted upon. It is something that a committee of this sort might well inquire into in order to ensure more effective expenditure of Government moneys.

It is not intended that a committee of this nature should effect economies. Its principal function would be to see that money was properly spent and that excessive amounts were not spent: in other words, to ensure that wastage did not occur in relation to projects voted upon by the House to be carried out during any one financial year. I consider that the introduction of such a committee would enhance the status of Parliament, particularly as Executive control seems to be growing stronger since Executive Government and Party politics came into being more than 100 years ago. It would enable proper and extensive consideration to be given to matters brought to the notice of Parliament by the Auditor-General. We know this. It is often the case. The Auditor-General criticizes the expenditure of certain departments and draws attention to what he considers to be irregularities. In most cases they are accepted by the House without question. There is some debate but the debate becomes pointless, because there is no way in which the House can carry out further inquiries and satisfy itself that there are irregularities or justifiable explanations of them.

In many cases it could be a prime function of a public accounts committee to explain to the House the reasons for apparent irregularities in Government accounting. It would certainly also enable a greater scrutiny from time to time of financial matters that are not now closely examined by any responsible Parliamentary committee, such as those affecting the Highways Department and certain trusts. There is no question that finance is the traditional and prime responsibility of the Lower House, although, as I have pointed out, in this State, under our Constitution, the Legislative Council has sufficient authority for it to be justifiably considered for representation on this committee. Therefore, I have drafted the Bill that is now before the House. I shall now explain it briefly. Clause 3 provides for the committee, which is to comprise seven members, five members to be appointed from the House of Assembly and two members from the Legislative Council.

Ministers of the Crown cannot be members of the committee. I think this is a wise provision. Subclause (4) provides for the appointment of the committee forthwith after the commencement of the Act and thereafter forthwith after the commencement of the first session of each Parliament. Clause 4 provides for the continuance in office of the committee until it is next appointed. Clause 5 provides for casual vacancies. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of a chairman and temporary chairman. Clause 7 provides

for a quorum of four, except when a proposed report to Parliament is being considered, when the quorum shall be not fewer than five and subclauses (3) and (4) provide for voting and for the chairman to have a casting vote in the event of an equality of votes.

Clause 8 provides for the appointment of a secretary and such other officers of the committee as are required for its proper functioning. Clause 9 sets out the duties of the committee. In detail, they provide for the committee to examine the accounts of Revenue and Expenditure of the State or any report by the Auditor-General; to report on any items or matters in relation to these accounts statements or reports laid before Parliament; to report to both Houses on any alterations the committee considers necessary in the form of the public accounts and to inquire into any question in connection with the public accounts referred to it by either House. New paragraph (*e*) covers reference by the Auditor-General in writing. Clause 10 empowers the committee to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and production of documents, while clause 11 empowers the committee to sit during the sessions of the respective Houses, with their leave. Clause 12 contains a general power to make regulations necessary for the carrying out and giving effect to this Act.

As I pointed out earlier, in general essence this Bill is similar to one introduced by the Government. I make no pretence of having drafted individual clauses. I modified the Bill introduced in 1965 to meet what I considered to be necessary provisions for the setting up of such a committee.

Mr. Jennings: Why have two Legislative Council members?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Under the State's Constitution, whether the member for Enfield likes it or not, the Legislative Council has certain powers concerning money matters. It cannot initiate, but it can pass judgment and to do this its members must inquire in the same way as do members of the Lower House.

I have been asked how long I have had the desire to see this committee function. The things that happened before I came into this House are matters about which I had little knowledge. In 1959 I voted as I did because I did not have my present understanding of financial provisions and of the ramifications of Government finance. Most of those who strongly oppose the appointment of this committee are either past or current Cabinet Ministers. Executive control is dangerous but it seems that the Executive is the chief opponent of a Bill that will give greater access to information. The principal function of this Parliament is to vote moneys, to raise taxes, and to ensure that the money raised is properly and wisely spent. A committee of this kind could examine that function, and I therefore commend the Bill to the House.

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

GAS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Hall:

(For wording of motion, see page 844.)

(Continued from July 26. Page 847.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. The Leader of the Opposition said that no doubt the Government would accuse him and the Opposition of playing politics on this matter. He need not have had any doubts at all, as I do accuse him of doing just that on this measure. His attitude will be evidenced from what he has said. The Leader has proposed that the cost of construction, the potential for gas usage, and the economic effect on certain centres by the construction of the Gidgealpa-Moomba-Adelaide pipeline be referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report. That means that South Australia would lose the race to get natural gas to its major industrial area in 1969, ahead of other States, at a comparative and competitive cost. What is now a race for industrial development based on natural gas would end in South Australia if this inquiry were to take place, as it would hold up the commencement of the construction of this pipeline.

There cannot be any other conclusion. Everyone knows how long an inquiry by that committee into a matter of this kind would take. It would not report tomorrow: it would not report in the time it will now take for us to complete the arrangements to commence construction of the pipeline, and get it under way. Negotiations with producers to provide a major contract that will make this proposal an economically viable one have been protracted and have been tough, but the difference between the Government and the producers is small, and I believe it will be resolved shortly. The Leader said that it seemed that the pipeline would not be commenced in the near future. From Opposition statements it seems that they hope it will not commence in the immediate future; not for the sake of the people of South Australia but because of

political capital. I believe the project will move shortly. If it does, let us make it clear that we are operating on a fine margin of finance in order to make the transport of natural gas from the field to the industrial complex of South Australia possible, so that there is an effective demand for natural gas at the time the pipeline is finished.

The gas has to be transported to areas where there is effective economic demand immediately, or the proposition is not a going concern, and we will not be able to finance it or pay the service charges on the pipeline. Making the financial arrangements was not easy. The fact that they were made is something for which a great tribute should be paid to my predecessor the former Premier of this State (Hon. Frank Walsh). We achieved an agreement with the Commonwealth Government that no other State has been able to do. Victoria asked for a special Commonwealth grant to provide for a pipeline, but the request was refused. In order to get gas to Adelaide, where the only known effective economic demand exists, we have to ensure that there are no extra expenses. Our margin is fine, and a small increase in costs can make it difficult to continue to pay the servicing cost of the pipeline. That has been made clear to the House.

However, there has been a campaign, deliberately engendered by the Liberal Party in South Australia, to ensure that no constructive support is given to the proposition to develop this most essential natural resource for industrial development in South Australia, and to try to wreck the project for the Party's political purpose. This campaign has been promoted by certain Liberal Party members in gulf towns represented by the Labor Party. Liberal Party organizations in your district, Mr. Speaker, and in the districts of the member for Port Pirie and the Minister of Education have spread propaganda that is sheer lies—nothing else! Time after time this has been put out in those areas in the organs of the local press and in pamphlets circulated by members of the Liberal Party. They have said, time and again, for instance, that there have not been feasibility studies of alternative routes. That is completely untrue.

However, complete feasibility studies of alternative routes and of the possible demands in various areas have been undertaken by the Government's advisers, the Bechtel Pacific Corporation. A complete study of the alternative costs is available to the Government and it is quite clear that on all scores, both for getting the gas to Adelaide where the only effective economic demand for servicing of the pipeline costs occurs, and for providing gas to the gulf towns, the cheapest way of providing it will be by the eastern route. Since the first natural gas feasibility study was carried out in 1965, the problem of deciding the most economic route of the gas pipeline has received much attention, having in mind always not only the short-term financial aspects but also the longer-term aspects of industrial development and decentralization.

The short-term economic facts are readily stated and categorically favour the shorter results for the main trunk line, that is, the eastern route, with an appropriate smaller diameter lateral to serve Port Augusta and Whyalla, when necessary, and also to serve Wallaroo, when necessary. If the trunk line is taken via Port Augusta in the first instance, a substantial extra capital cost is immediately involved, amounting to about $1,600,000 for which there is no immediate return by way of increased gas sales. Accordingly, the transportation cost of gas to the main market in Adelaide would be increased. Such case as may exist for routeing the trunk main by way of Port Augusta presupposes a substantial gas market at Whyalla; it does not presuppose a substantial gas market at Port Augusta. As you will know, Mr. Speaker, there is no such gas market at Port Augusta, and any proposals for a gas market must be in the longer term. The Leader talked about the situation in Whyalla as demanding the western route, and he talked about industry established at Whyalla. In order to take the route via Port Augusta, we have to tie demand in Port Augusta to demand in Whyalla. There is not a demand in Port Augusta at the moment. The suggestion that we should supply natural gas to the Electricity Trust at Port Augusta would not help Port Augusta.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It certainly couldn't be used in the present plant.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; we would have to completely reconstruct the present plant at a considerable cost, and then dismiss most of the workers.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: And close Leigh Creek as well!

Mr. Hurst: Is that what the Opposition wants to do?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Is it suggesting that we do that?

The Hon. Frank Walsh: The Leader of the Opposition is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the pipeline is to go via Port Augusta, we have to look at the possible market in Whyalla. In fact, the only market available in Whyalla (and we had a careful look at this) is the small domestic market that could not justify the capital expenditure. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has categorically declined to commit itself to the use of natural gas in its industrial complex. This is not new, but the Leader said in his speech that we had the $80,000,000 Broken Hill company's steel works now in production in the second blast furnace, as though the organization would demand natural gas, when it told us it did not intend to use it. There is no present case for a lateral line to serve Whyalla and, therefore, no possible case for taking the trunk line through Port Augusta at present.

However, even were an immediate lateral to Whyalla required, the figures show that it is more economic to take the lateral from an eastern route trunk line, taking off from the eastern route trunk line at the 300 miles post, crossing the ranges at Horrocks Pass and passing through Port Augusta. The details of the estimates are as follows:

	Eastern route	Western route
Main pipeline, 18in. diameter	480 miles	508 miles
Whyalla lateral, 8⅝in. diameter	77 miles	15 miles
Whyalla lateral, 6⅝in. diameter	35 miles	35 miles
Angaston lateral, 8⅝in. diameter	22 miles	33 miles
Taperoo lateral, 12¾in. diameter	1 mile	1 mile

The main pipeline is 28 miles longer for the western route than for the eastern route, but access is better and this would lessen the cost of bringing in materials, equipment and supplies. There is, however, more rock on the western route, and the crossing of the sand dunes north of Lake Blanche is at a more difficult angle. The Whyalla lateral from the western route takes off from near Port Augusta. From the eastern route, the off-take is from near mile post 300 on the main pipeline, and the lateral passes through the ranges near Horrocks Pass and then to Port Augusta from which point it follows the same overland route to Whyalla as the lateral from the western route. The estimated costs of the Whyalla lateral are $2,463,000 from the eastern route and $1,217,000 from the western route.

The Angaston lateral is estimated to cost about $470,000 from the eastern route and $706,000 from the western route. The Taperoo lateral is the same for both routes and is estimated to cost about $324,000. Looping of the eastern route totals 395 miles if supply to Whyalla is included, and 388 miles if it is excluded. On the western route these figures are 410 miles and 403 miles respectively. These amounts of looping are required for the estimated peak flows in 1988 and show that the western route requires 15 miles more looping than the eastern route requires. It will be observed from tables that have been prepared that, in the absence of any demand from the Whyalla lateral, the case is clear-cut but in all cases, whether there is clear demand there or not, the eastern route is economically the more attractive. I seek leave to have the following tables incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

CAPITAL COSTS
($Am.)

Year of construction of Whyalla lateral	Initial		Ultimate	
	Eastern	Western	Eastern	Western
1969	31.2	32.7	71.9	72.8
1973	31.2	32.7	72.3	73.0
None	31.2	32.7	69.8	72.0

UNIT TRANSPORTATION COSTS
(cents a thous. cub. ft.)

Route	Whyalla lateral	First year Costs	Average costs First 5-year	First 20-year
Eastern	1969	14.96	10.53	9.01
Eastern	1973	14.96	10.55	9.08
Eastern	None	14.96	10.55	8.99
Western	1969	15.65	10.67	9.12
Western	1973	15.65	10.99	9.20
Western	None	15.65	10.99	9.23

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although these tables show that the capital and unit costs are quite close for both routes, they indicate that the eastern route is to be preferred at all stages. It is quite clear from the tables that at all times the capital investment in the pipelines is lower for the eastern route; that at all times the unit cost of transportation is lower for the eastern route (in other words, it is cheaper to supply Whyalla by a longer lateral than to deviate the main line); and that it is better to supply the Whyalla market by means of an overland route via Port Augusta, rather than by means of an underwater crossing, as shown in Parliamentary Paper No. 102.

Quite clearly, in order to get this project off the ground, we need to have the lowest possible capital cost and the lowest unit transportation cost, because if we increase our service charges, we cannot supply gas to the Electricity Trust (which will be the main initial consumer in the metropolitan area) at an agreed price lower than the operative fuel oil cost as agreed at the moment. The agreements achieved so far with the producers are on the basis that the pipeline will not cost more than the estimate. The Leader says, "Oh, well, we don't know whether it will cost more than the estimate, because look what happened at Chowilla." However, I assure him that the pipeline will not cost more than the estimate: we shall be able to achieve that. On the other hand, if the Leader's motion is carried, we will lose our opportunity to make certain that that is so. If the western route is chosen, with a resulting increase in costs, what we have achieved so far in the negotiations with the producers will all go down the drain, as will our finance.

Mr. Hughes: That is what they want!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is placing the whole project in jeopardy. For the sake of what—the hope that he will be able to make a bit of political capital in some of the gulf towns. He is suggesting that the members who have represented these towns so vigorously and so vociferously for years, and who are concerned with the protection of their constituents, have neglected their interests in not demanding that the pipeline be diverted to the western route, even though that would jeopardize the whole project, regardless of the fact that it has been clearly shown that the major lateral from the eastern route could supply Whyalla and Port Augusta more cheaply than the western route could.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: And Angaston!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That would be out, under the western route: it would be much more expensive. Any possibilities of development in Peterborough and Clare would be out of the window under those circumstances because, in the view of the Opposition, it is only feasible to supply gas from the main trunk without laterals; but that is not so. It is the concern of the Government to see that we get this project off the ground so that we can obtain industries which are prepared to establish here and which will use natural gas. We will provide laterals to see that such industries get natural gas at a competitive price. There will be no difficulty, once the project is under way, in seeing that natural gas is supplied to the gulf towns at a reasonable price. However, we have to get the project under way in order to obtain major industrial development in South Australia, and this will turn on our getting natural gas at a price competitive with Victoria. On present indications, the price will be very competitive with that of Victoria, because we have not been prepared to agree with the producers here to a price similar to the price agreed between Sir Henry Bolte and the Victorian producers. The South Australian producers are also keen to see that their price is competitive so that the whole project is a viable concern.

The Leader goes on to say, "Why do we need to commit ourselves to this project anyway in order to get the gas to an industrial complex in the city because, after all, there may be future developments of gas closer to the city than Gidgealpa-Moomba? There may be

other means of supplying cheap natural gas to the city." I hope we do find something of this kind. If the Leader listens to an announcement to be made within the next 12 hours, he will see that we hope for such development but, at the same time, we cannot neglect the exploitation of what is a proved natural asset in the race for development merely because of future hopes as to the results of drilling. If we get a better supply of natural gas closer to Adelaide, that will certainly improve our prospects, but in the meantime let us press on with what we now have and something that can provide the necessary fillip to industrial development in this State.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Leader's motion has succeeded, because the Premier paid the Opposition a direct compliment in the way he addressed himself to it. For the first time this House has obtained information regarding this project for which Opposition members have been pressing continuously for almost 12 months. I think all members will agree that at last information concerning proposed costs of the gas pipeline via the western route, the cost of diverting the pipeline to the gulf ports, and comparative figures involved in the laterals has been forced out of the Government. In speaking to this motion, the Premier got very touchy and accused the Opposition outright of playing politics in this matter.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: There has been plenty of evidence of it.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister cannot accuse me of playing politics. What about the Government's withholding information which honourable members, as private members, are entitled to know? Members on both sides want this project to commence as quickly as possible. That was markedly shown when the Bill was debated last session. We know we have to get the project going quickly and, more important, get it going economically and at an advantageous price.

Mr. Hudson: Are you supporting this resolution?

Mr. COUMBE: I am speaking of the motion of the Leader, which, as I mentioned a moment ago, has succeeded. The Premier said that there was a race to get this going in Australia, but we want to get it early in South Australia, before the other States can derive any advantage from their own installations. We all know that the costs have to be kept to a minimum. The Premier said that the eastern route was the cheapest but, until he said so, the House did not know that. The whole point of the motion was (if members look at its wording carefully and do not take a slant on it) to enable members to get information. The motion seeks to find out this information. We did not know the difference in cost between the eastern and western routes, and I challenge members opposite to deny that. Last year we were given some figures on the cost of only the eastern route.

Mr. Hudson: The western route!

Mr. COUMBE: We were given figures on the eastern route. These were the bases on which the submission to the Commonwealth Government was produced. No concrete facts and figures were given to the House about the western route. The only information we were able to get (and I think this was in a reply given by the Hon. Frank Walsh to either the member for Gumeracha or the Leader of the Opposition) was that a deviation of so many miles would cost so many million dollars. Therefore, I suggest that no member had officially been given information about this route. Today, for the first time, we received the information we had been seeking. Therefore, the Leader's motion has succeeded in obtaining this information.

Last session in questions, in a motion, and in the debate on the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Bill, members sought from the previous Premier information about the cost of this route on the western side of the range. However, no information was supplied. Today the Premier accused the Opposition of wanting the Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta connected to the natural gas pipeline with the result that operations at Leigh Creek would be abolished, causing unemployment in that town. At no time has the Opposition suggested anything like that. We realized that the position at Leigh Creek was considered in the submission made to the Commonwealth Government, and we supported the view included in that submission. The Opposition has been accused of playing politics; yet, today the Premier has deliberately dragged in this red herring.

The Natural Gas Pipelines Authority was gazetted the day before it held its first meeting. We realize that under the terms of the legislation the Government has the authority to fix the route of the pipeline and we do not argue about that. Also, we have considered the report of Bechtel Pacific Corporation. However, no information was given about costs of the alternative route. This can be verified by checking *Hansard*. Although members of the Government Party may have been

given some information on the matter, no member of this House (certainly no member on this side) was given information officially. Today, for the first time, we received the information we have been seeking.

Mr. Hudson: We all knew when the looping was completed that the western route would cost about $2,500,000 more than the eastern route.

Mr. COUMBE: In reply to the honourable member, we had asked directly what feasibility studies had been carried out regarding the route on the western side of the range. We wanted to know this in relation to stage 1—before the looping stage had been reached. We wanted to be able to compare costs of this route with those of the eastern route. The Government had given figures to the House on the cost of the eastern route. It said that the western route had been examined, but he did not supply any figures of costs. That is why we brought forward this motion. It is all very well for the member for Glenelg (with his new-found knowledge of the United States of America) to talk about stage 3: I am talking about stage 1. In fact, the Premier says that it is stage 1 with which we are principally concerned.

As the Opposition had been unsuccessful in obtaining the information it sought, we introduced a motion to have a committee examine all aspects of the eastern and western routes to see which route was likely to be cheaper. I said last session that it could well be that the eastern route would be cheaper than the western route, but I wanted to know (as did my colleagues) whether that was so. The figures given by the Premier today indicate which is the cheaper route, but until he spoke we had no information before us on this matter. It is the job of the Opposition to satisfy itself, and to satisfy the people of South Australia, on such a matter. It was logical for us to suggest that the matter should be examined by the Public Works Committee, because a project of this magnitude should be examined carefully. It has been suggested that such an examination could cause a delay, but I assure the House that the Public Works Committee has few references before it at present; in fact, I think it has never had so few.

Regarding the suggestion that this project is too big and would delay the committee unduly, I point out that the committee investigated the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, an investigation which was spread over a year. However, from memory I believe that the committee presented three interim reports which enabled work on the project to commence. All members are aware of the importance to Whyalla and other northern towns of the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main. In 1964 that project was estimated to cost $33,000,000. It is interesting that stage 1 of the oil pipeline project will cost about $35,000,000, so there is a similarity in both cost and importance between these two projects. The Public Works Committee dealt with its investigation of the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main quickly by conducting the investigation in stages.

The question has been raised whether the pipeline route should be as near as possible to a straight line from Gidgealpa-Moomba to Adelaide. However, many precedents for deviation exist in the case of water supply. The Public Works Committee considered and agreed to two deviations in the case of the Morgan-Whyalla main; deviations were made at Jamestown and Gawler. As members know, the committee accepted the departmental recommendation on these matters. It is noticeable in other parts of the world that gas pipeline routes are planned by reputable authorities to suit the needs of centres of population, industries and markets. First, the Hetherington report to the Queensland Government shows this. The line from Roma to Brisbane deviates considerably to serve Toowoomba. The pipeline was deliberately taken to Toowoomba instead of in a straight line to Brisbane because of the potential available in Toowoomba. Incidentally, I have had a copy of the Hetherington report in my possession for two years and I used it when I asked the then Premier early last year to table the Bechtel Pacific report. The Hetherington report was tabled in the Queensland Parliament and another was tabled in the Victorian Parliament.

One of the largest gas pipelines in the world is in Holland. Members know that beneath Holland there is a vast reservoir of natural gas. One only has to look at the map of the pipelines there to see that they do not follow straight lines. The route of the pipelines is not dictated by the geography of the country but by the location and likely location of industry and centres of population. There is a marked deviation from the north of Holland, through Belgium to Calais and a swing from Brussels to Paris. The pipeline is shown by a curly line running down from Arnhem and up through Austria. I have given only the terminii and if the map of the pipeline is looked at in detail, it can be seen that the

pipeline went to the main centres so that gas would be available there. I have been referring to the main line. A number of laterals run to other centres.

Mr. McKee: Have you any information about America?

Mr. COUMBE: If the honourable member had studied some of the pipelines in America as I have been able to do, he would know that the pipelines there ran not only from State to State, but also from nation to nation. A pipeline runs from Canada to California. They do not take the shortest distance between two points but rather run so as to serve the main centres. As the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) would have confirmed during his visit, a pipeline running generally from east to west would deviate to serve centres of population or industry.

The motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition has succeeded in one essential point. Although the Government has not accepted the motion (and I did not expect that it would), the House has been given information that members on this side have been seeking continuously since last year. The former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) would not give us the information. However, the detailed figures have now been given by the Premier and they are extremely valuable. If this is the cheapest route, I am happy to receive this information. The whole point of the motion, apart from being political, was to get this information, which we and the people were entitled to get. I have not analyzed and assessed the information, but my figuring approximates some of the lateral figuring that the Premier has given.

My colleagues and I hope that this project gets off the ground quickly. We have always said that this work ought to be done quickly and we have always said that the cost of gas at the city gate has to be more favourable than the cost of alternative fuels. If that target is not achieved, the whole exercise will not have been worthwhile. I do not advocate the payment of a subsidy in relation to the cost of gas. Until the Premier spoke today, we had not been assured on this matter.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The member for Torrens is beginning to believe his statement that the motion has succeeded. The Opposition is confused about natural gas and seems to have had trouble deciding on a suitable motion. By the time members opposite had decided on the first motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the Government had beaten them.

Mr. Clark: As it usually does.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The Opposition is in a complete state of confusion because the Government has moved so confidently and quickly in regard to natural gas and other matters that will assist the development of the State and its people.

Mr. Hurst: We swept them off their feet.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The Opposition, in its efforts to jump on the gravy train, is becoming unpopular with most of the people of the State. This was borne out recently when certain school children criticized the Leader of the Opposition about his remarks regarding legislation that would be of benefit to the State. Surely the Opposition is not foolish enough to believe that it will bulldoze the Government into making mistakes from which political benefit can be gained. I assure Opposition members that they are not gaining any political benefits in the gulf towns. The only support they are getting there is from permanent supporters of the Opposition Party, who, I may add, are a dying race.

Mr. Hurst: The Opposition is not adding to its ranks.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What about last November?

Mr. McKEE: What about Corio? The Hon. Frank Walsh, when Premier, gave to members opposite information almost the same as that given by the Premier today, yet they deny that they have had this information.

Mr. Jennings: It takes a long time to sink in.

Mr. McKEE: That could be the main problem. The statement that this information has been denied to the Opposition is complete bunkum. This motion is pure political propaganda. At a meeting convened in Port Pirie, which I and the member for Wallaroo attended, representatives of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited said that the company was not interested in using natural gas. The Premier today gave reasons why other gulf towns would not use natural gas. The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla has made no representations suggesting that it wants to use natural gas. The coke ovens and the availability of shipping from Whyalla to Newscastle ensure that natural gas cannot compete against the present installations, and this company is concerned to maintain production at an economic level. I have been assured that the Smelters at Port Pirie will not use natural gas whilst

it can obtain electricity at a rate 7 per cent cheaper than the rate charged to other users.

Mr. Hughes: Do they get it 7 per cent cheaper?

Mr. McKEE: Opposition members know that the company receives electricity at a rate about 7 per cent cheaper than the rate charged to other users of electricity.

Mr. Hughes: What Government would make that agreement?

Mr. McKEE: It has been made, and this company will not use natural gas whilst it can use electricity at that price. Although the member for Gumeracha made great capital about water reticulation schemes provided during his term of office, he admitted that the water was not taken to places where there was no demand for it. The main was taken along the shortest route to the point of greatest demand. Later, small branch pipelines were constructed to enable other consumers to use the water, and this is a commonsense practice. Who would take an 18in. or 22in. gas pipeline halfway round the State in the hope that industry would follow it?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Who suggested that.

Mr. McKEE: The Opposition wanted to take it to Whyalla, then to Port Pirie, down to Wallaroo, and then into Adelaide. What would that cost?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This has never been suggested.

Mr. McKEE: As the Premier said today if the price of gas was increased by ¼c, it would be impossible to go into business, but perhaps Opposition members want that to happen. The Government will not make foolish mistakes, but is showing the Opposition how to run this State on a proper business footing.

Mr. Casey: Perhaps they don't want Peterborough to have the use of natural gas?

Mr. Hudson: They would use it just as well at Port Augusta would.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Gumeracha was responsible for constructing water mains along the shortest route, and he would adopt the same policy with a gas pipeline. It has been said to me by people who have observed the actions of Opposition members, that it would not matter on which side of the gulf the pipeline was constructed, it would be wrong because the Government was doing it. In most countries of the world using natural gas, it is the practice for smaller lines to branch from the main pipeline for the use of smaller consumers. I remind the Opposition that the Government's policy on natural gas is accepted by the Port Pirie corporation and by the people of Port Pirie, because they have been assured that Port Pirie will get natural gas, if necessary. An industry that is considering establishing at Port Pirie may require natural gas, and it has been assured that a supply will be available. I have confidence in the Government, and I assure the Leader that if his Party continues to oppose Government legislation that is beneficial to the people of the State generally and to my district in particular, it will pay dearly at the next election. I am certain that Opposition members will be foolish to enter a popularity contest at Port Pirie. I oppose the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): In supporting the motion, I remind members that I have always advocated the use of natural gas in South Australia. I was privileged to lead the Government that passed legislation enabling the mining companies to investigate the possibilities of natural gas, and that legislation became the standard in Australia. When I was Premier the Gidgealpa gas field was discovered, tested, and proved. At the time my Government was pushed out of office, two drilling plants were working on the field, and we were undertaking an emergency programme in order to get natural gas to Adelaide as quickly as possible. At that time an authority had been invited by the Delhi-Santos group to come to Australia.

Mr. Hudson: Which authority?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although I cannot recall, I referred to that authority when asking a question about it in the House. That authority, chosen not by the Government but by the Delhi-Santos group, came to South Australia and made a feasibility examination of the sale of natural gas and of the pipeline route. It made a firm report on those matters that is still in the hands of the Government so that, if I misquote the report, the Government can produce it tomorrow and correct me if necessary. The significance of the report was that it did not recommend the eastern route; it quite definitely recommended the western route. Having asked in the House whether the result of the previous investigation was the same as the result obtained by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation, I received a flat "No". Therefore, two reports have been obtained concerning the route that the pipeline should

follow. One was obtained by a company prior to the Government's directly negotiating in the matter. I believe that was obtained, bearing in mind that a market for gas existed in the gulf towns.

Mr. Hudson: Where is that market now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Strangely enough, it has disappeared but the investigation revealed that a worthwhile market existed, although it could not be compared with the market existing in Adelaide. That market in the gulf towns had nothing to do with the power station, which was never considered to be a user of the gas, because it was not physically designed for the purpose. It was found also that the availability of rail transport and communications would offset any disability that might occur in respect of the longer pipeline. The pipeline proposed by the Delhi Corporation is slightly larger than the one now proposed. However, the whole market for the requirements of gas had been examined by the expert authority engaged, and it was considered that a pipeline was required to supply the demand in Adelaide, taking into account the expansion that could normally be expected to take place.

The conclusion reached by that authority, incidentally, was the same as the one contained in the Bechtel report concerning the Electricity Trust's being the major user, initially. Although a survey was made of the users of gas in Adelaide and the quantities they would require, it was found that the major user in the metropolitan area would be the power station. I do not accept what the Premier has been saying about certain aspects of this project: he has said that the cost of gas supplied to industry here will be lower than that of any capital city in Australia. Unless the information that I have received from Queensland is completely inaccurate (and I have no way of checking it), the Premier's statement is not correct. Further, an agreement has already been reached in Adelaide concerning the supply of natural gas to industry. If a new industry established in the metropolitan area tomorrow it could not obtain natural gas from the authority.

Mr. Hudson: That's not so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am saying it is. The honourable member does not know the position. The South Australian Gas Company has entered into an agreement with the Delhi-Santos group, which has signed a contract to supply the company with gas at a certain price for metropolitan consumers with, I believe, five exceptions (two brick companies, two cement companies and, I think, Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand Limited). If any industry in the metropolitan area desires to use natural gas, it buys it from the South Australian Gas Company. When the Premier says that this is a matter of urgency in regard to establishing new industry, I point out that gas will be supplied to new industry at town gas prices, because an agreement has been entered into.

Indeed, it is public knowledge that the South Australian Gas Company has agreed to buy from the authority over a period of years. Part of the agreement referred to quantities to be supplied by the company and the vending organizations respectively. The cement works at Angaston, similar works at Birkenhead, and two brickworks are excluded from the agreement, and, as I said, I think I.C.I. is the fifth industry that is excluded. That latter fact could easily be verified by honourable members. Therefore, if industry is to be established as a result of the availability of natural gas, such industry has to be outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: What is your definition of "metropolitan area"?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot give the honourable member that definition. However, I know it represents an appreciable area, because the Angaston cement works is one industry that could get its supply direct. This matter would not be covered by the Gas Act, because it is the subject of an agreement between the two companies. Any industry that has natural gas for its base will have to pay the town gas supply price if it is established within the area to which the agreement applies. Therefore, it seems to me that such industry would have to be outside that area. The agreement, as stated publicly, provides that if an industry within this area wants to buy gas it will have to buy it through the Gas Company, and that company's price has been publicly stated to be about 40c a million b.t.u.

Mr. Hudson: But that is largely for domestic usage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not seen the agreement, for it is a private agreement and the detail of it has never been made public. It is an agreement which undoubtedly will put the price of gas out of the range of any gas-using industry of the type that we so frequently talk about as being likely to establish as a result of the availability of natural gas. Therefore, it is necessary that

we look closely at this project. Two things immediately arise in connection with it. First, we must have a project which brings the gas down at the cheapest possible price to our industries in the metropolitan area. I was rather disappointed that the financial arrangements in connection with this matter provided us with a capital cost burden which, in my opinion, was too high. This field is remote from Adelaide. If it were in America, the price of gas to the producer on the field would be low. I know it is desirable that people who look for gas should get a proper reward for the job, otherwise we would not have people looking for the gas.

On the other hand, we have to see that the very large public investment that will be made gives some benefit to the public. If this is not the position, it is not worth while making the investment. If we are not to get our fuel more cheaply, and if industries cannot operate more economically than they can with alternative fuels, there is not much benefit to be gained in putting $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 into the pipeline authority. It is no use any honourable member trying to deny that two authoritative reports have been made on this matter. The Hon. Frank Walsh, who is now in the Chamber, can confirm what I am saying. The Liberal Government obtained a report from the Delhi-Santos group prior to the last election, and a copy of that report is now in the Premier's possession. The report, which is a reasoned document, recommends not the eastern route but the western route.

I think every honourable member in the Chamber knows that agreement has now been reached with the Electricity Trust on the price of gas. Although the Premier said this afternoon that the announcement about it woud be made in a day or two, we know that he meant it would be made in an hour or two but that he was not prepared to take this Chamber fully into his confidence. We know that the agreement has been reached and that he intends to annouce it in his own way and in his own time. I do not object to that, although I do object to his saying in this Chamber that the agreement would be announced in a day or two when he knew quite well that it would be announced in an hour or two.

Mr. Jennings: You started that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that members opposite do not mind stretching the truth a little. However, the fact is that this was designed to mislead honourable members. The Premier's statements this afternoon in connection with this matter require some pretty thorough investigation. First of all, natural gas will be available to industry in Queensland at a very much lower price than it will be available in South Australia. Secondly, natural gas will not be available to industry in the metropolitan area direct from the authority, except in five instances. The price that will have to be paid by industries other than those is a price that would prevent a fertilizer works, for instance, from being established. We were negotiating directly for a fertilizer works prior to the last election. Such a works, which would be a significant industry from the point of view of our primary industries and also possibly from the point of view of our export trade, would have to get gas at a significantly lower price than any price that has yet been determined. The member for Port Pirie said that people in that town did not regard natural gas as important.

Mr. McKee: That is wrong.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member said that the people of Port Pirie were satisfied.

Mr. McKee: I said we had confidence in the Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member said that the council was confident that if an industry came to Port Pirie the Government would provide gas to it. He referred to an industry, to which reference has been made for some time, which will occupy the old uranium works at Port Pirie. He said that this industry had been promised a substantial gas supply if it wanted it.

Mr. McKee: That is correct.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Does the honourable member think the ordinary home consumers of gas in Port Pirie want to pay more for gas than they would have to pay for natural gas?

Mr. McKee: That will be examined eventually.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I point out that a spur line to supply gas to people living in that town would never be considered on an economical basis.

Mr. McKee: This afternoon, the Premier confirmed what I have said.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I listened to the honourable member with some interest and in silence. If the pipeline route passes near Port Pirie, that town will have the advantage of low price natural gas, but if the eastern route is adopted home consumers at

Port Pirie will not have the advantage of natural gas unless an industry is established there. The same position applies with regard to Port Augusta. If the pipeline passes close to a town there will be no problem in tapping it to supply industries or local houses. If the eastern route is adopted—

Mr. Casey: Peterborough will be entitled to it then.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I accept that. If the pipeline is near Peterborough that town will have the advantage of natural gas. The Leader of the Opposition was perfectly fair in the terms of his motion in which he provided that a committee should examine both routes to see which was the better. I do not think for a moment that the eastern route would be of advantage for the establishment of industries. People do not like to establish industries away from the sea-board. What the member for Port Pirie said about providing a spur line for the supply of natural gas if an industry were established at Port Pirie emphasizes that point. However, I believe the western route has possibilities in regard to the establishment of industries, because the towns it would pass are on the sea-board. Industries are attracted to sea-ports because of the transport advantages. Therefore, I believe advantages exist in adopting the western route.

Mr. McKee: They would have to be political advantages.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will retire at the end of the present session; I am 71 and I am not interested in the political angle. The only interest I have in the matter is to try to advocate as best I can the wisest course to be followed. Reports show that gas prices in Queensland will enable ammonium nitrate to be produced there, whereas I do not think the price here will allow that to be done. Also, gas users in Adelaide (with the exception of the five companies to which I have referred) will have to buy their gas from the South Australian Gas Company. The likely price of this gas has been stated publicly as 42c and 39c a million British thermal units. Even if the price were 30c it would be unattractive to industry because the price of fuel oil is only about 25c or 26c at present. Industries will be interested in natural gas only if its price is as low as, or even lower than, the price at which it will be provided to the Electricity Trust. That fact is inescapable. Another inescapable fact is that no way exists for any industry (except for the five companies to which I have referred which were excluded from the general agreement) in the metropolitan area to obtain gas direct from the producers. Therefore, if we want to use natural gas as a means of establishing industries, we will have to consider doing this outside the area of the agreement.

Mr. Hughes: There is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not say there was. However, I point out that if the eastern route is adopted this will not be easy to do. All I am pointing out is that the eastern route is not conducive to that.

Mr. Hughes: I think it is.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Whatever advantages that route has (and it has some: it is shorter and it may be slightly better country to go through) it does not have (and honourable members opposite can say what they like) the advantages that it would provide gas at the sea-board quickly, that it would supply the majority of the established centres. It would supply one established centre only, and that is an inland one.

The third point is that, whether we like it or not, the big development of the gulf towns will still take place at Whyalla or Iron Knob. There are two reasons for that. The first is that the natural resources are at Whyalla and Iron Knob, and the second is that we have established at Whyalla one of the most progressive and powerful industrial complexes not only in Australia but also (I think we can say) in the world. I hope there will be a pronounced tendency for that complex to grow industrially and in other ways. I believe the Whyalla development will be important and that gas, which would be adjacent to it if it came down by the western route, would significantly help. If we approached the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and asked it whether it was prepared to enter into a contract for the supply of natural gas, it would probably say "No"; but, when we asked it whether it wanted electricity at Whyalla when we established the power station at Port Augusta, it said "No".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And it didn't at that time, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. It said, "We have always got surplus heat"; but, once power was generated at Port Augusta, it quickly seized on to the advantages of using some of that power and wanted not one transmission line but two. Again, when we approached the company at Whyalla and asked how much water

it would need, it replied, " We shall need 100,000,000 gallons a year. We will contract for that amount, which is necessary for our undertaking." Ultimately, by negotiation, we got that company to agree to 350,000,000 gallons. The member for Flinders will correct me if I am wrong.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I was not here in those days.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Perhaps the Minister will know. I think it was 350,000,000 gallons. On the strength of that, the State installed a pipeline capable of suppling 1,000,000,000 gallons to Whyalla and 1,000,000,000 gallons to Port Augusta and the northern towns. Within 14 years the company that had said that 350,000,000 gallons was the most it would ever need was demanding another pipeline, to give it 2,000,000,000 gallons a year. The duplication of that pipeline is now history. So, even if we approached the B.H.P. tomorrow and asked, "Will you enter into a contract to buy gas?", it would probably not enter into one; it might not even show much interest. However, I am certain, judging by the experience we had with electricity and water, that if gas was there and available that company would reach out and soon become an eager consumer—provided the gas was competitive with other fuels. That would be the only stipulation. At Port Augusta there is no reason why it should not be competitive, so that company would reach out and get it. I am certain the Leader of the Opposition is right when he maintains that this matter should be investigated. It would not take long because the Government has in its possession two complete reports, which could be evaluated quickly before the additional drilling was undertaken—because, if the pipeline is to be constructed, the Moomba field has still to be tested. Today, it is only partly tested; it will probably be a few months before it is tested sufficiently for the pipeline project. I do not stress that time limit: we might gamble and take a risk.

One of the two reports available to the Government was obtained from the Bechtel Corporation and the other from the Delhi-Taylor-Santos group. They are on the Government's files, the latter one reaching a completely different conclusion from the former one. Rather than make a mistake in this matter, it would be well worth while having it investigated by the Public Works Committee, even if a time limit was imposed. We could say to that committee, "We want a report within a certain time. Get to work and submit a report quickly; we want it within eight weeks". It is desirable that the two routes be closely examined, with the help of available reports, before we proceed with the eastern route merely because it is the shorter. As a matter of fact, its only merit is that it is shorter. It has transport and access problems and would not serve nearly as many people or provide nearly as much opportunity in the future as the western route would. I do not say that the western route is the better but I do stress that it should be examined on a reasonable basis, taking into account the advantages that could accrue from industrialization if we got the gas down there at a price that would allow chemical industries to operate. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): It is amazing that a motion of this sort should come forward at a time when the Government is on the verge of seeing the agreement between the producers of the gas and the Electricity Trust finalized. In the debates on this matter during the last week or two it has been apparent that the Opposition has been most concerned that the agreement between the trust and the producers be one most satisfactory to the State. The Opposition has been most concerned lest we entered into an agreement that was not beneficial to the trust. The debates showed clearly that these negotiations have been held on a very fine state of balance. In fact, it was a difficult agreement to negotiate: there was little margin in which to manoeuvre. Despite that, this motion has been brought forward at a time when we are about to be successful in the negotiations.

The importance of this point rests on the fact that, unless we clinch this agreement with the biggest consumer of natural gas in the State, this matter will not get off the ground at all, and all the talk about what will happen in the northern towns and the other towns mentioned in the motion will not be worth a cracker, because natural gas will not be available anywhere. This is the crux of the matter. All this argument about the establishment of industries outside the area of the agreement of the South Australian Gas Company is beside the point, because no establishment of industries could occur unless this project got off the ground with the biggest consumer of gas in the State.

It is about time the Opposition got down to the hard core of the subject and stopped meandering in an attempt to make Party

politics out of the matter. I shall show conclusively how it has been trying to do that. Does anyone imagine, in view of the fact that the Labor Party represents three districts in the northern area, that the Government would not have the line coming down the western side, close to Port Augusta and Whyalla, if it could possibly be done economically? We should be politically idiotic if we did not do that. We are choosing the eastern side because the whole economics depend on it. If it could be done economically on the western side, the Government would be doing it like a shot, obviously. It would be to our advantage to bring it down on the western side if that could be done economically.

Mr. Heaslip: How do you know it can't be?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This afternoon the Premier gave figures that showed it could not be done economically, because he showed that the extra cost of bringing the line down the western side was sufficient to prevent the success of the negotiations about to be completed.

Mr. Heaslip: That is what we have been asking you for months.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This afternoon the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that the only reason why the Opposition moved the motion was to force the Government to give information to the Opposition. He said the motion had been successful, that it had at last forced the Government to give the information the Opposition wanted. He said the information was given for the first time this afternoon. He also said that no member had been told of the comparative costs and that no information could be obtained on that matter. He said, "We could get no figures before us." Later I shall show how much truth there is in his statements but I point out first that his speech was different from the speeches of other Opposition members, because he, having got the information, said that if that was the truth, let us get on with the project straight away.

He did not pursue the subject, because he knew that the negotiations were so finely balanced that, unless we concluded them and got the project off the ground, there would be no gas for anybody, whether in the country or in the metropolitan area. Let us see whether the member's statements about the lack of information have any basis in truth. As is reported in *Hansard*, on October 11, 1966, the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) asked six questions and received this reply from the then Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh:

1. The alternative routes considered by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation are: (1) that to the east of the Flinders Ranges which passes between the ranges and Lake Frome and passes close to Peterborough; and (2) that to the west of the ranges via Port Augusta.

2. The relative cost of the pipeline by these two routes differs at different stages. The initial cost of the eastern route (480 miles) is $31,000,000, including one compressor station. The initial cost of the western route (510 miles) is $33,600,000, including two compressor stations, which the extra distance makes necessary. The ultimate relative cost of the two routes is subject to several offsetting considerations; for example, the lateral to Port Pirie and Whyalla is reduced in length and diameter by the western route, but on the other hand, the cost of providing "looping" at 18in. diameter—

That, of course, was the duplication of the line—

or possibly larger diameter, is increased by the extra 30 miles of the western route.

The member for Torrens said that the Opposition had no information on the subject! Later, in another place on March 9, 1967, the Minister of Mines stated the position in regard to the comparative costs of the lines on the eastern and western sides, respectively. Surely the honourable member is not going to contend that he has not access to *Hansard*. All the protestations about not having information are simply nonsense. When the Minister of Mines was speaking, he outlined in detail the relative merits of the eastern and western approaches to this question.

One can go further. I refer to a deputation from Port Augusta that waited on the Minister of Mines (Hon. S. C. Bevan) and the Director of Mines (Mr. Barnes). That deputation included people closely associated with the Liberal and Country League. It is interesting to note that a seminar was held by the L.C.L. at Port Augusta at which this question was heavily canvassed, the emphasis being laid on the virtues of the western approach and on the fact that nobody knew what the alternative costs were. Of course, that was not correct. The whole matter has been peddled around the northern towns for party political purposes.

It is interesting to note that the people in these towns cannot get from some of the local newspapers any good reports about what has been happening in the House on this matter. I wonder why? It is because the L.C.L. wants to keep the people in the northern towns ignorant of what is being said in the House

and ignorant of the facts. All this adds up to a Party political campaign in readiness for the next State election. It is interesting to see some of the propositions that were submitted by people from Port Augusta. Incidentally, they had been told that the additional cost of the western route was $2,600,000 and that the cost had been checked by independent engineers. They were assured that, in the event of the direct route being chosen, gas would be supplied wherever there was a demand for spur lines. Some of the suggestions made by these people were remarkable; for example, they suggested that gas could be used at the Port Augusta power station. However, it has been made quite clear in this House that the power station there cannot be converted to use natural gas without very great expense. In fact, the cost of conversion would be as great as the cost of building a new power station. In any event, if the conversion took place the station could be run by about six men, with the result that Port Augusta would experience unemployment.

It was even suggested that Leigh Creek could be closed down and held in reserve. What a proposition to put up! These things show to what lengths people will go to serve their parochial interests or their Party political interests. If we had wanted to serve our Party political interests to the economic detriment of this project, we would have brought the line down on the western side, and said, "To blazes with the economic consequences". However, we are not doing that; instead, we are saying that we must have this project and, since we must have it on an economic basis, we must bring the pipeline down in the most economic way, because the negotiations are delicately balanced.

The deputation to which I have referred was informed that the Bechtel representatives favoured the eastern route, and a statement to this effect was published in the *Advertiser*. It was suggested earlier that no survey had been made and that no estimates of costs and freight had been taken out. The deputation was informed that a survey had been made, that freight estimates by the South Australian Railways, the Commonwealth Railways and road hauliers had been prepared, and that the terrain was well known to the Mines Department. In other words, it received full information and assurances on every aspect.

The Opposition has been speaking in at least three different voices about this project. We have witnessed in this House the Opposition first of all urging us to go faster; they later said, "Stop! You must be sure that you do not have a negotiated agreement that will not be favourable to the Electricity Trust. Hold your horses! Be careful!" Now, we are told that we must wait until the Public Works Committee has looked at the proposition.

The member for Gumeracha is very vocal about the need for the committee to look at this matter. However, he would not have the Port Augusta power station (a very big and expensive project) investigated by the Public Works Committee and, as a result, Port Augusta has had a smog problem ever since. Had the committee looked at the project it might have said, "Something should be done about the smog nuisance over Port Augusta." Now, the member for Gumeracha is very vocal about referring this project to the Public Works Committee. Why should this be done? Are we to believe that the members of that committee have expert knowledge about this matter which can be compared with that of the Bechtel engineers (people who are experienced in natural gas pipelines)? What is the point of referring a matter that has already been dealt with by experts to a committee composed of people who are comparative amateurs?

Mr. Clark: The committee would have to call the experts as witnesses.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Exactly.

Mr. Hudson: And the Government would have to pay their expenses.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, and not only that but if this motion was carried it would sprag all the negotiations and probably result in our losing the project completely. This demonstrates the seriousness of this motion, and it is amazing that an Opposition that calls itself responsible should bring this up at this juncture.

Regarding Whyalla, the Leader of the Opposition said, "I am not bringing this up in a Party political way; I am viewing it with a very responsible attitude," and he then went on to tell us all about Whyalla. He told us about the population in 1965, the steelworks now in production, the second blast furnace, the shipbuilding industry and all the other industries. However, he did not come down to the core of the subject: he did not tell us how these industries now get their power and how they got it in the past. He spoke as though they were getting particularly expensive power and as though natural gas would be a great advantage to them. Of course, if he was going to be non-Party political about this issue, he would have

reviewed the whole question objectively and admitted that the B.H.P. Company has for many years been running its power system on the waste gas of the blast furnace, and that is why natural gas is not attractive to the company.

At present, even with the steelworks in production, the company takes very little electricity from Port Augusta and, in fact, when the new boiler comes into commission in a few days' time, the company will probably take no electricity from Port Augusta. The power produced at Whyalla is sufficient to carry out all the operations at Iron Knob and Iron Baron and throughout the city of Whyalla; it is sufficient for the activities of Perry Engineering (Whyalla) Limited, C. A. Parsons of Australia Limited, etc. The B.H.P. Company has not the slightest interest in natural gas. True, in the course of time the company may be interested in it, as the member for Gumeracha has said, but that is another issue altogether.

We must get this natural gas project off the ground. It is worth remembering that the B.H.P. Company has a very big interest in the discoveries of off-shore natural gas in Victoria. In other words, it has its own natural gas and, whilst I have not delved into the economics of it, I venture to say that it is possible that the gas it owns could be frozen and taken to Whyalla; this method may provide natural gas that is cheaper than South Australia's gas. We cannot be sure about this but it is a possibility, because natural gas can be handled in this way. Therefore, to suggest that Whyalla is in dire need of natural gas at present or will be in need of it at some time in the future is sheer nonsense and, of course, this is the point that the Leader of the Opposition very skilfully evaded.

I was greatly interested in the way the Leader approached the question of the Whyalla steelworks and this city's development. He gave all the credit to the Playford Government for the extensions and facilities there and at other places. He said that he accepted his share of the responsibility for the money spent to bring these things about. When he said this, my mind went back to the days when I was a member of the then Opposition and when I was on my feet many times advocating a steelworks at Whyalla. I remember the time when I went to the Middleback Ranges with the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, when he was looking for other sources of iron ore. I remember the co-operation given by the Opposition in those days in every move that the then Premier made in an endeavour to have a steelworks established at Whyalla. Although the Government of the day, supported by the Opposition, made large concessions to the B.H.P. Company with respect to prospecting for iron ore in that range and agreed to other conditions that the company insisted on, the Opposition never said that it would not have a bar of it because it did not suit its point of view. We said that the setting up of steelworks in Whyalla was so important to the State and its progress, and to decentralization, that we would support the then Government in every way in its efforts to have the steelworks established.

The only person who objected to establishing the steelworks at Whyalla was one of the most prominent members of the Government of the day, and I remember his saying that it would be uneconomic. Also, I can remember members of the then Government objecting when the then Director of Mines, in at least three successive annual reports, emphasized the value of a steelworks at Whyalla and suggested that it be established. The Government of the day always received the closest co-operation from the Opposition: we did not play Party politics, but got on with the job.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: We were always a responsible Opposition.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, but it is always being suggested that Labor people are irresponsible. Nothing is more irresponsible than this motion, in view of all the circumstances I have outlined. I have shown that the House did have this information. Bechtel, experienced experts in this matter, carefully surveyed both routes. Negotiations are finely balanced, but no-one will receive natural gas unless this project gets off the ground. The negotiations to have gas used by the Electricity Trust are fundamental to the whole scheme. After that, we develop spur lines when necessary, and northern towns and other places have received that assurance. Once the project starts it will develop. Like many similar projects, further economies can be made after it has started, and new capital can be invested to bring about a series of industries associated with the base project. But we must have the base project first. A house cannot be built without a foundation, and the foundation of this scheme is the settlement now being negotiated. I believe I have shown conclusively that what

is being done by the Opposition is not only irresponsible but is being done for Party political purposes, and I hope the House will completely reject this most irresponsible motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): The debate has spread far from the tenor of the original motion, and I remind the House of its wording. My interest lies in the furtherance of the possibility of establishing a nitrogenous fertilizer factory in the north of South Australia.

Mr. Curren: Wallaroo would be a good place.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I agree: it is not often I agree with the member for Chaffey, but when he says that Wallaroo is a good potential site for such a factory I am with him all the way. Already, a superphosphate works has been established there, and a nitrogenous fertilizer factory would be an admirable complement. During the debate in February and March on the Bill setting up the authority for the natural gas pipeline, the three members who would be most affected by the proposed western route had the least to say on the Bill. By coincidence, the three members representing the districts through which the western route would pass are Labor members. This is an important point, because they had little to say in the debate early this year.

Mr. Curren: It was important to the three districts.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, but why did not these members make a greater contribution to the debate? The member for Wallaro did not speak to the Bill and made no contribution in Committee. The member for Port Pirie did not speak in the second reading stage but made two contributions in Committee, one of which was a point of order.

Mr. McKee: I made a couple of contributions and they weren't in Committee.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The House is not interested in what the member for Port Pirie said on the point of order. He was especially interested in natural gas being used at Peterborough in cigarette lighters and to pump beer. What else? He described the pipeline debate as a political display, and then said:

If natural gas went to Port Augusta another industry would need to be set up there to offset the unemployment that would be caused. I understand a claim has been made for the pipeline to go to Port Augusta because it is considered that natural gas could be exported from Port Augusta. A sizeable industry at Port Augusta would be needed to consume 6,000,000 cubic feet per day, in order to make it a paying proposition.

Before referring to what the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) said, I should perhaps point out that although you, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Stuart, are not in a position to contribute to debates in the House, we appreciate the good work that you do. The member for Frome quoted the most irrelevant figures that were quoted during the earlier debate: he said that the cost of the western route would be about $2,500,000 more than that of the eastern route. I do not know where he obtained that figure, because I think the Premier said today that the western route would cost an additional $1,600,000.

Mr. Hudson: That's only the initial cost.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Perhaps I misheard the Premier, but I believe he said that the additional cost would be $1,600,000. In reply to a question on notice asked by the member for Gumeracha on October 11, 1966, the former Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) said that he was not sure of the extra cost involved in the western route; it would depend on the size of the loop line. It can therefore be seen that there is much doubt in the minds of Government members about how much extra cost the western route will involve. However, that is not the only factor to be considered: we must consider also the potential use of natural gas in towns on the western route. It is not fair for the Minister of Education to say that there is no need to have a Public Works Committee inquiry into the matter. That committee could go much further than merely obtaining a report from the Bechtel Pacific Corporation. The terms of the motion are beyond the scope of any investigation made by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation and would come well within the scope of a Public Works Committee inquiry.

Mr. Rodda: What about gas for Wallaroo?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: We do not have gas for Wallaroo, and I do not think that the member for Wallaroo is very active in obtaining it. I was delighted to see a report in last Friday's *Advertiser* that the Premier, when addressing a meeting in Adelaide, made a prophecy that was so rosy that it seems that gas can be supplied cheaply to the towns on the western route. The report states:

A favourable conclusion to natural gas price negotiations "in a few days" was forecast by the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) in the Assembly yesterday. At a luncheon earlier the Premier predicted again that natural gas would be available to industry in Adelaide at a price "significantly lower" than in Victoria and Queensland. Mr. Dunstan told the Assembly

that a gas price offer at least within break-even point of alternative fuels had been telephoned to him from Honolulu on Sunday.

The Premier's statement concerning a "significantly lower" price indicates the great potential for the use of natural gas, in order to promote industry on the western route and, in particular, a fertilizer factory at Wallaroo. I shall now quote from an article which appeared in the *Petroleum Gazette* of March, 1965, and which makes some rather interesting comments about natural gas and nitrogenous fertilizer. The report states:

The major constituent of natural gas, methane, is a comparatively inert gas, and its simple unreactive nature has retarded the use of natural gas in chemical manufacture except for a relatively few products. Some chemicals, however, can be made from natural gas alone, without the need for any other raw material. Nitrogenous fertilizers, such as urea and ammonium nitrate, are perhaps the best examples of these products, and almost 38 per cent of the world's ammonia production is based on natural gas.

World production of nitrogenous fertilizers has been greater than consumption in recent years causing a fall in price, but the current level of nitrogen usage is much lower than actual needs for soil fertilizers.

The availability of abundant, inexpensive, natural gas-based fertilizers would enable much more efficient use to be made of land in densely populated areas of Asia, Africa, and South America, which contain 60 per cent of the world's arable land but absorb only 20 per cent of total fertilizer consumption.

I believe that the House will be greatly heartened by a press report concerning the member for Glenelg when he returned from his recent oversea trip (and I take the opportunity now to welcome him back; it is nice to see him looking so fit).

Mr. Broomhill: You'll be sorry next week that he is so fit.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for West Torrens is too smart for me. Referring to a fertilizer factory at Wallaroo, the report in the *Advertiser* of August 1 states:

"Confident" on plant: Mr. Hudson, M.P., returned from a two-month U.S. visit yesterday "confident" that a nitrogenous fertilizer industry would be established in this State. In Jackson, Mississippi, he had discussion with representatives of an American syndicate reported to be interested in establishing a $6,750,000 chemical fertilizer factory at Wallaroo on land owned along the seafront.

The honourable member has developed his ideas rather well; he points out that the company has a site at Wallaroo and is ready to produce nitrogenous fertilizer if the Government will only provide the gas. The report continues:

He said he had written to the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) while he was away, but he proposed to submit a detailed report, with certain specific recommendations, for the Cabinet to study soon. "I have no doubt whatever that this sort of plant can and will be established here using natural gas," he said. "It will be of tremendous benefit to the agricultural areas of the State. The advantage of nitrogenous fertilizers is that they minimize the extent to which the farmer needs to leave his land fallow. This significantly increases the productivity of the land."

I am pleased to see that the member for Glenelg has been able to put to good use some of the training he has received through being a member of the Land Settlement Committee. We were pleased to have the honourable member on that committee.

Mr. Hudson: That was very good stuff to quote, but did you quote it all merely to support your claim that I had received my training from the Land Settlement Committee?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I quoted it to indicate the support the honourable member is giving to the proposal to build the gas pipeline on the western route, which is what the Opposition is trying to press the Government to consider fully. The Opposition considers that South Australia could be better served by having the pipeline on that route than on the difficult route it has been surveyed to follow. I know a little about the lower part of the eastern route, because it crosses the very hilly country near Auburn in the west of the Light District, and with the little knowledge I have of pipeline construction it seems to me that the cost involved in taking the pipeline across the steepest and most rugged country in that district would be very much greater than the cost of constructing the pipeline on the western route, which is much flatter and therefore, I would think, more acceptable for trench-laying purposes. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 27. Page 905.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): In his second reading explanation, the Premier said the Bill consisted of a number of miscellaneous amendments. Obviously, the Government places little importance on the Bill because it tried to place the responsibility for

its passage on to the Opposition. The Government told representatives of racing clubs that, unless they got approval for its provisions from the Opposition, the Bill would not be proceeded with. Therefore, we have the strange spectacle of the Government's refusing to accept responsibility for the introduction and passage of the Bill. Although the Government places little importance on it, I believe the Bill contains some matters that are worthy of comment. It transfers Saturday racing dates from the Gawler Jockey Club to racing clubs in the metropolitan area. This transfer of dates is desired by the managements of the Gawler club and of the metropolitan clubs. On the surface, this appears to be reasonable.

However, the transfer will not take place without a protest from some people in South Australia. They are concerned because the Gawler club will replace its Saturday racing dates with mid-week meetings, meaning that racing clubs in other country areas will lose meetings to enable this to happen. We can expect that some small country clubs, at present holding two meetings a year, will have to forego one of those meetings.

Mr. McKee: The Balaklava and Snowtown clubs in your district could be affected.

Mr. HALL: The Balaklava meetings are popular, and the club is sufficiently well established to be able to retain its meetings. However, people associated with that club have told me that it will probably lose the meeting it holds that coincides with the Melbourne Cup meeting; of course, that meeting is valuable to the Balaklava club. However, the transfer of Saturday meetings will not deal a death blow to the Balaklava club although it could deal a death blow to the Snowtown club and to other clubs which exist precariously by operating two meetings a year and which will not be able to exist on only one meeting a year. I cannot name the clubs that will be affected and we do not know how long it will be before they will have to close down. However, some clubs will have to close down and this fact cannot be ignored if we are to consider people interested in country racing in this State. I do not intend to oppose this provision, which is desired by the interests of the Gawler and metropolitan clubs. It remains to be seen what will be the result of the Bill if it becomes law.

I believe the requests of the South Australian Trotting League, for which provision is made in the Bill, are reasonable. No reason seems to exist why the league should be restricted, as it is at present, in the light of the increased country interest in trotting. As the Premier said, possibly two additional clubs will be formed on the Eyre Peninsula. This will lead to a greatly increased demand for two-day trotting meetings. It is interesting to note that the Bill provides for a return to the method of handling totalizator fractions that obtained before the Totalizator Agency Board was introduced. Apparently this provision has also been requested by the racing clubs concerned.

Mr. McKee: Do you think that with three clubs in the metropolitan area we have too many?

Mr. HALL: I will not express an opinion on that at present, but the honourable member may do so if he wishes. If honourable members were to compare the patronage of the three metropolitan clubs in South Australia with the patronage of clubs in other States, they would find that clubs in other States have much more business from which to maintain their courses and provide facilities for the public. Apparently the Bill will not meet with undue opposition in the House. However, the provision in clause 8, relating to the broadcasting of betting odds, could meet with some opposition. I view this provision with some regret. When the provision of T.A.B. facilities was being discussed in this place, fears were expressed that people might be prepared to offer a discount on winning tickets, operating close to T.A.B. agencies. It was feared that there would be a demand for this because winning tickets were not paid on the day of a race meeting. If totalizator dividends are broadcast it will greatly assist those willing to discount winning tickets. This provision appears to me to add to the danger of this practice growing. At this stage, I do not know whether discounting is taking place or, if it is, to what extent it is taking place. However, I imagine that some discounting would be taking place. As it seems to me that the provisions of clause 8 will contribute to discounting, I should like the Premier to explain why it is necessary to amend section 67a of the Act.

When the Premier was making his second reading explanation, I was reminded of the wide discussion that took place in this House, during the debate on the Bill to provide for T.A.B. facilities, about whether or not the winning bets tax should continue in South Australia. The information I have been able to obtain shows that the patronage of T.A.B. is far greater than what was expected before it

was instituted. I believe that the profit accruing from T.A.B. operations could be twice that predicted by the Betting Control Board in the report it prepared some years ago. I remember asserting in that debate that the winning bets tax should be removed entirely when we knew that Government revenue from T.A.B. would equal what we had received from the winning bets tax. Because of the great patronage that T.A.B. is receiving from the public of South Australia, the Government could abolish the winning bets tax without losing revenue that it could have expected to receive if that system of betting were not in operation. I urge the Government to seriously consider this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see in the Bill any provision that deals with the winning bets tax. If the Leader of the Opposition knows of such a provision, will he tell me which one it is?

Mr. HALL: I accept your guidance, Mr. Speaker. I understood that what I was saying might be related to the clause dealing with the dividends fund. However, I realize that my remarks may be beyond the intention of the Bill. I do not oppose the second reading but I may seek explanations from the Treasurer in the Committee stage. He owes the House an explanation of the alteration of the clause dealing with broadcasting of betting information. I also ask that he say what he thinks will happen to a number of smaller racing clubs as a result of that allocation to the Gawler Jockey Club of a significant number of mid-week racing days.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the main part of the Bill. The Gawler Jockey Club has agreed to forego Saturday meetings, and I think racegoers generally do not wish to travel to Gawler to attend meetings. The Strathalbyn club, which is in my district and which is the most progressive and prosperous country club, will be able to continue without difficulty, but the smaller clubs will be at a disadvantage. I oppose the Bill in that we are finalizing a situation, whereas the smaller clubs will not know their position until a meeting is held in September. I strongly support the provision to allow the payment to local charities of the totalizator fractions. In Strathalbyn the ambulance has been able to provide an almost free service because most of the fractions have been paid to it by the club.

However, unless the Government gives a good reason for the inclusion of the provision about the broadcasting of betting information, I shall oppose that clause. It was the action of Opposition members that enabled the Government to introduce the T.A.B. system of betting and we were told that the organization would be completely different from the system of betting shops that operated 20 or 30 years ago. The broadcasting of betting information will enable young people, instead of playing sport, to hang around T.A.B. offices, listen to information broadcast on transistor radios and then place bets on the T.A.B. I supported the introduction of the T.A.B. system because people to whom I spoke, although they might not desire to bet themselves, did not object to other people having the right to bet. The present system enables bets to be placed in the morning and, because winnings cannot be collected until the next week, persons making investments can engage in sporting activities on a Saturday afternoon. However, this clause may result in young people hanging around T.A.B. offices, as I have said.

Mr. Speaker, you ruled that the Leader of the Opposition was not in order in dealing with the winning bets tax. However, in clause 3 there is mention of the totalizator and I crave your indulgence to mention certain matters. I have seen newspaper reports of objections to the short odd available through the T.A.B. system. As the Opposition pointed out in the debate on the T.A.B. measure, the large deductions made, compared with the tax paid by bookmakers, must mean that the odds available will be less than is available by other means of betting. The elimination of the winning bets tax and an increase in the turnover tax would result in a much fairer scheme.

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I cannot find anything in the Bill concerning the winning bets tax. I think you drew the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to this matter and I ask that you rule against the member for Stirling.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I hold that members are in order in referring to the winning bets tax as an illustration, but I cannot allow development of the debate on matters not included in the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. One of the main objections of the public to the totalizator system is that dividends are not as high as those available elsewhere, and action must be taken to remedy this defect. Generally speaking, I support this Bill in general because it will do much to assist people to go to the races in the city. The general tendency nowadays is to do things in a bigger way, and

this is more efficient and economic. However, at the same time we must remember that many small people will be penalized because of what we are doing today.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): Like most members on this side, I expected that the rest of this week would be devoted to the Licensing Bill. I had informed the Eudunda Racing Club in my district of the nature of this Bill and, perhaps unwisely, I told the executive of the club that I did not think that the Government would consider this Bill this week. Consequently, I thought the executive of the club would have adequate time to give me a list of objections to the domination that will be given to the Gawler Club under this Bill. Gawler will be given a very large number of Wednesday meetings.

Mr. Nankivell: Until September the other country clubs will not know which Wednesdays have been allocated to them.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. The Eudunda Racing Club had planned to prepare a statement that I could have used next week, but because this debate has been pushed on us this evening I telephoned an official of the club and I obtained some information from him. He did not have time to check it, but he believes that three race meetings were conducted on the Gawler racecourse last year which were under the auspices of the Barossa Racing Club.

Mr. Clark: They were mid-week meetings.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I am speaking about Wednesday meetings. I was informed that the Eudunda Racing Club objects to the fact that the Saturday meetings the Gawler Jockey Club enjoyed are being allocated to the metropolitan clubs and the Gawler club is to be given an increased number of Wednesday meetings in lieu thereof. Obviously, some country clubs will be forced out of existence by this measure. The official of the club told me that last year nine Wednesday meetings were held at Murray Bridge, nine at Balaklava, eight at Strathalbyn, five at Tailem Bend, six at Kadina, one at Morphettville (the Adelaide Cup meeting) and one at a course the name of which I cannot recall.

I have not had time to study the rest of the Bill in detail but I lodge this protest on behalf of the country racing community, because it appears that some country clubs will be destroyed as a result of this action taken so precipitately by the Government. The Eudunda Racing Club is one of the few country clubs in a good, solvent financial position. I have not even had time to obtain the last annual report of the club to give more information to the House. However, the club owns its own course at Eudunda, it has a reasonable amount of capital and no outstanding debts, it runs only two meetings a year, and it asks for only two Wednesday meetings a year.

Mr. Clark: It will have that number of meetings in the future.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It cannot possibly have two Wednesday meetings: this is what I object to, and I speak on behalf of the members of the club and country race-going people. There just won't be enough Wednesdays left in the year to give all the country clubs the Wednesday meetings they have enjoyed in the past. This is most unreasonable and it will be the beginning of the end for some of them.

I have not had time to check on the position of the Morgan Racing Club which conducts meetings on, I think, one or two Wednesdays a year. What will be left for it if the Gawler Jockey Club receives all these extra Wednesday race meetings? I can see the Morgan club also going under, and the people of Morgan, who enjoy their sport and the benefits of belonging to the club, will lose those benefits. I condemn the Government for introducing this measure in such a high-handed way and giving us so little time to consider it. On behalf of the club and the people in my district I protest vehemently at this action.

I do not think the Minister of Agriculture, whom I see sitting opposite, should speak out of turn because he must take part of the responsibility for this Bill. I notice that there have been nine meetings a year at Murray Bridge, and members of the racing community there will not be pleased if they lose some of those meetings. This is a typical arrogant Socialist action. What about the working man at Gawler who has been used to going along eight times a year to the Saturday race meetings at Gawler? Let us talk about some of the people who the Australian Labor Party claims vote for it. What about the man at Gawler who likes his Saturday race meeting and who will be debarred by his normal work from attending meetings at Gawler? He won't be pleased. This is a blow to the working man who likes to go to the races on Saturdays.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: He will have to pay his fare to Adelaide to enjoy his sport.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. I protest most strongly.

Mr. Ferguson: Who will protest on behalf of Murray Bridge and Gawler?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Since the change of Government I think the people of Murray Bridge have become rather disillusioned about their member: they find that he has to vote along regimented party lines and that he is not the nice friendly member whom they used to know when he was a member of the Opposition. I believe that, like the curate's egg, there are some good parts in this Bill. However, the only parts that have been brought forcibly to my attention are bad parts. I support the second reading and I shall vote against the bad parts of the Bill in Committee.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I support the Bill. There was a time when I would have been very hostile indeed about the idea of Gawler's losing its Saturday racing meetings. In fact, until recently, this was the feeling of the Gawler Jocky Club, which was at one time most anxious to retain these meetings. However, after consideration I can inform the House that the Gawler Jockey Club is now happy to have mid-week meetings and give up its former Saturday racing dates to city interests.

I inform the member for Light that the people of Gawler are happy about this measure, although there was a time when this would not have been so. However, opinions have changed and there is now satisfaction with the idea of racing on a Wednesday. I was surprised that the member for Light did not produce the A.L.P. rule book to prove that there was something socialistic about the Gawler Jockey Club giving up Saturday racing and being satisfied to race on Wednesdays. I know he would have found it hard to do so; perhaps he mislaid the rule book—I do not know. I doubt whether every Wednesday of the year is used for a country race meeting. Also, racing clubs situated a great distance from each other could conduct race meetings on the same Wednesday. I know the Eudunda Racing Club well: some years ago I taught in that area and, believe it or not, played football there. I never claimed to be a jockey, but if I had not been so heavy I could well have been a good one.

The SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that he consider what I said to previous speakers and to try to confine his remarks to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. CLARK: I shall be pleased to do that, Sir. I am pleased that this Bill is in the interests of racing in Gawler, and I do not think it will damage country racing clubs, for which I have every sympathy. South Australia is the only State in which the broadcasting of certain betting information is not allowed and, occasionally, when one listens to the wireless on Saturday afternoons one will find the peculiar situation that suddenly the broadcast from Victoria or New South Wales is cut off to ensure that information allowed to be broadcast in those States is not broadcast here. This is rather silly. It has not caused problems in other States, and I do not think it will lead to a significant increase in betting. In the Saturday morning's newspapers betting odds are quoted and, unless there is a heavy commission for a particular horse, those odds are usually similar to those paid after the event.

Mr. McKee: It will be an improvement on the broadcast of the member for Mitcham on Saturdays.

Mr. CLARK: I did not say anything about that although I had it in mind. I support the Bill, the clauses of which, particularly clause 8, will prove to be wise provisions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This Government prides itself, as the Premier has often said, on its reformist zeal and the quantity of reforming legislation it has introduced. Apparently, this is to be the only opportunity we shall have of considering the Lottery and Gaming Act this session, and I express my great disappointment at the refusal of the Government to overhaul this Act now that we have a State lottery working well and popularly supported.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will not pursue this aspect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, Sir, I am confining my remarks to the first two clauses. It is absolutely absurd that we are going to leave in this Act such sections as section 7, which outlaws all lotteries in this State. It is an absolute travesty that the Government refuses to overhaul that Act, especially when it regards itself as such a reforming Government. This gives the lie direct to its contention that it is a reforming Government anxious to bring the law up to date. If it is good enough to do it with the Licensing Act it is good enough to do it with the Lottery and Gaming Act, and I am surprised and disappointed that the Government apparently intends to ignore the opportunity to do it in this Bill or during the session. An overhaul is long overdue, as we now have a State lottery. The member

for Port Pirie and others speak of it often and obviously, from the referendum held, the lottery is supported by a majority of people. Why we should leave an outdated section in the Lottery and Gaming Act after that expression of opinion, I do not know.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this Bill because I like one or two of its features. No important racing clubs exist in my district and are never likely to, because it is completely built over. However, many people from my district attend race meetings although perhaps not many travel to Gawler, because it is more convenient for them to go to a city meeting. I am not canvassing that question. Recently, I asked a question about facilities at Globe Derby Park, South Bolivar, being used for mid-week trotting meetings. I hope the Premier will inform me whether the Government intends later this session to introduce another amendment to this Act to provide for these trotting meetings as requested by the South Australian Trotting League.

I have been approached, as no doubt other members have been, by many charities and church organizations about on-course totalizator fractions. After Totalizator Agency Board betting was introduced many charities, which had been receiving considerable sums from the fractions, lost this money, upon which they had relied. Mr. Richardson (Secretary of the Adelaide Racing Club) is reported to have said that accumulated fractions at each racing club would average about $7,000 a year, and that was a worthwhile sum. These fractions are the money left over when totalizator dividends are adjusted to round figures. When T.A.B. betting commenced, fractions on place dividends went into a pool to maintain the winning dividend to at least 50c, and any balance of those fractions was paid to the Government with the 5¼ per cent of T.A.B. revenue, to be spent on Government and subsidized hospitals. Many charities have approached me and also the Treasurer on this matter. I am interested in one small charity which, in the year before the introduction of T.A.B., received $335 from the South Australian Trotting Club, the South Australian Jockey Club, the Port Adelaide Racing Club, and the Adelaide Racing Club. This sum has been denied to this charity this year, and it has to consider whether it can obtain the money in another way or try to effect economies in operating its organization. Representations were made to the Government on this matter and, as I said previously, I, too, was approached. I am pleased that the provision has been inserted, because I believe that a hardship was imposed on these charities as a result of an oversight that occurred when the House considered the Bill establishing a Totalizator Agency Board. For that reason I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I have only one racing club (the Onkaparinga Racing Club) in my district and, having made inquiries, I find that it is not directly involved in this legislation and has no view to offer either in opposition to or in support of the measure. That club does not expect that its present allocation will be altered as a result of this legislation. However, the view has been expressed that the centralization of racing in Adelaide may be detrimental to programmes involving jumping events, which some of the Adelaide clubs do not encourage. Although the Onkaparinga club, which has a popular meeting at Easter time, is interested in such events, I shall not elaborate on that matter at this stage. However, I should like further information from the Premier concerning the following remarks he made when explaining the Bill:

As section 19 in its present form needs revision to give effect to these changes, clause 3 of the Bill repeals and re-enacts the section. The effect of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) of the section as so re-enacted is that the racing dates for the year 1967 allocated to the three metropolitan clubs will be unchanged but from 1968 the eight Saturday racing dates previously allocated to the Gawler Jockey Club will be allocated as follows; three days permanently to Morphettville racecourse and three and two dates alternating each year between Victoria Park and Cheltenham Park racecourses, with Victoria Park being allocated the three dates for 1968 in accordance with an agreement reached between the clubs concerned.

Paragraphs (d) and (e) of subsection (1) of the section as re-enacted correspond in substance with paragraphs (*a*1) and (*a*2) of the present section. Paragraph (f) of subsection (1) will make it possible for mid-week racing to be conducted at Gawler on 13 days in the year as from 1968. It is proposed that, of those fixtures, the Gawler Jockey Club will be allotted 10 days and the Barossa Valley Racing Club three days.

As far as that takes the matter, it is quite clear, but it does not take the matter to its ultimate end, because the Gawler club, at which meetings have previously been held on a Saturday, will now hold mid-week meetings. That will automatically affect clubs that at present hold mid-week meetings. Although I cannot obtain confirmation of this, I have been told that some country clubs will be forced to close down altogether, as they may

not be allocated a date that will be of any value to them. In fact, I was given the names of some of the clubs concerned. If that is the case, I think the House should know which clubs will close down. I believe that there is at least some social value associated with racing clubs. One of the first speeches that I heard when I entered the House was made by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Andy Lacey), who made a strong plea for the retention of country clubs because of what they meant to the various country districts in which they were situated.

Mr. Casey: How long ago was that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was when I first came into the House a long time ago and I rather shudder to think when it was; it makes me feel quite experienced when I look at the honourable member. Although a country club may be small, it has a considerable meaning for the centre in which it is located. I have been told that the districts of two honourable members in the South-East are not involved, because racing is held there in a different set of circumstances; I am told that the clubs at Mount Gambier, Millicent, Naracoorte and, I think, Kalangadoo will not be directly affected. However, I have been informed that other clubs nearer Adelaide will be affected and I think members representing the districts concerned should know about this. For instance, it should be made known whether it is intended to interfere with the fixtures at present available to Kadina and Wallaroo. Is it intended to alter the fixtures available to the Tailem Bend club? I have been told that the Tailem Bend club will be affected. Clubs as far afield as those at Port Augusta and Iron Knob may well be affected because their fixtures may be altered as a result of the Gawler club's participation in Wednesday fixtures. I think the Premier should be frank with the House in this respect if the Gawler club is to take up some of the meetings previously allotted to smaller clubs.

Mr. Casey: Some country clubs race on Saturdays.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier will have the information to which I have referred, and I am sure he will give it to the House. As 10 mid-week meetings previously held by other country clubs will now be allocated to Gawler, I am sure that the country members opposite will be interested to know what effect this will have on race meetings in their districts.

As a matter of general principle, I believe it is rather unfortunate that circumstances compel us to centralize all Saturday racing in the metropolitan area. I know that over many years members of the Labor Party in this House have opposed such a move. Those members have always said that from the point of view of decentralization and the promotion of social life it is a good thing for some activity to be maintained in country areas. As I have said, this measure undoubtedly centralizes all Saturday racing activity in the metropolitan area. I know that through the establishment of T.A.B. it will possibly be easier than it was previously for people in a number of country centres to place a bet legally. In that respect, the position has been altered by the provision of off-course betting facilities.

However, the fact still remains that 10 racing days previously held by other country clubs are now to be allocated to Gawler, and this will adversely affect those country clubs. I believe that an agreement has been made regarding those 10 country clubs, and in those circumstances I consider that it would be proper for the Premier to say which clubs will lose Wednesday racing when this Bill becomes law. Undoubtedly, some clubs will lose their meetings. I do not know whether members opposite who represent country districts are interested; evidently they are not, and that is their business. However, I believe information on this matter should be available to the House before the Bill is finally accepted.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I must of necessity oppose this Bill because it has not been clarified here what will happen to the clubs that are at present nameless but whose position has been referred to by the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford). We do not know which clubs are doomed to receive the axe. The three clubs in my district that now hold mid-week meetings are those at Burra, Clare and Jamestown. In addition, Snowtown, a bit farther over, and Laura, a little farther north, also have mid-week racing. It seems that at least some of these clubs will go out of existence. Some country clubs only manage to scratch along now, and if this Bill becomes law they will find it extremely difficult to survive.

The one day that was of any use to the Jamestown club was the day on which the Invitation Stakes was held, but with the transfer of that day to Strathalbyn the Jamestown club is now practically on the verge of extinction. Obviously, it is the policy of centralization that has killed it. People in the country

like their own race meetings, but what is the use of people attending those race meetings if they cannot get bookmakers there and if they cannot bet on other races? With only other mid-week racing, they are unlikely to have races worth betting on.

I am not happy about the destruction of these clubs, and if the intention is to destroy country racing clubs I will vote against this measure. Although that probably will not make much difference, at least it will give me the satisfaction of saying that I am not prepared to vote for a measure that centralizes all these activities within a mile or two of the metropolitan area, with the exception of the clubs below the 36th south parallel.

Mr. Freebairn: Or up on the Murray River.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, within 50 miles of Barmera. That puts Burra out, and Clare, Jamestown and Laura will go, as probably will Kadina. A policy of centralization is destroying these country clubs, which have a long history behind them. Over the years it has been made increasingly difficult for them to operate, and now this measure, in my judgment (unless somebody can convince me to the contrary), will sound their death knell. It will mean that all these clubs, all their property and everything else will go out of existence. Some of these clubs have considerable property and quite good fixtures. I suppose Clare is as lovely a country racecourse as one would find in the State. It has a lovely grandstand on the hill, and people are able to look over the whole course. There are many points of vantage, because the hills overlook the racecourse. It is a beautiful place, and I do not want to see the club become extinct. It is because I am not satisfied that that club will be able to continue that I oppose this measure.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Although I live in the area beyond the 36th parallel, clause 4 interests me. I commend the Government for introducing the amendment contained in that clause, for it will enable trotting clubs in this area to race on days other than Saturdays or public holidays. Trotting is increasing in popularity in the South-East and the amendment introduced by this clause will enable owners, trainers and patrons to participate further in the sport in that area. With those few remarks, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Incorporation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is the only opportunity I shall have, in view of the fact that the Premier did not see fit to reply to the second reading debate, to deal with the question I raised during that debate regarding the condition into which the principal Act has fallen. The principal Act is now, as we know, hopelessly out of date. I referred to section 7 of the Act, but one could quite properly refer to the whole of Part II, which is headed "Lotteries". These things have now been shown unmistakably to be not in accord with the views held by the people of this State. I well recall that, when the Labor Party was in Opposition, the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh) year after year introduced Bills to legalize art unions and so on, and those Bills were supported, as far as I can recall, by other members of the Labor Party. For some reason best known to themselves, members opposite do not intend to do anything to bring this Act up to date. Obviously, it ought to be brought up to date, especially by a reforming Government, which is the self-arrogated title of gentlemen opposite. As this clause refers to the principal Act, will the Premier tell honourable members why, in all the welter of legislation he is bringing down, he does not intend to tackle an Act which so obviously and badly needs bringing up to date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Because it is impossible for the Government, in the space of three short years, to remedy the gross neglect of 30 years. Here is a great reformer, a man who demands reform, and yet who did not see to it, when he was on the Government benches for years, that the Lottery and Gaming Act (which in those days was grossly out of touch with the views of the ordinary citizens of the community) was brought up to date. He supported his Leader time after time in defeating measures introduced by the then Leader of the Opposition (the former Premier of the State, Hon. Frank Walsh) and now, when this Government has a programme of reform which taxes this Parliament so that it sits for far longer periods than it has ever previously known, the honourable member says that is not enough. I am working the Parliamentary Draftsman into the ground and I am working myself into the ground in trying to give the honourable member some work to do.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't you think he is being hypocritical?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the Premier is apparently under some strain tonight and has seen fit to make—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The Committee is dealing with clause 2 which provides for the incorporation of this Bill with the principal Act. The honourable member must confine his remarks to clause 2.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Surely, in view of what the Premier has said (and you, Sir, did not pull him up)—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham shall relate his remarks to clause 2.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir, I shall confine myself to saying that I much regret the personal attack by the Premier on me, and I regret his refusal to give a direct answer to my question.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Limitation on use of totalizator."

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: What assurance can the Premier give the Barossa Racing Club that it will be allotted at least three meetings a year after 1967?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is the undertaking on which the Government has agreed to introduce this measure.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier say, as a result of his discussions with racing interests on the possible operation of the Bill, whether he has come to any conclusions about the difficulties some of the small country racing clubs may experience? Has he any idea of which clubs may be deprived of, perhaps, one race meeting of the two meetings they now conduct?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no specific list of alternative racing days for small country clubs because, of course, to a certain extent this will depend on their application for other racing dates. There will now be more Saturday racing dates available and some clubs may build up their number of meetings by holding Thursday and Saturday meetings. Precisely how this will work out will depend on the applications from those clubs. I have been assured that, in fact, some country clubs will be better off, as a result of this measure, than they would have been otherwise.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: What the Premier has just said is news to me. I do not know of any country club that stands to gain from the transfer of dates to the Gawler club. With great respect, I question whether any country club would apply to race on Thursday. I do not know of any club that races on that day which, I think, would be a most unpopular day on which to conduct a race meeting. The whole point is that there are just not enough Wednesdays to go around.

Mr. Casey: The Port Augusta club races on a Thursday.

Mr. Burdon: So does the Mount Gambier club.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am indebted to the honourable members for that information. The transfer of dates from the Gawler club will mean that fewer Wednesdays will be available for the country clubs to share. This will particularly affect the Lower North where the number of race days available in most cases will be reduced from two to one a year, which will be the beginning of the end for some clubs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: What will be the ultimate effect on other country clubs of the transfer of the eight Saturday meetings of the Gawler club? Although the club in my district has no objection to the Bill, I have been informed by a prominent racing authority that the effect of this transfer of dates will mean that certain clubs will have to stop racing because there will not be suitable times. I assume that the Premier has this information. The reform has been under discussion for a long time but my Government did not give effect to it because inquiries showed that some country clubs and their race meetings would be blotted out. Can the Treasurer say what clubs that at present hold meetings on Wednesday will not in future have Wednesday available to them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no precise list of the clubs that would not have Wednesday available to them. As to the end result, I have said that this depends on applications for other days. That information is not known at present, because we do not know the wishes of smaller clubs in regard to racing days. Therefore, I am not able to give a precise schedule. I do not think the information is ascertainable at present.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Prohibition of broadcasting certain betting particulars."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the second reading debate questions were asked about this clause. Following arrangements made by the T.A.B. with the 5AD network, as the board's official broadcaster of T.A.B. dividends, it was found that difficulties arose from

the fact that permission did not exist to broadcast T.A.B. dividends immediately they were available after each race and the manager of 5AD wrote to the Chief Secretary pointing out that the broadcasting of T.A.B. dividends immediately they were available after each race was a practice in all other States where T.A.B. operated and that, if the facility were not made available to the station, it was considered that the station would be unable to give the public a satisfactory service. It was pointed out that the board had applied to the Government for this change to be made and that, if it were not made, the station would have to recast its thoughts about broadcasting Victorian mid-week races and Sydney races on Saturdays. The reason for this was that the service was extremely costly and, with the limited information the station was able to broadcast, it would not be able to recover its costs. This further submission was made:

As you may be aware, the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board has installed an answering service to provide current racing information, such as scratchings, results and dividends, for the information of the public. Information is recorded on this service as it becomes available. Unfortunately, the service is restricted to those members of the public who have access to a telephone, and it is not providing a coverage in country areas. It has been found desirable in other States to provide a similar results and dividends service through broadcasting stations. With the introduction of T.A.B. to South Australia, a demand has arisen from broadcasting stations to provide an up-to-date service for those members of the public who cannot attend the racecourse or cannot use the T.A.B. answering service.

The board has already nominated station 5AD as the official radio station for racing information. Such an arrangement, of course, is of great importance to the off-course betting public. In addition, T.A.B. uses the official radio station as an integral part of its communication system. It is hoped to extend the service to include the broadcast of dividends progressively during the afternoon for the benefit of country agencies. The purpose of this letter is to request your approval to the broadcasting of dividends progressively throughout the day by the official T.A.B. radio station. Any restriction on the broadcasting of dividends during the day could have a marked effect on the successful introduction of a T.A.B. service to the public, especially in relation to telephone betting and to reinvestment of winnings by telephone betting account holders.

The board applied to the Government for this change and was able to point to the fact that this service was a feature of the service in every other State where T.A.B. operated. It has not produced the unfortunate results mentioned by some honourable members opposite as something that they fear, nor is it productive of difficulties about discounting. In consequence, the Government considered that it was proper to make this change.

Mr. McANANEY: Does the Government intend to take any action to prevent the discounting of winning T.A.B. tickets?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has been examined. A difficulty is involved. Prohibition of discounting of winning totalizator tickets would be impossible to police unless tickets were made non-transferable and ticket holders were required to establish their identities when presenting their tickets for payment. This would cause much delay and expenditure to the board and the public, and the mischief thereby caused would be worse than the present mischief.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There always seem to be 100 good reasons why we should relax provisions such as we put into the T.A.B. legislation. When the measure to establish T.A.B. was being discussed, even the ardent protagonists of that legislation accepted the restrictions on broadcasting that were included. We did not want to re-create the betting shop system, which had been the cause of much resentment and concern. Not having travelled interstate for some time, I cannot say whether any deterioration in behaviour has occurred in other places, but there is undoubtedly a very real danger of this happening. I realize that some members of the public who are absent from racecourses may find it convenient to be able to obtain early information about race dividends. However, I do not think we are justified in placing their convenience above other damaging results.

The Premier added to my concern about this matter when he said it would be impossible to police effectively the discounting of winning bets tickets, and I can see that his reasons for saying this are valid. It seems that we are proposing to return to the time when a person could spend the whole of his Saturday or Wednesday afternoon near a betting agency, and we shall find that people who should be participating in sport are near the agency instead.

For a long time I was the President, Secretary and Patron of some sporting clubs in my home town area and I well remember, when a certain commission came there taking evidence regarding the establishment of betting shops, that this point was raised. When a betting shop was established there, I remember

how I had to dig people out of it in order to get them to go in to bat. So, I question whether, so soon after this legislation has been passed (following a thorough examination by this House) we should agree to a relaxation of part of it now. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Whilst I realize it is not desirable that a non-transferable ticket be issued, I point out that the Victorian Government has made it an offence to discount a ticket.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Clause 8 repeals that portion of the principal Act which prohibits the broadcasting of certain betting information. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am restricting my remarks to the effect of this clause. I think we should discuss the problem that arises when this embargo is removed; when this was done in Victoria a prohibition was still placed on discounting of tickets.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause deals with the lifting of the prohibition on broadcasting certain betting information. It does not deal with the discounting of betting tickets.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am merely answering the Premier's statement, which you, Sir, allowed him to make.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Stirling asked a question and, until he asked it, I did not know its content. I allowed the Premier to answer it, but that does not allow a debate on subject matter that is not contained in the clause. The member for Gumeracha must deal with clause 8 as printed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This clause will make it easy for the odds to be known to ticket holders. So, the broadcasting will have an effect on the conduct of T.A.B. offices. I realize the problem that arises in connection with any prohibition on providing information to the public but, on the other hand, I believe that the Committee should consider the problem that will arise through unofficial people coming in and using this information in a way that is desired neither by the Government nor by this Committee. I therefore ask the Premier whether he has considered, not the question of making these tickets non-transferable, but at least providing that people shall not lawfully discount them. I believe that this provision operates successfully in other States where broadcasting is permitted. If he has considered this suggestion, will he act on it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answers to those questions are "Yes" and "No".

Mr. CASEY: This clause is very clear-cut, and I point out to the member for Gumeracha that at present anybody who has a telephone nearby can obtain the T.A.B. dividends immediately after a race. He has only to dial the automatic number to obtain details of dividends. If a person wants to establish himself as a scalper he can do this now. The same applies with telephone betting. A person with an account rings the T.A.B. office, gives his number, and obtains the dividend on the race on which he has won money, or any information about his account. Anyone can use these facilities today. Broadcasting dividends is giving information to the general public, and they are entitled to it. It is not possible to make tickets non-transferrable: in Victoria 140,000,000 T.A.B. tickets were distributed last year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the honourable member for his courteous explanation.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LICENSING BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from August 1. Page 969.)

Clause 27—"Club licence."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Does the member for Mitcham wish to move his first amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: These amendments depended on the insertion of the definition of "bowling clubs", which was rejected by the Committee. I aimed to ensure that members of bowling clubs when visiting other clubs could obtain a drink and pay for it and, secondly, that it was not necessary to have substantial food with drinks after a game and before going home. I am disappointed that the Committee rejected the principle behind the amendments. It may be possible to overcome the first difficulty by the device of honorary membership under clause 86, but this is most cumbersome and the same position could be reached by agreeing to my amendment. Now, every club will have to amend its rules to provide for honorary membership.

No answer can be found to the problem of food with drinks after 10 p.m. The Premier said that bowling clubs should not have greater privileges than hotels. However, as the pattern of trading changes in any section

of our community, we cannot hold back the clock by legislation. If people wish to buy liquor and consume it away from hotels we will not prevent them by legislation. Apparently it is the Premier's aim to prevent the natural change in the habits of the community concerning liquor. What happens will not be much different from what happens today and, undoubtedly, within weeks this provision will be ignored, because people will not be prepared to abide by it if they do not respect it. It is silly to suggest that substantial food will be supplied in bowling clubs to a person who wants to have a drink in these circumstances. It just will not happen; people will have their drinks in just the same way as they have them now; the law will be ignored, and part of the object of having the Royal Commission and having a new Act will immediately be defeated. It seems to me to be utterly foolish for this Committee to allow this to happen with its eyes open, and yet that is what it is doing by not agreeing to the amendments I have suggested concerning bowling clubs. Although it is no good, as I see it, going on with these three amendments, I wish to make clear to members of the Committee what they have done by not agreeing to the preceding amendment concerning the definition of bowling clubs on which these three amendments depend.

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

In subclause (1) (*c*) after "in" third occurring to insert "such areas of"; and after "club" to insert "as are fixed by the court".

The first amendment seeks to specify an area of the club premises for a supper permit. The second amendment is merely consequential.

Amendments carried.

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

In subclause (1) (d) after "in" second occurring to insert "such areas of"; and after "club" to insert "premises as are fixed by the court".

These similar amendments are necessary concerning the dining-rooms of clubs.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move in subclause (1) to insert the following new paragraph:

(*e*1) the sale and disposal of liquor to a *bona fide* lodger at any time.

This would mean that a club that had residential provisions could sell liquor at any time to a *bona fide* lodger, which would bring it into line with the hotels provision. I suggest that it is a reasonable provision for residential clubs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been suggested that the guest of a *bona fide* lodger should also be able to have a drink in these circumstances. It seems to me not unreasonable that a visitor to a club, when he is being entertained by somebody who is staying there, should have the right to have a drink with that person just as we have somebody in our own homes. Will the Premier say whether this is covered or whether he intends that it should be covered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was intended to be covered when the amendment was made in relation to hotels, but I will examine the matter.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (3) after "fit" to insert "and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the court may impose either or both of the following conditions upon the licensee—

(*a*) restricting the sale of liquor by him to such periodic or other occasions as may be specified by the court;

or

(*b*) requiring the licensee to purchase all the liquor that he requires for the purposes of the club from a person holding a full publican's licence in respect of premises in the vicinity of the club premises".

The amendment as originally drafted makes the two conditions a straight alternative, as it could conceivably be argued that the court would impose one of those conditions but not both. Normally the court would wish to impose both but we wanted the court to be able to impose merely one, depending upon the circumstances of the case. The purpose of the clause is to spell out the general nature of conditional club licences. As I explained earlier, such licences are designed for those clubs that wish to sell liquor only occasionally in connection with their sporting activities.

While it would be difficult for those clubs to obtain an unconditional club licence (because this would raise objections from local licensees, and the clubs would not desire to provide the full facilities provided by the registered clubs of today), nevertheless, it would be reasonable to provide a club licence subject to those particular conditions. If they are to be clubs of this nature they should be restricted to purchasing their liquor at retail. Most of the unlicensed clubs that now engage in this activity buy their liquor retail.

Mr. Millhouse: Not all of them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but most of them do, and it is quite clear that, in conducting their activities, there is no real difficulty to them in this respect. If it is to be very much easier now to obtain a club licence because of the abolition of local option and

the fact that clubs will be able to specify the conditions contained in the application provisions, it is only reasonable that these particular outlets not be allowed to proliferate in such a way that they will make inroads on the normal retail trade of those people who gain their livelihood by the purveying of liquor. Although under the existing clause the court could impose such a condition, it was quite clear from the Commissioner's report that he believed the court should impose conditions of this kind in relation to this particular class of club, subject to conditions in this way, and these two conditions were ones to which he referred. In those circumstances, I think it proper that as a guide to the court we should spell out with particularity these two particular conditions as the sort of conditions to which the court should turn its mind.

Mr. HALL: The clause that is being amended has already given the court power to impose conditions. Subclause (3) provides:

The court may grant a club licence subject to such conditions as the court, on the application of the person applying for such licence, or of its own motion, thinks fit.

The Premier is endeavouring to add two specific restrictions to this general power of the court. He has used the word "particular" several times. As far as I can see, there is no restriction in this amendment: it refers to any club. We are not making it any more particular than does the clause as it stands. We are spelling out that the court may have wider powers, but we are not making the provision more particular.

This has important repercussions for a number of clubs. One such club with which I am associated (I happen to be a honorary member, so far the only one) is the Para Hills Club, which has been in existence for about two years. That club, which has no premises, has made representations to the Premier regarding the difficulties in which it may be placed. I believe that the club now has $20,000 cash in hand, and the latest report I have indicates that it will soon be calling for tenders for a building. That club has not got a licence. Dare it go ahead in expending $40,000 or $50,000, almost half of which it has today?

Mr. Heaslip: It will have to buy retail.

Mr. HALL: I do not know that definitely, but the club would have to think of that contingency. This club has a membership of more than 500 families, and it has made tremendous efforts (and successful ones) to raise money. The management of this club is extremely perturbed at this proposed amendment. The clause itself is disturbing enough, for it provides that the court may impose restrictions and conditions upon which we here will have no influence. However, we are spelling out in more drastic detail what may be applied to every club. I should like to read a copy of the letter which was sent to the Premier and which the officials of the club made available to me. I believe it presents a case which must surely apply in other directions in other districts. It reads:

On behalf of my club I wish to put before you briefly the following observations in respect of proposed amendments to the Licensing Bill which is now before the House of Assembly. Details of the objects and form of the club are set out in the enclosed booklet, and I would only add that club membership now stands at nearly 600 families and that tenders for the construction of Section 1 will be called within the next two weeks. An approach was made to Mr. Pope of the Licensing Court over a year ago in an effort to properly register the club, but in view of the pending Royal Commission we were advised by Mr. Pope to defer our application for the time being. Subsequently the Government took action to freeze the issuing of new licences, although it appears that a number of new hotels have been granted licences in this area.

From its inception in 1964 the club has been determined to operate within the licensing laws of the State, and it now seems that we are to be penalized for having adopted such a policy. According to reports in the press, it would appear that an amendment is being considered which would allow special concessions to existing clubs where they are operating outside the law by legalizing their present activities and at the same time prohibiting new clubs from enjoying the same privileges. I find it hard to believe that you, Sir, would be a party to such discriminatory legislation. As new areas develop, the need for proper community facilities for social, recreational, cultural and sporting pursuits becomes a more urgent need, which we believe that clubs such as ours will be called upon to provide.

A further amendment, I understand, seeks to make it compulsory for licensed clubs to obtain their liquor supplies from an hotel rather than direct from the breweries. This would, of course, seriously curtail the financial return necessary for clubs such as ours to provide and maintain a diversity of interests for all age groups and sections of the community. Many of our members are migrants who realize that the Government is unable to provide community facilities to the same extent to which they have been accustomed in their homelands; many of them are prepared to accept the challenge to help themselves, but there must be access to finance and it cannot be denied that profits from the sale of liquor have been used in the past and will have to be used in the future if the clubs are to remain as viable organizations. I submit that the intention of amendments such as those to which I have referred would be detrimental to the new clubs, and it now appears that the Bill is being amended to protect the brewery and hotel

interests at the expense of the needs and wishes of the general public.

In the Eastern States the clubs have flourished and are very popular with their members; however, they do not appear to have adversely affected other interests. We who have been striving for almost four years towards the establishment of our community club believe that only good can come from the provision of facilities which can be enjoyed by all members of the family as a whole, and that such organizations should be encouraged by all means, including equitable and liberal licensing regulations. As you may recall, the original petition which led to a review of the Licensing Act was prepared by the people of this district and presented by the member for Gouger, Mr. R. Steele Hall. We were pleased that the Government set up a Royal Commission and that the Bill as drafted appeared to cater for the needs of the people. We only hope that the multitude of amendments now being considered will not defeat the original purposes of the Bill.

I cannot support a move that means that this club is simply unable to assess its future regarding its building programme. Obviously, this club would have obtained a full licence under the old law.

Mr. Clark: It will still get a licence, won't it?

Mr. HALL: We do not know. Under this clause, the court will have the power to provide any conditions and restrictions up to the full control we are talking of now. There is not the slightest doubt that with the framework of the subdivision in which the Para Hills District is situated (the subdivision of St. Kilda), a local option application for a club licence would have been successful. The subdivision has a particularly concentrated population and there was widespread support for the club, so it was a foregone conclusion that such an application would have been successful. I want to be completely assured that this club will be able to buy its supplies at wholesale rates.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly it will. There is no difficulty about a club of that kind applying for and obtaining a full licence. Indeed, other clubs of this kind have been along to the Superintendent of Licensed Premises, who has pointed out to them that that would be the case. In this case we are not adding restrictions: we are dealing with the conditions that the licensing tribunal may impose. The existing Bill provides for the imposition of conditions (and this was provided for in the Commissioner's report) for certain specific purposes. However, it was felt by a great many people that we should distinguish the kinds of club to which conditional licences should apply and those which would have full licences without conditions.

It was considered that we ought to specify the two basic conditions that would usually distinguish conditional licences from unconditional licences. If the Leader looks at those conditions he will see that one is that the licensee is only to supply liquor on certain periodic occasions. This is not the case with a full club licence—the service that is desired to be supplied by the Leader's constituents. There is no difficulty for them; the only difficulty they will face, as against existing registered clubs, is that, not having premises built and not being registered at the time of the passing of the Bill, they will not get single bottle sales. They will be able to sell for consumption on the premises and they will be able to buy their liquor at wholesale prices.

Mr. Hall: Does this apply even though the club runs sporting activities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, the fact that the club has general sporting facilities associated with it does not mean that it will have a conditional licence. The conditional licence is only there to cover those clubs that would be happy to accept the conditions in order to get a licence. Those conditions will fit in with the kind of activity that the members are undertaking. By having an application which, in itself, would specify these conditions, they can overcome the objection of local licensees to the granting of a licence. The club to which the Leader has referred is clearly the kind of club that is specified in a previous paragraph of the clause where the club is providing facilities to members. In that case it will be applying for an unconditional club licence and, given the background the Leader has outlined, I have not the slightest doubt that it will get it.

Mr. Heaslip: What do you mean when you refer to the club's providing facilities?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the case of an unconditional club licence, the club is expected to provide usually some bar facilities, certainly lounge drinking facilities, of a satisfactory standard. There should be provision in the club premises for the general purposes of the club. For instance, many of these clubs have some specific object in view—some specific reason for the association of their members. Those facilities would be required to be provided. The honourable member would know the kinds of thing that are provided now in registered clubs in Adelaide.

If he comes to the Norwood Club, for instance, he will find excellent facilities. We do not have stuffed lions' heads and the like on the walls (as can be found in certain other registered clubs in Adelaide), but we do have other things which are of interest to the members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not like this amendment: it restricts the discretion of the court. The fact that we are putting these words in must be heeded by the court when it comes to a consideration of the conditions that it imposes. I point out that the wording in subclause (1) (*b*) is similar to the wording in clause 66, which is even more objectionable than the wording in this paragraph. At least this allows the court some latitude, but clause 66 does not allow any latitude at all. I take it that the amendment that I have on the file will be considered if the Minister's amendment is carried.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out to members that this verbiage will allow a court to give a monopoly to the holder of a full publican's licence in the vicinity of the club's premises. There are objectionable features about this provision. We will be telling the court that it can impose a condition that a club must buy its supplies from a hotel and from nowhere else. I leave aside for a moment the difficulty of the interpretation of the phrase "in the vicinity of the club premises", which is vague and difficult to interpret. The Premier says we have to protect the hotel trade, and to some extent I agree with him. However, we can never successfully change a pattern in the community by legislation; if hotels are to lose trade they will lose it whatever we do.

There is not only the question of the price of the liquor (and this will mean that the club will have to buy at full retail price because undoubtedly that is the price at which the hotel will be prepared to sell), but there is also the question of service. This matter has been put to me strongly by members of clubs, particularly with regard to clause 66. However, what they have said is just as relevant here. If a publican has a monopoly by knowing that his is the only possible source of supply for a club, then he will be at least less inclined to give any service, such as delivery.

Mr. Casey: Where is that likely to happen?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been told of one hotelkeeper who has said point-blank that he refuses to deliver to a club some miles away. If the proprietor of the hotel is able to say that now, if he becomes a monopolist he will be certain to say it, and say it more definitely.

Mr. Casey: The club does not have to go back to that hotel.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If this sort of thing is put into the Act that may well be the only possible outlet or source of supply. We are bestowing on a certain hotel a monopoly. Once that has been done the hotel man will know that he is absolutely secure; he will not have to give any service at all to those who must buy their supplies from him. The member for Frome was not allowed to speak in an earlier debate, but I hope he will be able to speak in this debate so that he can explain to me where I am wrong. A hotel man will become a monopolist and will not give any service because he will not have to. This is altogether undesirable and will not be accepted willingly by club members. I do not know of any other commodity in respect of which one retailer is given a monopoly in an area. I consider the practice undesirable. It will cause resentment and will not work.

Mr. HEASLIP: I oppose this amendment. I speak on behalf of all sporting clubs, many of which have been able to sell liquor at a small profit from which they have provided facilities to enable members to sit and enjoy a drink instead of having to stand at the bar of a noisy hotel. Hotels have had plenty of opportunity to provide these facilities but have neglected to do so, and they are now being protected. The clubs will not be able to buy liquor wholesale and will not be able to afford the wages of a barman: they will have to buy retail. In addition, they will be compelled to buy from one source. This is unjust treatment of clubs that have provided amenities and yet, in some cases, have been able to reduce subscription fees.

Mr. CASEY: I support the amendment. Every sporting club that I, as a country member, have been associated with has always purchased its liquor from the local publican. There is no other source of supply. If that is good enough for the country club, the member for Rocky River, who is always standing up for the people in the country, ought to say why he thinks it is not good enough for the city clubs. I would think that the clubs got their liquor at a lower price than the retail price.

Mr. Heaslip: They won't if this is passed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CASEY: Country towns usually have more than one hotel and the sporting clubs give all the hotels a turn.

Mr. Millhouse: They won't be able to, under this amendment. It is in the singular and says "a publican's licence".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It refers to any person holding a publican's licence.

Mr. CASEY: The member for Mitcham started to cite a case but he would not specify the place. We on this side have often been accused of not giving information but it was all right for him to cite a hypothetical case. Was there only one hotel in the area to which he referred, or could the club have gone to another hotel in the vicinity? There is much competition between hotel keepers now and they have to maintain good relations with the clubs. If they do not, the clubs will boycott them and they will not be in business for very long. That is simple business procedure.

Mr. HEASLIP: I point out to the member for Frome that he was dealing with the provisions of clause 66. Practically every country club will operate under permit, not under this club licence, because many of them are not big enough to open more than once or twice a week. The member for Frome was talking about big clubs, such as those at Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta.

Mr. Casey: No, all clubs.

Mr. HEASLIP: At present clubs that are able to get beer at a brewery have every right to do so. However, this amendment will not allow them to do that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out to the member for Frome that this clause will give the court power to direct the purchase of liquor from a specified publican. The court may not go as far as that, but it does have the power to do so, and this is what I am complaining about. Let the honourable member just listen to this; the amendment provides:

And, without limiting the generality of the foregoing—

that is, the power to impose conditions—

the court may impose either or both of the following conditions upon the licensee— . . . (*b*) requiring the licensee to purchase all the liquor that he requires for the purposes of the club from a person holding a full publican's licence in respect of premises in the vicinity of the club premises.

This obviously gives the court power to direct the purchase from a specific publican if it wants to do so.

Regarding the other point raised against me, I am not prepared to name in this House a specific publican, but it is so obviously a matter of commonsense and common experience that if a person has a monopoly in any commodity he does not need, in order to attract custom, to give the service that he would need to give if he had competitors. That is the only point I am making, but that is the position that will obtain under this clause if we carry this amendment, and that is why I think it is objectionable.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I oppose the amendment for two reasons. I accept the position that the Licensing Court has the right to impose any conditions it believes to be proper for the conduct of the club. However, I know of no reason why the Licensing Court should be empowered to force a club to buy its liquor retail if that club is qualified to buy it wholesale. It means that the club cannot give service to the public which would be as good as the service it could give if it was not limited in this way. If, as the member for Frome says, clubs already go to the hotels by choice, we do not need to compel them to go.

I can mention a specific case where there were two hotels and a club in a country town, and the club gave the best service. The club was approached by the two hotels to reduce its standard of service to that of the hotels, and when it refused to do so the hotels approached the brewery and asked that the club's supplies be cut off. This happened in Eudunda, and it shows that, where competition is keen, people will sometimes resort to unethical methods in order to get business. I cannot see the Government's purpose in saying that a club shall buy its liquor at a higher price. The Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, knows that the desire of the Government and of the community is surely to keep prices down. So, why make this liquor pass through an extra set of hands? The Premier has strongly opposed restrictive trade practices. This amendment means that we will impose on club patrons a standard of charge that is unnecessary if the club conducts its financial affairs in a proper manner.

Mr. HALL: At present the clause contains provisions under which the court can apply conditions as it thinks fit. The amendment invites the court to pay more attention to how clubs purchase their liquor, and I oppose it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In many cases clubs obtain beer supplies but not necessarily wines and spirits, which would be more expensive, from hotels. It is unfair to think only in terms of beer. Clubs will obtain wines and spirits from hotels if they are forced to and, as they should not be forced into this position, I oppose the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to amend the Premier's amendment as follows:

In paragraph (*b*) after "premises" second occurring to add "or from the holder of a retail storekeeper's licence".

We must accept now, of course, that the Premier's amendment has been carried in a form that was entirely objectionable to me. My amendment seeks to make it a little less so, to allow for some competition, and to ensure that existing businesses are not altogether ruined. The whole of the amendment is merely a guide to the court; it is not mandatory on the court, but the fact that we have inserted it in the Bill will be a strong influence on the court to impose such conditions as are contemplated by these paragraphs.

My aim is to ensure that the court will not overlook the other retailers of liquor who are the holders of retail storekeeper's licences. One particular organization in my district is doing much trade of this nature with sporting bodies and social clubs. While it is not at present of a retail nature (because the ale licence does not allow sales in quantities of less than certain gallonages) I seek to achieve what is desired to make up for the business that must otherwise be lost under the provisions of the Bill. My aim here (and I think that it does not vitally conflict with the Premier's aim) is to see that other retail sellers of liquor are not completely cut out from the club trade.

I take it that the Premier's real aim is that clubs should buy at retail prices. If that is his real aim, it will not be affected by my amendment. However, it will mean that those who have built up businesses in the past or, in the case of my people, want to concentrate on this particular business in the future will be able to do so; otherwise, as I said last night, there is certainly one business (and I should guess there would be others) that would be entirely ruined by this amendment. I am prompted by something that was said a little while ago, I think by the member for Gumeracha, to ask what would happen if the club required a line that was not stocked by a hotel.

Mr. Casey: That would be most unusual.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In my humble contention, it would not be most unusual. I think it is notorious, especially in the field of wines, that retail storekeepers often have a wider stock than is carried by a hotel.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In many cases it is certainly not wider; often it is a very small range indeed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will not argue about that. The Premier has his opinion and I have mine. I doubt whether he is going to change my mind, but I may change his after some time. Quite obviously, there is a difficulty if either one outlet or the other does not stock everything that is required by a club. This amendment will safeguard existing businesses. It will not, so far as I understand the Premier's aim, destroy or spoil it at all, because clubs will still have to buy from a retailer of liquor. I therefore commend my amendment to the Committee and hope that it will be supported.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not happy to accept the honourable member's amendment. The honourable member mistakes my purpose in moving my amendment. The point is (and this seems to have been overlooked by many members who have spoken in the debate on this clause) that clubs are now going to be able to get licences very much more easily than they have been able to under the existing Act. There are only 40 or so registered clubs under the present Act, but there will be hundreds under the new Act. The aim is to see that these clubs that are not providing a full service to members in the way the present registered clubs do but are only getting licences for periodic sales in connection with certain functions should not be able to make inroads on the hotel trade in the area.

In consequence, they could be confined to seeing that there is not a general increase in competition with the hotels, and that the hotels are not as a result of this Bill being made to die the death of a thousand cuts because there are so many little inroads on a trade in which we are requiring that they give added service without, for the most part in relation to the average hotel, a commensurate increase in return. What the honourable member proposes to do is give this particular

protection to retail bottle outlets. These outlets will not be the existing retail bottle outlets in their present form. They are not required to give the kind of service to the public that the hotels are required to give. They are now being permitted to sell single bottles of any class of liquor. Therefore, their trade is being immediately expanded without their being required to give the service required of hotels.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No meals, accommodation and so on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nothing of that kind—none of the facilities required of hotels under these conditions.

Mr. Millhouse: You say trade is to be extended, but where will they get their customers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From people wanting to buy small quantities of liquor, who will be able to go into these places and buy not merely Australian table wines by the small bottle but spirits and beer by the single bottle in any quantity.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Several hundred hotels in the State do not have bottle departments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They may not have a room that they say is a bottle department but they certainly have places from which they sell bottles.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Some are pretty antiquated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can point to many antiquated hotels in South Australia. However, the provisions of this Bill will require that their standards be bettered, and bettered quickly. In places where hotels do not have facilities of this kind, one does not usually find a bottle outlet, because the place is not big enough to warrant one. Therefore, with great respect to the honourable member, I think his interjection has introduced an irrelevancy.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Barmera has a bottle outlet, opposite the Community Hotel, which is grossly antiquated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Is the honourable member suggesting that the Barmera Hotel does not give a reasonable service?

Mr. Millhouse: He is pointing out what is wrong with your argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What I am saying is that, where there is an unsatisfactory hotel with no bottle facilities, it is in a small settlement where, for the most part, there are no retail outlets. I suggest to the honourable member that by writing this in he will again be making an inroad (and a marked inroad) upon the hotel trade when already the people who are getting retail bottle outlets, and who have retail outlets of a limited nature now, will get an enormous expansion in what they can sell without being required to provide any of the additional expenditure that will be required of hotels. I do not think that that is fair or proper. The honourable member has raised one particular case (he raised it previously on this clause) of somebody who has a brewer's licence at the moment that he is not using except to sell liquor wholesale. If he wants to change to another form of licence then his appropriate licence is as a wholesaler and not as a retail outlet.

Mr. Quirke: He could apply for a retail outlet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I cannot agree to the honourable member's amendment; I think it could do considerable damage to the hotel trade if it were allowed.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is apparent that the aim of the Bill is to protect hotel keepers. I am surprised that the Labor Party supports a provision that takes something from the little man and creates and protects a monopoly. The working people who want to play sport in their leisure time will pay and the monopolies will profit. The amendment moved by the member for Mitcham will take away the monopoly and allow competition. On one hand, the Government introduces legislation to create more competition in insurance and on the other it provides in this measure for a monopoly.

Mr. Casey: How will the member of a club pay more?

Mr. HEASLIP: Every member of a club will pay more, because the present arrangement allows clubs to make a profit that helps to reduce subscription or registration fees and to provide amenities.

Mr. McANANEY: I disagree with the Premier's statement that hotels suffer a disadvantage in having to provide certain accommodation. The leading hotel keeper in my district told me that he made most of his profit from accommodation and that he made little from the liquor trade. Any hotel that provides a high standard of accommodation and operates on a 60 per cent reservation basis will make a profit.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is obvious that the Premier, with his obedient followers behind him, will not accept my amendment and I guess that on this occasion I shall have to accept the situation. However, I think it is deplorable to give a virtual monopoly to hotels, publicans,

or members of the Australian Hotels Association, or to direct or influence the court to do so. To do that is to take the grave risk of spoiling the business of a section of the trade that, so far as I can see, does not deserve to have its customers cut off in this way. Yet that is what we are going to do. It is all very well for the Premier to say that the holders of the new retail storekeeper's licences will be able to sell a wider range of liquors than they ever could before, but this is no good if no customers are interested in buying from them because they have to buy their supplies from somebody else or because there is so much competition. I warn the Premier and members on both sides of the House that the effect of this amendment as it stands will be to spoil the trade and the businesses of many people who have done nothing to deserve having their businesses ruined in this way.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am going to put in a plug for the hotels. At Clare there are three hotels and two cellar door wine licences. The hotels there experience real competition and provide very good accommodation, but neither the wineries nor the retail stores have to provide accommodation. Clare does not have any retail storekeeper's licences. I do not believe that all bowlers are beer drinkers. I assure members that the bowling clubs do not now buy supplies from the wineries. If they did so and this business was lost, I am sure they would not go broke.

The hotel has duties to the public. I am not saying all hotels have carried out their duties well. Some South Australian hotels should have been closed long ago, and they may yet be closed and nobody would grieve at their passing. However, most of them try to give good service. In general, the hotel keeper is not an ungenerous person when it comes to providing a keg for a function, even if he is not supposed to do so. This applies to the liquor trade generally; there is nobody more generous than the wine industry in providing these things. If this Bill is passed the hotel keeper will have competition that will keep him on his toes, and we should not make it difficult for him now. Eventually, everyone will have to stand up to competition, and the people of the State will be able to buy wherever they please.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There is a trade practice.

Mr. QUIRKE: Most clubs today buy from hotels, but if they are given the right to buy from other places they may not do so. No matter what we do some people will try to get around this legislation. Hundreds of applications will be made for retail licences and, obviously, the hotel keeper will meet strong competition.

Mr. HALL: Much competition exists amongst hotels, depending on their situation. In some towns there are too many hotels. If the situation is widened by this amendment, the court could restrict the number of storekeeper's licences as these outlets may provide too much competition. The amendment could react against the issuing of storekeeper's licences which in other circumstances would be issued.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was pleased to hear the Minister of Lands say that there was a trade practice. If the Government stands fast on this matter (as it seems likely to do) some licensed storekeepers who have an established trade will lose it. It has been brought to my attention that half the turnover of a particular storekeeper in Goodwood results from sales to clubs and similar outlets. That is the sort of person who will lose trade, because his customers will be forced to buy from publicans.

The Committee divided on Mr. Millhouse's amendment:

Ayes (10)—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Rodda and Teusner.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Ferguson, Hall, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Nankivell, Quirke, and Walsh.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(4) Notwithstanding anything in this section contained a club licence held by any club to which section 113 of the repealed Acts applied or in respect of which a proclamation under section 114 of the repealed Acts was in force at the commencement of this Act shall authorize the sale, supply and delivery of liquor by or on behalf of the club in the club premises to a member of a club or to a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member thereof at any time on any day.

The object of this amendment is to preserve the present position regarding what have come to be known as exempt clubs. The exempt clubs get that title and hold their present position by virtue, as my amendment indicates, of sections 113 and 114 of the Licensing Act.

Section 113 provides:

The provisions of this Act or any amendments thereof (other than sections 92 to 112), shall not apply to any club established before the first of January, nineteen hundred, which on the twenty-third of December, nineteen hundred and fifteen, was used *bona fide* for residential purposes and had no bar-room on the club premises.

Section 114 gives the Governor power to make a proclamation or proclamations exempting any club from the provisions of the Act other than sections 92 to 112 if it were established before January 1, 1900, and if it were used *bona fide* and mainly for residential purposes or mainly for the purpose of playing an athletic game or sport approved by the Governor and carried on during the daytime in the open air. The Royal Commissioner recognized six or seven of these exempt clubs and in his report he states:

This submission (with regard to the exempt clubs) would appear to relate to the Adelaide Club and the Naval, Military and Air Force Club, which have long operated under the exemption afforded by section 113, the Democratic Club of Adelaide, which has, since about June, 1966, claimed (and apparently correctly) also to be exempt under that section, the Adelaide Bowling Club, the Royal Adelaide Golf Club and the Commercial Travellers' Club, which operate under proclamations made under section 114.

He gives the *Government Gazette* references to those proclamations, and continues:

. . . and the R.S.L. Club, which operates under special legislation.

Those are the clubs that will be affected by my amendment. I point out that the Commissioner also states, on page 14 of his report, that he can find no social evil in the way in which all clubs (and this includes the exempt clubs) have carried on in South Australia in the past. I believe the aim of the Bill is to bring the law of South Australia into line with the drinking habits presently accepted generally in this community. That means in every case that we are aiming to liberalize the laws that at present govern the consumption of alcohlic liquor in this State. One has only to think of the example of what we are doing in this field for the presently unregistered clubs which have been carrying on illegally, but with the sanction of the overwhelming number of those in the community, in the last few years. Of course, we are trying to give the blessing of the law to what they have been doing.

By failing to reproduce in the present Bill the substance of sections 113 and 114, we are restricting the rights previously enjoyed by the members of the exempt clubs with one important exception that I came across only yesterday. We do not touch (and I am surprised the Premier has not referred to this) the position which obtains in relation to the Returned Servicemen's League Club. The R.S.L. Club Act of 1934 is not repealed by the Bill. This means that the R.S.L. Club in the old Prince of Wales Hotel in Angas Street will be able to continue to serve liquor between 8 a.m. and 11 p.m. This is an exception to the general rule which has been laid down, and the reasons for the exception have not been explained by the Premier.

Mr. McKee: It is no different from any other club enjoying a full licence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This club will have different hours by one hour and we have argued about one hour in respect to bowling clubs; the Premier refused to do anything about that. Section 2 of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League Club (Licensing) Act provides:

So long as the league is registered as a club in respect of the premises formerly known as the Prince of Wales Hotel situated in Angas Street, Adelaide, the hours during which the said league may sell liquor on days other than Sunday, Good Friday or Christmas Day shall be between eight o'clock in the morning and 11 o'clock in the evening. A person shall not be a member of the club referred to in this section unless he—

and paragraph (*a*) refers to the First World War—

(*b*) served in a theatre of war in any other war in which His Majesty was engaged before the passing of this Act.

This Act obviously needs amending. It does not define nearly widely enough the present membership of the club. That Act is not repealed by the present Bill and the position *vis-à-vis* hours is not altered. However, the hours will be restricted in respect of other clubs and I can find no practical reason why that should be so. The Royal Commissioner could see no reason why any person or body should have privileges that any other person or body did not have but he did not say in his report whether there was any practical reason why the rights that have been enjoyed by about 37,000 members of these clubs in South Australia should be taken away.

These clubs have a long history of good management. No suggestion that their position has been abused in any way has been made. It is notorious that the Bill, if passed in the form in which the Government intends it to be passed, will give privileges to certain classes in the community. The grand principle of equality laid down by the Commissioner has

already been abandoned, with the consent of the majority of members of this Committee.

Apart from the South Australian Temperance Alliance, which would have liked to restrict all drinking in South Australia, no other person or body appearing before the Commission asked for this restriction on the clubs that are exempt at present. My amendment, allowing members of clubs to continue to hold a position which is highly prized and which has not been abused, will not affect any other person. The whole aim of the Bill is to liberalize drinking laws in the State and no case has been made out for the restriction of members of these clubs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having looked carefully at the amendment, I am not happy about it. A deputation from the exempt clubs put the position to me as forcibly as it could. However, I draw attention to the fact that the Commissioner pointed out that, whereas there was a considerable difference between exempt clubs and other clubs when the hours of other registered clubs ended at 6 p.m., with the new trading hours and provision for clubs in South Australia the hours during which exempt clubs would be required to trade to be outside the normal trading hours of clubs would have to be somewhat bizarre, to say the least. The clubs will be able to serve liquor until 10 p.m. and consumption will be allowed until 10.30 p.m. The only difference will be that the R.S.L. Club can trade until 11 p.m., but then must cease. In fact, it does not get a half an hour's consumption time after 11 p.m. So, the difference, in effect, is about half an hour.

Mr. Millhouse: That's fairly important, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have not considered it necessary to make a specific change. They are not exempt clubs like the others because they do not come under sections 113 or 114 and have no limitation on trading time at all. I know something about exempt clubs because I am a member of one such club, and I know that it is not the habit of most exempt clubs to trade outside the hours that will now be prescribed for all clubs. Therefore, I do not see the need to provide this specific exemption.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the amendment because it will not harm anybody and because no positive reason has been advanced for removing this exemption, which has existed for about 100 years in the case of some clubs.

Mr. Millhouse: For over 100 years in one case at least.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When we are dealing with legislation to liberalize drinking hours and other facilities throughout the State, I do not see why we should have a group of people who will undoubtedly think that this measure provides rather tough treatment. The six clubs involved, apart from the Returned Services League Club, are the Adelaide Bowling Club Incorporated, the Adelaide Club, the Commercial Travellers Association Club, the Democratic Club, the Naval Military and Air Force Club, and the Royal Adelaide Golf Club Incorporated.

The member for Mitcham reminded the Committee that the Royal Commissioner had reported that he was satisfied that there was no substantial evil in clubs at present. However, in spite of that, he did not favour these particular clubs' retaining their exemption. His main worry was that clubs in general might become a problem in the licensing field similar to that experienced in New South Wales. He pointed out that, even allowing for the fact that we had no poker machines it was still possible for clubs to become a problem in the licensing field. However, he was obviously not referring to these six clubs, whose membership is but a minute section of the total membership of all clubs and it will be an even more minute section in the future when new clubs are formed.

So, it is safe to say that the Commissioner was not worried about these clubs. When approaching a new measure we should favour the *status quo*. I think every member of this Committee who has been a member of Cabinet knows that he must first of all be convinced of a benefit before making a change: it is not sufficient that the proposed change does not seem objectionable. I do not think a good reason has been advanced in this connection. The Premier received a deputation at which I introduced representatives from these clubs, and they presented him with a letter setting out their claims. Signed by Mr. G. R. Macdonald (Honorary Secretary of the Registered Clubs Association of South Australia) it was written on behalf of the exempt clubs, and stated:

The Commissioner recommended the deletion of these provisions, because he thought that these clubs should not have special privileges. He did not recommend this because of any criticism of the clubs. The general remarks of the Commissioner upon the possibility of there developing a problem such

as exists in New South Wales very clearly refers to clubs in general. It is safe to say that the Commissioner was not concerned about any inroads into the hotel trade likely to be made by "exempt" clubs. These clubs have a fine record of conduct. There has been a remarkable absence of allegations of any improprieties over more than half a century. It will be particularly hard on our members if the new Licensing Bill, which is being hailed in the community as a liberalizing measure, is to become a memorable blow in our respective histories. The new Act if not amended will certainly change the character of our club life. We do not seek to expand unreasonably, and we would readily give whatever assurance is required on this point.

Our old-established clubs are known and admired widely throughout the world. Indeed, they have frequently been agreeable mediums for entertaining persons whose visits have been of importance to the State. The seven "exempt" clubs provide and maintain services for their members beyond those of the existing "non-exempt" clubs. They are, in the main, residential, and all of them provide meals. The provision of these services alone over seven days each week involves costs to which "non-exempt" clubs are not subject, and are services which cannot be regarded as profitable activities.

The "exempt" clubs have not and do not aim at making large profits, but seek to provide the fullest possible service to their members. Supply of liquor is only ancillary to this purpose. The Commissioner, in referring to the "exempt" clubs, held the opinion that there should be uniformity of club conditions but the Bill and the Government amendments thereto now provide for differing club licences. The Government acceptance of the *status quo* for existing clubs generally leads us to suggest that you might apply this principle of the *status quo* to the "exempt" clubs also.

The Premier heard the deputation but, as we have heard from him tonight, he does not favour the case of the exempt club. There will be considerable changes in some of them: in others there may not be much change, particularly if they obtain permits to cover certain times. One golf club involved has drinking facilities on Sundays but will have to apply for a permit and, if other clubs obtain one, it should be able to obtain it. A permit will restrict the hours that it has now. No reason exists to make that club seek a permit when it already has the privilege. It was formed before 1900. The same may apply to bowling clubs, although I am not familiar with their politcies. This restriction will almost certainly create hardship. After 100 or more years in operation, some clubs (whose activities have been recognized in previous licensing legislation) will, under this Bill, lose privileges that have not been abused in any way. Indeed, such clubs have conducted themselves with the utmost respectability. The amendment seeks to continue a tradition that has been observed in previous licensing legislation. The six clubs concerned should be left alone.

Mr. COUMBE: One of the principles that the Government has laid down in this Bill is that a certain equality shall apply; throughout the Bill we see provision for liberalizing the supply and consumption of liquor. Many practices that have been illegal in the past are being legalized. However, I cannot recollect another provision in which rights already existing have been taken away, except in respect of this particular provision. The amendment seeks to ensure that the exempt clubs will enjoy the same privileges as they enjoyed previously. When these clubs were established, the drinking hours in this State extended to 11 p.m. (and not 10 p.m., as the Bill seeks to provide). It was not until the 1915 referendum that that condition was changed.

The conditions enjoyed by the clubs under 11 p.m. closing were good enough to be continued when 6 p.m. closing was introduced: we are now extending trading hours to 10 p.m., so why should they be changed? If these exempt clubs had been abusing their rights, there may have been some reason for the present provision, but it is acknowledged that these clubs are conducting well-run establishments and providing a service to their members. Indeed, the Commissioner himself found no fault with them. Furthermore, it must be remembered, apropos the Premier's remarks about a proliferation of outlets, that that will certainly not apply in this provision because we have these clubs, and these clubs only, and it is not likely that more will be formed.

The Premier claimed that this would have an adverse effect on the hotel trade, but how can it? This amendment merely seeks to maintain the existing rights and the conditions of trade of these clubs. They will not have the slightest effect on any hotel, because they will continue to trade in exactly the same way as they have traded for generations, in some cases for 100 years.

The Premier made three or four points in discussing the basic principle of this legislation. He spoke of equality and of giving privileges and extending facilities to other clubs. If the present amendment is defeated, we will be achieving the opposite because we will be taking away already existing rights. There will be no proliferation of outlets if the amendment is carried, and there will be no

adverse effect on hotels. I maintain that this is a reasonable amendment, and I warmly support it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I, too, support the amendment. I am not a member of any of these clubs, nor do I aspire to such membership. I wish to deal with this matter purely as a matter of principle. The clubs concerned have enjoyed these privileges during times of far more stringent licensing regulations than we are proposing today. We are, in fact, liberalizing the whole of the Licensing Act and giving to other clubs, some of which have never been registered, trading rights and trading hours which they have never legally enjoyed before. In this instance we are making a special exception of six exempt clubs, and in my opinion this is an unwarranted attack on those clubs.

Mr. RODDA: Like the Premier, I am a member of one of these clubs, which have enjoyed these privileges for 100 years or more. They have been conducted with dignity and decorum. I can appreciate the point that the Premier has made, in view of the way the Bill is drafted. However, we are making certain concessions to people who have not lived up to the conditions of their licences to the extent that these clubs have done. I support the amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE: Why does the Premier intend to penalize these clubs by refusing to accept the amendment? The clubs have enjoyed rights and privileges for many years and have never abused them. They have had undoubted privileges. When the members of this Chamber go to Government House, the Speaker claims the undoubted rights and privileges of this place, and we will not concede one of them. However, by the force of law the previously exempt clubs are being deprived of rights and privileges they have jealously guarded over the years. They have considered the law and there has not been one blemish on their reputations. I oppose the clause as it stands and wholeheartedly support the amendment which, if carried, will preserve the rights of these clubs. Can honourable members opposite tell me that these clubs are not being penalized? If members opposite perpetrate this flagrant injustice, they will be condemned. I am sure the Premier, after hearing my impassioned plea for justice, will recant on his original intention and either withdraw the clause or accept the amendment: I prefer that the amendment be accepted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As an old hand at the boards, I admire a good act when I see one, and I have seen an excellent example this evening. The honourable member's impassioned plea and dramatic mode of expression have got me on side and I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 28 and 29 passed.

Clause 30—"Restaurant licence."

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

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

This is a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 31—"Cabaret licence."

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

In subclause (1) to strike out "refreshments" and insert "food".

This is a drafting amendment. It is intended that solid food and not liquid refreshment be served.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In subclause (1) after "on" third occurring to insert "Christmas Day or Good Friday at any time or on".

The clause as it stands means that liquor can be sold and disposed of until 3 a.m. on Good Friday. I think all members will acknowledge that Good Friday is the most sacred day in the year, and I do not think that we should permit the sale or disposal of liquor at all on Good Friday morning. What I have said about Good Friday also applies to Christmas Day.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not entirely happy about this amendment. There is little difficulty in accepting the amendment about Good Friday. However, cabarets operate on Christmas eve, which is a variable feast.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask leave to withdraw my previous amendment with a view to moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

In subclause (1) after "liquor on" to insert "Good Friday at any time or on"; and after "Christmas Day" to strike out "or Good Friday".

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

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 32—"Theatre licence."

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I firmly oppose this clause and cannot understand why it is included. It is a poor show if one cannot attend a function without there being

a drinking licence provided at it. The Royal Commissioner's report, concerning the licensing of theatres, states:

At some time, undoubtedly, theatres will justify the provision of liquor during interval. Such liquor might well be supplied by a publican operating under a booth permit. If provision be not made in theatres patrons will undoubtedly leave the theatre building to go to nearby hotels—this would be particularly so at Her Majesty's which is just across the lane from the Metropolitan Hotel in Grote Street, and this indeed is the experience in Melbourne with the motion picture theatre just across Bourke Street from the Southern Cross Hotel. My conclusion is that the Act should provide for such a licence, but that the conditions should be stringent enough to ensure availability without intrusion into the convenience of non-drinkers.

I do not think it would be possible to maintain the conditions set out in the latter part of this statement. If a licence to supply liquor were available at a theatre I believe that the supply of liquor would intrude on the rights of theatregoers who were non-drinkers and who wanted to attend for the sake of the entertainment. Despite the remarks of the Royal Commissioner, I point out that not even the wording of the Bill complies with his suggestions: the Bill authorizes the court to grant a licence for a booth to operate in a theatre during, and even before the commencement of, a performance. Let us preserve some place, particularly a place of entertainment, where we can go without our seeing alcoholic liquor consumed. Bearing in mind the rush to reach an ice-cream or soft-drinks counter that we see in theatres during an interval, I point out that it will be even more undesirable to see this sort of thing happening for the purpose of obtaining alcohol.

I hope that I shall receive some support in this matter. I think the provision is totally unwarranted. Even if this provision does apply overseas, must we follow suit? Although the Royal Commissioner suggests that a hardship will be created if people have to leave Her Majesty's Theatre during an interval to obtain alcoholic liquor in the Metropolitan Hotel, the people wishing to visit the hotel will do so, anyway. The Bill seeks to extend many concessions to people who wish to consume alcoholic liquor, but I ask the Committee to reject this clause because it is unnecessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I appreciate my colleague's attitude, I disagree with it just as strongly as the way in which he has expressed his view. I hope the Committee will not accept that view and that it will pass this clause. His basic thesis is that the serving of alcoholic liquor to people who attend theatre performances will inevitably mean to those who do not consume alcoholic liquor some instrusion, discomfort, or distasteful situation.

I do not see why that should be so, or upon what evidence the Minister says this. I see not the slightest reason why a person cannot during intervals at a live theatre performance have an alcholic drink and return to the theatre without any intrusion on theatregoers and without causing discomfort to them. I have been professionally engaged in theatre work from time to time. I know most theatre managements in South Australia, and it is not unusual for them to offer me a drink in the interval. I have never found the slightest indication that anyone has thought this was an intrusion upon their theatre-going or that it caused them the slightest discomfort.

We claim to be the festival city of Australia, and we are proposing to increase theatre facilities in South Australia and to have them on an international standard, with the kind of facilities internationally provided in theatres. We know that liquor facilities are provided in theatres overseas and that this does not cause any hindrance or discomfort to theatregoers. Indeed, it is something that is appreciated by those interested in live theatrical performances. One of the things that seems to have been retained from Mr. Utzon's design for the Sydney Opera House is a bar. When we have been providing new theatre facilities in South Australia, much interest has been expressed in providing these facilities. The Union Theatre has asked about it, and the Shedley Theatre in the Gawler District has also been inquiring about it.

We have already established in South Australia a pattern of having these facilities available in certain theatres. For instance, the Old Kings Theatre has now obtained a restaurant permit, and people there can be served with liquor, together with a substantial meal during a performance. Indeed, it is proposed that the Majestic Theatre convert to a similar sort of show, so successful has the Old Kings Theatre been. These music hall theatres, where food and wine are served, are in vogue in the other States and command large audiences. In my opinion, it is unreasonable to suggest that liquor should be excluded altogether from a theatre. There is clearly a demand among the theatre-going public internationally for facilities of this kind. They have been provided in other countries and

they can be provided well here without causing any discomfort to those theatregoers who are teetotallers.

I hope that in retaining Adelaide as the festival city and a place to which we are attracting people from overseas, we are able to provide the kind of facilities they look for in theatres of international standing elsewhere. Visitors to this city at festival time have criticized our antiquated licensing laws. In providing for this facility, the Commissioner has taken into account not only what he has seen in other States but also what he has seen overseas: he has recommended a facility which people have been looking for, which has not been abused, and which has been useful and convenient to theatregoers elsewhere.

Mr. HUGHES: This is one occasion on which the Premier has failed to convince me. I agree with what the Minister of Agriculture said; I like to go to the theatre, as he does, with my family and I would not like to see alcoholic beverages served there at intervals. At some theatres once the curtain goes up patrons must wait for an interval before entering and, as the Minister said, if this clause were passed those people might entertain themselves in other ways while they were waiting. So far, the Committee has agreed to liquor facilities for sporting bodies, places of entertainment and so on and has been generous in providing for those wishing to consume liquor.

I believe that we could mark time at present with regard to liquor facilities at theatres. Although visitors from overseas might miss these facilities when they come to South Australia, I believe other avenues can be provided whereby they can be entertained to their satisfaction. If we defer the implementation of provisions such as are contained in this clause the people will accept the new licensing laws in the manner in which the Premier hopes to have them accepted. On the other hand, the forcing of these provisions on to the people will cause much criticism.

People from various walks of life to whom I have spoken do not consider that this is the time to make alcoholic liquor available at a theatre, and I consider that one of the weak points in the Royal Commissioner's report was contained in the passage that was referred to by the Minister of Agriculture. An endeavour has been made to back up what was erroneously considered to be an argument. Although I was taken to task by an Opposition member for referring to something that had taken place in another State, the Royal Commissioner took evidence from other States and made submissions about the position there.

Mr. QUIRKE: I support what the Premier has said about this matter. We must not overlook the possibility of good entertainment being ruined by a general exodus from the theatre to a nearby hotel at interval, because hotels will be open until 10 p.m. The member for Wallaroo said that he understood that, if one did not arrive at the right time, one was not allowed to enter until a break in the play. At least, if somebody does come late, he will have somewhere to go and will not be left fretting and fuming at not being allowed into the theatre; he will be consoled elsewhere.

It is not an unholy business to go into such a place; the husband can have a beer and his wife can have a lemonade in the same place. The time is overdue for the provision of these facilities, which are not abused by the general run of people. In England a waiter will bring a drink to one's seat in the theatre, and conditions there are not abused. More abuse can result from restriction than from allowing people to exercise their freedom of choice. Oversea people have criticized our Mother Grundy attitude toward night life, because they want to enjoy here those things which they do not abuse in their homeland and which they will not abuse here.

If people's behaviour gets over the fence they can be charged with creating a disturbance, and the appropriate correction can be administered. In this enlightened age many restrictions do not do the job that the people seeking the restrictions think they do. I support the clause.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Presumably there will be only one licence issued under this provision. I should like to correct statements made concerning the oversea position. I have been overseas several times and I have seen the conditions there, and I have not yet found one theatre operating under the conditions set out in this clause. It would be impossible to carry out what the Royal Commissioner has suggested, as the clause is framed.

[*Midnight*]

True, liquor is available at oversea theatres and this provision should operate in the same way. The bar is opened before and after the performance and during the interval, but not during the performance. This facility should not be provided at the inconvenience of those patrons who do not wish to drink.

As only one licence is involved, I do not think the matter is worthy of much argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: More than one theatre has expressed interest in making facilities available within the theatre, and of making alterations to the theatre to provide the facilities the court would require for live shows.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: How many would there be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present, three theatres are interested, but in the foreseeable future there will be more theatres requesting this facility. The number of places where theatrical performances can be seen, particularly in the metropolitan area, will increase because it will be essential that we develop them for the Festival of Arts. I hope that in the foreseeable future we shall have a permanent home for the South Australian Theatre Company which, I think, is a company of great importance to theatre life in South Australia and which would obviously ask also for a facility of this kind. I do not think we can specify that everybody has to close down the moment the curtain goes up and re-open the moment it comes down. I think the matter will be sensibly dealt with by the theatre proprietors, anyway, and that the inconvenience to which the honourable member refers will not occur.

Mr. COUMBE: I think the member for Gumeracha is trying to ensure not that we spell it out in this clause but that the court, in granting a licence, shall have the power to specify that at certain times between the hours of 7 p.m. and 11 p.m. this facility be made available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The difficulty about specifying times in the licence is that intervals vary widely in theatrical performances.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although I am usually prepared to support the Premier, with all due deference to him I cannot accept what he says about the Festival of Arts. On each of the three occasions when the festival has been held, it has been well supported and liquor has not been supplied at live shows. I do not think the provision of liquor for live shows during the Festival of Arts will help the State one iota; in fact, it will have a detrimental effect. Because of the publicity it receives and the standard of the performances, the Festival of Arts has been an absolute success. A person attends a theatre not for the sake of consuming liquor but for the entertainment provided. I cannot accept that it is necessary to drink everywhere one goes.

People are entitled to have this type of entertainment without being inconvenienced by alcohol being placed in the thearte foyer. Surely we do not class this sort of thing as civilized. Sometimes I think we go too far in these matters. It seems that some people become so obsessed with the need for alcoholic liquor that they have to drink everywhere they go. I think that 75 per cent of the people who go to theatres go there for entertainment purposes, and that it is quite wrong for the other 25 per cent to be provided with the opportunity to become a nuisance or cause a hindrance to the majority. I oppose the clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (25).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan (teller), Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Quirke, Stott, and Walsh.

Noes (8).—Messrs. Bywaters (teller), Curren, Ferguson, Hughes, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, and Mr. Rodda.

Majority of 17 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 33 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Licence fees."

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not intend to proceed with the amendments I have on file because the member for Chaffey has an amendment which is acceptable to the Government and which reduces the licence fee for winemakers to four-fifths of what was originally proposed in the Bill, it goes most of the way I had intended to go in my amendments. My objection to this clause is that the fees would be based on the gross sum received by the licensee. This would mean that the money that came over the counter rather than the wholesale price of the commodity would be the basis of the fee. Of course, that would have been a new departure and I am strongly opposed to it. I want the position restored to that which obtained before the Bill was introduced.

In other words, I want the licence fee to be calculated as it is now for a publican's licence. A publican's licence fee is now based on the value of the liquor he receives for sale; it is not based on the amount he is paid by his customers. Brewers have paid the same fee as

wineries for the retail portion of their licence. The fee in respect of all these licences in the wine industry will be increased because of the difference between the value of goods placed in store and the price at which they are sold. Apparently, it has been realized that the tax is excessive and the member for Chaffey's amendment provides for the tax to be based not on the total amount received in the retail trade but on four-fifths of that amount. That amendment would restore the position almost to that which operated before the introduction of this Bill. Because of that and also because I have good reason for thinking that my amendment is not acceptable to the Government, I will not proceed with my amendment. There is no reason why the wine industry should be treated in this way, because the breweries do not pay any fee other than excise, and they pass that on.

Mr. Curren: It will balance out eventually.

Mr. QUIRKE: It does not balance, although the honourable member's amendment will improve the position. My objection is to the form of the tax, which is a heavy impost on the wine industry. It is a very severe tax and far removed from the original licence fees that applied; then, the biggest hotel in the State did not pay more than $800, but the bigger wineries now pay thousands of dollars for their licences, and the smaller ones pay $1,500 to $2,000. This is a tax on hard-working people, because the tax is paid not by big co-operatives or proprietary companies but by the growers, as all the profits that accrue to the co-operative wineries must be paid out to the growers or placed in a reserve.

The main finance for all the co-operatives has come not from the growers but from advances by the State Bank. The interest charges and the principal are repayable over 18 years, and these charges have to be met by the growers and recovered in the prices. Now, the difference between the wholesale price and the price at the cellar door is also being taxed. I have a serious and, I believe, well-founded objection to this; it is quite unwarranted. Because I cannot improve the situation to the extent to which I want to improve it and because of the grudging consent of the industry to this tax, I must accept the amendment that the Government intends to accept.

Mr. CURREN: I move:

In subclause (1) (*b*) after "centum" to insert "of four-fifths".

I wish to bring some equality into licence fees paid by companies and to arrive at a figure equitable to each company. At present, the fee is levied on a figure arrived at by the companies after much calculation. One company took the matter to court, which ruled that as the company did not pay for the wine it sold it did not have to pay a licence fee. The point made by the member for Burra (that, with the reduction of 20 per cent in the fee, one-fifth of a loaf is better than none) may apply to some wineries.

However, the amendment will result in a decrease in fees for other wineries because of the varying mark-up used by the different companies. A list shows variations of 31 per cent, 80 per cent, 20 per cent, 26 per cent, and 12½ per cent, so that the equivalent amount of sales by each company means a considerable variation in the fee paid. The mark-up is not on individual items.

These figures were for overall sales for individual companies, with a resulting difference in licence fees. The co-operative wineries in the Upper Murray, when I made this suggestion to them yesterday morning, agreed that it was a fair and equitable way of determining a licence fee. The present method of determining the figure to be submitted to the Licensing Court, for the purpose of reviewing the licence fee, involves much bookwork on the part of the individual organizations. Determining the fee will now merely entail adding account sales at the end of the licence period and deducting one-fifth, which will give the sum on which the 5 per cent licence fee will be payable.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has adequately explained the difficulties experienced in providing that the licence fee would be calculated on the basis of the cost to the distiller or winemaker of the product that he was selling. Some played fair in this matter, but some most certainly did not. One of the biggest wineries in South Australia did not play fair by a long way in respect of the sums it assigned to the cost of the product. As it was extremely difficult to check on this, it was better in our view to calculate a sum on the basis of something that was ascertainable, which was the sum paid to the manufacturer or wholesaler.

This provision was made by the previous Government in the existing Act in relation to a brewer's licence for sales to unlicensed persons. The provision allowed a specific calculation but I agree that, as the Bill is at present drafted, it would mean an increase in licence fees in some areas and, of course, the payment of licence fees to an extent not previously

known by some sections of the industry. I think the honourable member's amendment is a sensible compromise in endeavouring to maintain a present standard of licence fees, where fees have been set and where people are playing the game.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can these provisions be challenged? We were previously informed that a similar provision was open to challenge in the court because of the fact that it involved an excise tax. It was stated that in a similar case elsewhere it was held to be an excise tax. I know that Sir Richard Butler got into great difficulty with a similar provision that was taken to the High Court and held to be an excise tax. That was in connection with petrol licences.

I suggest that as a safeguard the matter might be examined to see whether it could be technically challenged. The licence is directly related to the sales. On one occasion when this matter came under my notice the amount had been fixed on sales not of the current year but of another year. I do not recall whether that was held to be correct, but I believe it did escape the challenge that it was an excise tax. Here we have directly based the tax upon a percentage of the sale. I suggest that before the Bill is finally passed it might be advantageous to look at this matter from a legal point of view to see whether there is any technical infringement of the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation relating to excise.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Tax such as this is bad in principle. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) pointed out that the fee is payable on retail sales, and I agree with him that it is an iniquitous form of taxation. Every item has to be taken into account in the calculation of the amount of tax paid for the licence. Consequently, when a vigneron is fixing his retail price he has to take all these things into account, and that affects the price he pays to the grower for grapes. In effect, it means that the grower, who is up against it in any case, is going to get less for his product, because naturally the vigneron in fixing his price will say that he cannot afford to pay more and consequently the grower will get less.

This is an iniquitous form of taxation, and I do not like it. I know the Government wants some revenue from licences, but I maintain that to be fair the fee should be fixed on the wholesale price rather than the retail price. The amendment moved by the honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) improves the position slightly. The distillers in my district agree with me that we may have had difficulty in getting the member for Burra's suggested amendment accepted. Although I do not think the member for Chaffey's calculation of four-fifths balances out quite as well as it should, I am now prepared to accept it. However, I still protest against the method of calculating this tax which, after all, will come out of the grower's pocket.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause 1 (*b*) after "licensed" to insert "under this Act"; and after "permitted" to strike out "under this Act" and insert "by law".

These are purely drafting amendments.

Mr. QUIRKE: This matter will not be easy to administer because of the various types of wine, the different prices at which various types of wine are sold and so on. Has anything been worked out yet for collecting these fees?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nothing very specific has been worked out, although later provisions relate to the court's powers in certain respects.

Mr. Quirke: It takes a fair amount of bookkeeping.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. Regarding these amendments, I should point out that, when we took out the provision relating to the Commonwealth the other evening, in fact, we provided that a brewer, in providing beer to somebody authorized by the Commonwealth to sell, would have to pay the turnover tax on the sales to that person because that person was not licensed under the Act. Therefore, it was important to write these particular amendments in to make certain that persons authorized by the Commonwealth to sell liquor within the terms of the Commonwealth Constitution were able to obtain their liquor without having to pay turnover tax as if they were buying it at retail, or to have the brewer do so in their stead.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) (*c*) after "licence" third occurring to insert "and was not disposed of under such licence to any other person licensed under this Act to sell liquor or exempted under section 13".

Amendment carried.

Mr. CURREN moved:

In subclause (1) (*e*) after "per centum" to insert "of four-fifths".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) (*e*) after "licensed" to insert "under this Act"; and after "permitted" to strike out "under this Act" and insert "by law".

Amendments carried.

Mr. CURREN: I move:

In subclause (1) (*f*) after "per centum" to insert "of four-fifths".

The member for Burra said that the licence fees would be levied on the excise content of the price.

That applies also to the licence fees charged in respect of ale and beer sold in hotels. The excise is paid by the breweries before the liquor is bought by the hotels. Therefore, there is no differentiation between ale and beer on the one hand and wine on the other. The member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) claimed that the licence fees to be charged for the sales would affect the gross return received by growers for grapes. However, the three wineries in my district that have been operating on storekeeper's distiller's licences paid a total fee of $3,850 in 1966, so I should not think that there would be any great variation as a result of the increase or that the amount involved would affect growers on the basis of a supply of 40,000 tons of grapes.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (*i*) (*f*) after "licensed" to insert "under this Act"; and after "permitted" to strike out "under this Act" and insert "by law".

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) to strike out "be excluded from 'gross amount' for the purposes of this subsection" and insert "not to be taken into account in computing a 'gross amount' in relation to the licensee required so to purchase liquor".

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier confirmed the other day that the Leigh Creek canteen would have to pay a licence fee in future, although it had not had to pay it in the past. Can he say why this impost is now being put on?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leigh Creek canteen will now have a full hotel licence and, in all the circumstances, there is no reason why that canteen should not pay the same fee as is paid in respest of other places.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What has it had up to the present time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has had a special statutory licence, applicable only to Leigh Creek.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will this make any practical difference to what is available at Leigh Creek?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may; I do not know yet.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 37 passed.

Clause 38—"Applicants for licences, etc., to furnish declarations as to liquor purchases."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (1) after "purchases" to insert "or, as the case requires, sales"; in subclause (3) after "purchased" to insert "or, as the case requires, sold": in subclause (4) to strike out "wine licence or a railway" and insert "brewer's Australian ale licence, distiller's storekeeper's licence, wholesale storekeeper's licence, or a vigneron's"; and in subclause (5) after "purchased" to insert "or, as the case requires, sold".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.56 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 3, at 2 p.m.