

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 17, 1967

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

GAS

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier supply to the House the details of the announced contract, which is either signed or to be signed, between the Electricity Trust and the producers for the supply of natural gas for electricity generation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No detailed contract has been signed. However, an offer having been made by the Electricity Trust to the producers of natural gas, I was informed this morning that the producers, at a board meeting, had accepted the trust's offer concerning the supply of gas. The price will vary according to the proportion the trust is able to use of the contracted demand, but on the basis of an 80 per cent load factor, which is the expected normal load factor, the price in the earlier years (that is, the base price) will be about 26c a thousand cubic feet. If the trust achieves a 90 per cent load factor the price will fall to about 25½c, and if this is bettered a lower price still will apply. A particularly low price has been agreed for interruptible supplies, that is, supplies made available to the trust at times when other users are using less than their normal load. The contract will be for 20 years and the prices will be increased by a half cent after each successive four years. These increases will be equivalent to only about 2 per cent each four years. On the other hand it is expected that an effective discount upon the agreed prices of about 8 per cent will be available to the Electricity Trust by virtue of the reduced costs of transportation arising out of the fact that the pipeline will be financed out of relatively low-interest Government guaranteed funds. That would mean that the net cost to the trust would vary from about 23c a thousand cubic feet in the earlier years to about 25c in the 17th to 20th years.

The volume of gas which the trust is to take under the arrangements is likely to involve, at least in the earlier years of the operations, between 60 per cent and 65 per cent of the

total of all natural gas brought to Adelaide. All parties, including the pipelines authority, are satisfied that adequate reserves of gas have been proven to justify the construction of the contemplated 18in. pipeline between Gidgealpa and Adelaide. The only important arrangement yet to be concluded before actual pipeline construction can be authorized is agreement between the pipelines authority and the producer companies on transportation charges. No serious problem or delay is expected in this, for there is already an understanding upon the basis upon which such charges are to be determined. The volume of expenditure by the Electricity Trust involved in the contract for natural gas supplies over the 20-year period is likely to be about \$140,000,000, which is by far the biggest contract entered into by any public authority in this State. When to this is added the worth of the South Australian Gas Company contract which will aggregate about \$45,000,000 over the 20 years, and the direct arrangements with certain major industrial concerns, it is expected that well over \$200,000,000 will be involved in sales of natural gas for which arrangements have now been made. I point out to members that, although these arrangements will be of major importance to the trust because they involve a large volume of clean and efficient fuel from assured local sources at a price that is very competitive indeed with that of any alternative fuel (it is well within the price that is available to us for alternative fuel or the expected price of alternative fuel in the future), one of the most important things about the completion of these arrangements is that they make possible the economic supply of natural gas to the domestic consumer and to industry in large quantities at a price which is known now to be very competitive with that which is available in the industrial areas of our neighbouring State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I welcome the news that agreement has been reached and a definite contract is about to be made. I take it that is the purport of the Premier's answer, although I do not express any opinion on the price he mentioned. In the light of the announcement he made, can the Premier give a more precise estimate of the date on which gas will be available in the metropolitan area and, if he can, what is his estimate now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On present indications, mid-1969.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that as far as you can go?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot go further than that. At the moment no contract has been let.

Mr. Millhouse: But you say it will be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it will be, and the pipeline authority has been investigating the means of letting a contract at the earliest possible opportunity to ensure that the pipeline is built at a cost within the estimate given by our consultants. A contract cannot be let until we are assured of being able, as a result of the use of the gas, to pay for the pipeline, and that is now assured. We have now got the green light to go ahead, and I assure the honourable member that there will not be the slightest delay.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier say whether the contract provides for penalties for non-supply or non-acceptance, or does it contain escape clauses? I ask this question because, when discussing the matter of contracts two years ago, members of the Electricity Trust said that they were opposed to long-term contracts because of changing conditions that could affect the costs of contracts. Also, a long-term contract could involve the trust in the problem of non-supply. In the event of natural gas being available much closer to Adelaide and at a much cheaper price for the Electricity Trust, can the Premier say whether the trust is irrevocably committed to the payment of the current price and whether the supply company is irrevocably committed to supply gas at that figure. Further, can he say what are the penalties for non-observance of the agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Those details have not been concluded. What has been concluded between the trust and the producers in an exchange of letters is an offer by the trust to take gas over a 20-year period at the price I have detailed to members, as well as an undertaking by the producers that they will undertake to amortize the cost of the pipeline. That would be the basis on which transportation costs are worked out, provided that the cost of the pipeline does not exceed the figures on which we have been advised by our consultants. The further details of the agreement have yet to be concluded, but I have no doubt that no difficulty will be experienced in concluding these arrangements.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You say that the exchange of letters has been on principle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We can now get down to working out the details of the agreement. We do not anticipate any

difficulty in this area. The producers have shown themselves to be as keen to conclude these negotiations and to supply gas to the metropolitan area for industrial use as the Electricity Trust is to obtain a guaranteed local supply of fuel at a competitive price. In the circumstances, I am happy to say that negotiations, which at times have been hard and tough, have nevertheless come to a conclusion that has satisfied both parties. One of the difficulties to which the honourable member refers concerning long-term contracts is the large-scale escalation of cost over a long period, but that difficulty has been resolved.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the Government intends to provide a spur line to Angaston from the main Gidgealpa-Adelaide pipeline so that the Brighton Cement Works will be able to use natural gas in its works there, can the Premier say at this stage when gas will be available at Angaston from that spur line?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I will inquire for the honourable member, I understand that it will be not later than the date on which gas is supplied to the metropolitan area.

Mr. COUNBE: The Premier has said that the authorities concerned are now satisfied that adequate reserves are available or established at the Gidgealpa and Moomba fields. As doubt had been expressed about this earlier, and as the matter is so vital to the whole undertaking, can the Premier say whether a further assessment has been made that has led the various authorities to make this decision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it has not. Recently an assessment has been made of the quantity of gas that would be necessary to justify an 18in. pipeline and it was considered, in view of the results from the latest well (and I have given the House what was, in view of the results, a somewhat conservative figure assessed), that there were sufficient reserves to justify the building of the pipeline.

CLELAND PARK

Mr. BROOMHILL: About six weeks ago, on visiting the Cleland National Park at Mount Lofty, I was impressed with the potential of the area. One of the advantages is the space available but, at this time, it is something of a disadvantage because, with only a few animals in the reserve, people can walk long distances without observing wild life. To enable the children to obtain full value from a trip to

the area, will the Minister of Lands have the department consider establishing an area for children similar to that which now exists at the Adelaide Zoo?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has visited the Cleland National Park. As members are aware, this park was opened in April of this year and has been extremely successful. Members will also be aware that the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), when Minister of Lands, played a prominent part in the moves that led to the establishment of this park and I am pleased that the project has been as successful as he expected. Regarding the number of animals at present in the park, the member for West Torrens will realize that, possibly because of the short time for which the park has been operating, difficulty has been experienced in getting into the area as much native fauna as the commissioners would like to have there. Nevertheless, there is also a danger of eventually having too many animals there, and this matter will be borne in mind. I appreciate the honourable member's suggestion that it may be tiring for small children, anyway, to travel the distance required in order to observe the animals, and there may be merit in his suggestion that a children's area, similar to that operating successfully at the Adelaide Zoo, be developed. I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the commissioners with a view to their considering the suggestion. I take this opportunity to suggest to any members who have not visited the park that it would be well worth their while to visit it.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last week, when I asked a question about the movement of grain and barley from silos in the South-East, particularly Wolseley and Bordertown, to feed starving stock, I suggested that the Railways Department remove the charge of 83c a ton that had been imposed for the removal of this grain. I pointed out that the department could not deliver the grain to certain places where there was no railway centre and, in addition, that the department had no facilities for delivering lots of 100 bushels. Nevertheless, the department was charging 83c a ton if the farmers pulled in at silos with their own bulk trucks. Has the Premier a reply to that question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I told the honourable member earlier that I was awaiting a report on this matter from the Drought Relief

Committee. That has not yet been received, but I shall let him know when I receive it.

WHYALLA RAILWAY LINE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my question about the Port Augusta to Whyalla railway?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague states that representations have been made recently to the Commonwealth Government about the proposed standard gauge railway line between Port Augusta and Whyalla and that it is to be hoped that the Commonwealth Government will make a decision within a reasonable time. I do not know what is meant by "a reasonable time", but the Minister is trying to get a decision from the Commonwealth on this important matter.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. LANGLEY: For many years stamp duty on receipts was 2d. on sums of \$2 and upwards, but an amendment to the Act, which became effective when decimal currency was introduced on February 14, 1966, provided for a duty of 5c on all receipts for sums of over \$50. Last November, the Act was amended to provide that a duty of 2c was to be paid on receipts for over \$10 and less than \$50, and on receipts for over \$50 the duty was 5c. As cheques are often used to pay accounts, in which case a receipt is not required, and as some accounts state that a receipt will not be issued unless it is required, can the Premier say whether it is compulsory to issue receipts for all payments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The honourable member will remember that this matter was debated during the early session this year. The Government intended that there should be compulsory issue of receipts for all payments, as is the case in Western Australia; but, as a result of a compromise between the Houses, the provision for the compulsory issue of receipts was not enforced, and in certain circumstances receipts are not necessary. However, I shall obtain details from the Commissioner of Stamps and Succession Duties of the circumstances in which receipts must be given.

MATHEMATICS COURSE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 6 about the new mathematics syllabus and whether service clubs could conduct special courses?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: On investigating this matter, I find that there is a considerable and growing interest among parents in the new mathematics course in primary schools. Classes for parents in primary mathematics are being organized by the Adult Education Section. In addition, many heads of schools have arranged open nights for parents. At these demonstration lessons, displays of equipment and addresses by teachers have been featured. Several schools have organized a series of evenings for parents.

In April this year, the Superintendent of Primary Schools, assisted by a panel of speakers, addressed a meeting of the South Australian Public Schools Committees Association at the Adelaide Boys High School. Last year a special display, which lasted for a week, was held at the Flinders Park Primary School. At present an extensive and intensive inservice programme of training is being conducted for teachers throughout the State, and this will need to be continued for some time. Officers of the Education Department and teachers best qualified to conduct special courses in mathematics are heavily committed already.

As an illustration, at Gilles Street Primary School a refresher course of training for people interested in returning to teaching is being held for a month. This course is primarily devoted to mathematics and requires the services of several key personnel. In addition, 80 inservice training courses in mathematics for teachers in the field, including seven residential courses of a week's duration, have been planned for 1967. The sessions in mathematics are, of course, only part of the inservice training programme. Therefore, although I sympathize with the proposal to assist parents in this regard I do not consider that we are in a position at present to provide speakers for special courses along the lines envisaged.

As a more practicable alternative in the immediate situation, I intend to ask District Inspectors to request heads of schools to endeavour to hold one or two open nights devoted to mathematics. That this is an effective means of catering for parent interest in the new mathematics is indicated by the success of open nights held at Blackwood Primary School on July 18, and at Magill Demonstration School on July 19. At Blackwood, 200 parents attended, while at Magill the attendance was 600.

DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: At about the time that the Loan Estimates debate took place last

year, I told the Minister of Lands that Mr. Hawkes, part of whose property comprises Alf Flat, had at least indicated that he would be willing to co-operate concerning his interest in the water on the property, provided there was some guarantee that it would be a permanent watering place. As the Minister knows, Alf Flat is on the northernmost end of the Eastern Division natural drainage area, but this water is now being diverted in accordance with the drainage proposals under legislation passed in this House. I think the Minister previously indicated to me that he intended to have a committee investigate the matter. Can he say whether the committee has, in fact, investigated the position and brought down any recommendations? If it has not, will he give an assurance that the committee will consider the matter soon and ascertain whether or not the suggestion is feasible?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, the honourable member raised this matter with me some time ago, when I indicated that I would be prepared to appoint a committee to examine the suggestion. That committee was, in fact, appointed and it comprises the Surveyor-General (Mr. Bailey) and the Chairman of the Land Board (Mr. Rix). As the committee has been investigating the matter, there is no need for me to give the assurance for which the honourable member has asked. I have indicated to the committee that Mr. Hawkes could be co-opted to help with its investigations. Some negotiations have been undertaken concerning the purchase of land in the area, and the matter is still being considered.

Mr. Nankivell: Including suggestions made by people from Keith?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The honourable member knows sufficient about this matter to be aware that while these negotiations are proceeding little can be said about them. I hope soon to be able to give the honourable member more specific information. Like the honourable member, the committee and I hope that a satisfactory conclusion will soon be reached.

HAMBIDGE RESERVE

Mr. BOCKELBERG: For many years I have been trying to have something done in the hundred of Hambidge, which is adjacent to Lock. As I heard recently that the Minister of Lands was not averse to the cutting up of some of this land for agricultural purposes, can he say whether it will, in fact, be cut up or whether it will merely continue to be held as a reserve and wasted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not agree that this land is at present held in waste. The area concerned comprises about 97,000 acres. When visiting Lock in December last I met people interested in having some of the area opened up for agricultural purposes. After having some discussions with them, I pointed out the need to hold a large area of this type of land. The people concerned had many arguments to advance against holding the land, and I was sympathetic in this regard, because no-one could ignore their claims. However, I pointed out the advantage that could accrue to primary industry as a result of scientific investigation carried out in this area which might be far greater than anything resulting from the area's being opened up for settlement.

I also pointed out that I had not been convinced by the commissioners that it was absolutely necessary to hold the 97,000 acres. On that score, I said I was willing to have the matter investigated and to have the commissioners' report on the area. Only as recently as last week, three commissioners, the Chairman of the Land Board (Mr. Rix), Dr. Peter Crowcroft and the Chairman of the commission (Mr. Lothian), when visiting Lock, as well as the reserve itself, discussed with residents the future of the reserve. At this stage I have received no recommendations from those commissioners. No doubt, their views will be expressed at the next meeting of the commission, as a result of which I may receive a report. On the other hand, a further investigation may have to be undertaken by the commissioners. I have not ignored the views expressed and the representations made to me by the people who are so concerned about the future of Lock, and who claim that the area in question, while being held out of production, is having a marked effect on the future of Lock.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. BURDON: I have often raised the matter of warning devices at railway crossings in my district. From previous information given me, I understand that priorities for these works are being prepared. Will the Minister of Social Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether the priorities have been determined? If they have, when is the work likely to be carried out?

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

BLUFF ROAD

Mr. HEASLIP: Some time ago I introduced to the former Premier a deputation from Wirrabara regarding a bitumen road which leads to a television station situated at a high point in the Flinders Ranges known as The Bluff. This could be a great tourist attraction if people were allowed to use the road. However, as the Postmaster-General's Department has closed the road to the public, South Australia, by not having this road available, is missing a great opportunity to attract tourists. Therefore, can the Minister of Immigration and Tourism do something to have the road opened to the public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As a result of representations made by his predecessor, only last week the Premier received from the Prime Minister a letter regarding the road to The Bluff. The letter was forwarded to me, the Premier requesting that I consult the Minister of Roads about the future of this road for possible tourist activity. Last Monday I had preliminary discussions about the matter with the Minister of Roads, who has the docket which he is considering at present. I hope I will be able to continue discussions with him early next week. When something final is achieved, I shall be happy to inform the honourable member.

CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday, in the House of Representatives, the Minister who is the President of the River Murray Commission made a statement which raised a doubt whether a more serious position might not arise regarding the Chowilla dam than we have been led to believe. Therefore, will the Premier table a copy of the correspondence that has taken place between the Prime Minister and him since Mr. Beaney reported on the suspension of work on the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly. In the course of the debate in the House on this matter, I detailed to members (indeed, I read out the text) the approach I had made to the Prime Minister. Before the debate took place I had sent a letter on the matter, the contents of which I detailed to honourable members during the debate. The only other letter that I sent was the letter giving the Prime Minister the text of the unanimous resolution passed in this House.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There has been no other interference with the River Murray Waters Agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: None whatever.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Commonwealth Minister said yesterday that South Australia's share of the water was only three-thirtieths.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable gentleman concerned needs a little correction on that score. I have not had a reply from the Prime Minister concerning the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards our approaches to it. I hope I will get a reply urgently but, if I do not, I assure members that other action will be taken to get a reply, and that promptly.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Since the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme was approved and work commenced in September, 1966 (the expected completion date being 18 months after the commencement of the work), I have been asked continually by home owners in the area when their houses are to be connected to the scheme. Can the Minister of Works obtain for me a detailed report on progress made on the project, particularly regarding whether all the preliminary survey work has been completed and where the trunk mains have been laid? Also, I should like to know the streets in which the reticulated main laying has been carried out and whether it is expected that the scheme will be concluded by the due date.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When I discussed the matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief yesterday morning, he assured me that the work on the scheme was running to schedule. However, I will obtain further particulars for the honourable member.

BAROSSA VITICULTURE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Under the heading "Survey of Barossa by University Students", the following article appeared in the *Barossa and Light Herald* (which circulates in part of my district) a couple of weeks ago:

Between August 6 and 12, a party of final year students from the Geography Department of the University of Adelaide will carry out a study of viticulture in the Barossa Valley. Such a practical survey forms an important part in their training in Economic Geography and will be carried out by 15 students and one staff member based at Tanunda. The main objectives of the survey will be to establish the role of viticulture on holdings engaged in this kind of agricultural production and the degree of dependence upon vines from farm to farm. This is of importance in view of the alleged tendency towards over-production in recent

years and the increasing importance of the Murray Valley as a producer of wine grapes under irrigation.

Will the Minister of Education approach the university to have the findings of the survey made available to the economic section of the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

FISHING

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to my question regarding the regulations that would apply on how close cray fishermen may approach the *Ocean Digger* when that drilling rig operates off the South-East coast?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Mines reports that the Convention on the Continental Shelf, to which Australia is a signatory, was signed at Geneva in April, 1957. Article 5 provides for the protection of fisheries, navigation and natural resources, and lays down that there shall be a safety zone of 500 metres around oil rigs and oil production installations, measured from the outside perimeter of such installations.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the payment of school subsidies during the last financial year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In the latter half of the 1965-66 financial year a new policy on the distribution of subsidy funds was adopted. To ensure that all schools obtain a fair share of the moneys available, an allocation is made at the beginning of each financial year. Allocations are made in accordance with the requests submitted by the schools, having regard to the following factors: (1) date of establishment and the needs of the school; (2) enrolment; (3) the subsidy paid in the preceding three or four years; and (4) any circumstances that warrant special consideration.

For the financial year 1966-67, the Government provided \$499,000 on the Estimates for school subsidies, an increase of 5.1 per cent on the previous year. In addition, subsidies totalling \$100,000 were provided under the minor works programme from Loan money towards the cost of construction of canteens, swimming pools, change rooms, and assembly halls. Taking this into account, the increase in subsidy money made available last year was 26 per cent more than the sum provided in 1965-66. Under the new method of allocation, the

department reviews the subsidy position at the end of each February and, if necessary, makes a re-allocation in order to ensure that all money voted by Parliament for subsidies is made available for the maximum benefit to schools.

The introduction of the allocation system ensures a much fairer distribution than was possible under the old system of "first in, first served". Schools are able to plan projects in advance, and to purchase items of a general nature immediately they are advised of their allocation, without further reference to the department. On completion of the first full year of operation of the present system, I can report that it has been well received by school organizations, and has simplified the department's handling of subsidy claims.

SOUTH-EAST ROAD

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of August 9 about a main arterial road in the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the Highways Department is aware of the necessity to provide an arterial road from Lucindale in a north-westerly direction through Marcollat, eventually reaching the Dukes Highway near Tintinara. The planning of this road is in hand but has not been completed because of staff shortages. The question of construction has not been considered at this stage and no statement on this can be made.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Saturday morning, when visiting in my district, I was reminded by a constituent about a danger of which we all have been made aware: that there are, dotted all over the metropolitan area, private swimming pools that are not fenced. This is a danger, especially to small children who could fall in and be drowned. I understand that in some other States legislation obliges the owners of swimming pools to have them fenced. I ask the Premier whether this matter has been considered by his Government and, if it has, whether the Government intends to act on those lines in South Australia. If the matter has not been considered by the Government, will the Premier take it up in the interests of safety, especially that of small children?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the first question is "No". The second question, therefore, does not arise. Regarding the

third question, I shall discuss the matter with the Minister of Mines, but I doubt that we shall have an opportunity this year to introduce legislation on the matter. So far we have had no grounds for complaint.

OFFSHORE BOUNDARY

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier has said that agreement has been worked out about State boundaries in relation to offshore oil exploration. Some time ago he said that Victoria had already entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth about offshore rights.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was in relation to one lease.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Wells, in his White Paper, states that, unless agreement is reached between South Australia and Victoria, the whole structure of the proposed legislation will fall to the ground. Can the Premier say whether that statement would also apply to the agreement between Victoria and the Commonwealth? Would there be a complete collapse of all legislation, or does Mr. Wells's statement imply the collapse only of legislation relating to other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it could be a complete collapse of the proposals for joint legislation. The honourable member will see that Mr. Wells states that at present the States have legislation relating to mining. The Commonwealth has a convention power in relation to mining under its external affairs powers as a result of having signed the Convention on the Continental Shelf. The legal position of the States as regards waters beyond territorial waters is extremely doubtful. The position even within territorial waters is subject to challenge.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What are territorial waters?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Again, that is the subject of dispute.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is the agreement between Victoria and the Commonwealth a valid agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Victoria and the Commonwealth made an agreement in relation to royalties to be paid by the lessee on a particular lease in Victoria: it is the terms and conditions on which an exploration lease would be converted to an exploitation lease, and these terms differ from those previously agreed between the States and the Commonwealth.

Mr. Hall: You mean previously agreed in secret consultation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, as the basis on which we were to consider joint legislation. That agreement caused extremely hard feelings between the negotiating parties. The negotiations had continued for a long time, and this matter was considered to be settled. Undertakings were given by all States that they would not depart from these principles as that had been demanded by the Commonwealth. That agreement avails nothing regarding the certainty of title, because without joint legislation between the States and the Commonwealth there is no way to ensure certainty of title to the lessees. That is the constitutional position with which we are faced.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We are in a stronger position than we thought we were.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: How?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Victoria would have to agree to a reasonable proposal to secure its own oil well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Victoria is in the same position as we are. We are to have a rig spud in 15 miles off Robe (beyond territorial waters) and we need to give B.H.P.-Esso, the company that is involved in Victoria, security of title. Indeed, in securing all our offshore exploration leases we have to get security of title, but without joint legislation we cannot do that. This matter is urgent for every State involved in this operation. Each State has granted offshore exploration leases which at present have no secure foundation in law, and each is trying to obtain this secure foundation in law by joint arrangement between the States and the Commonwealth. That is why the matter is regarded as important and urgent by Mines Departments and legal officers in every State. It has been a long hard road, but we have got agreement between all States and the Commonwealth essentially to provide the things which the lessees will require of us, and which they are entitled to require, to cover every constitutional loophole that the States and Commonwealth are capable of covering by this legislation. Legislation is almost ready to be presented to all Parliaments in Australia, and members will be able to discuss the details when legislation is introduced this session, because it will include a schedule providing offshore boundaries between this State and Victoria and between this State and Western Australia.

Mr. COURCE: Members would be assisted if a simple report were obtained explaining how this new boundary line was drawn by surveyors. I presume that the new boundary is supposed to be an equal distance from several points on the neighbouring coastlines of the States.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Only beyond the 100-fathom line.

Mr. COURCE: Yes. But in places the median line is inside the longitudinal line forming the boundary between the two States; then it is inside on the South Australian side, then it deviates. To help members understand it, will the Premier obtain a simple report and make it available?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The line that was drawn up to the point where the proposed boundary joins the median line at about the 100-fathom line resulted from negotiations directed to ensuring to the contending States certain portions of interesting oil exploration areas. Victoria's original proposals (even where they gave a little) gave us nothing like what has eventuated.

Mr. Coumbe: This line was deliberately drawn?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It follows the meridian line to beyond the point where the meridian line would cross completely the interesting structure mainly centred on the South Australian side of the meridian line in which we are interested.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You share the chocolate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Obviously, members will realize that both States would be in an invidious position if the Premier of either State started to boast. I simply ask members to look at the map.

ORANGES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A complaint has been made to me by a retail fruiterer in my district that he is unable to obtain ungraded oranges, or culls, to sell to his customers. He informs me that, in the past, these oranges (usually having a skin blemish) were available at about 75c a half-case compared with the cost of graded oranges at \$1.10, and that they were popular with his customers. He has had many requests for them but they are not available, and he believes that they are being dumped. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether these oranges are being dumped rather than sold and, if they are, why they are being

dumped? Will the Minister consult with the Citrus Organization Committee to see whether these oranges can be made available, in view of the undoubted demand there has been for them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain a report from the committee.

COMPANIES ACT

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that some months ago the Premier attended a meeting of Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and the States, at which amendments to the Companies Act were discussed. If he did, will he say whether it is intended this session to introduce amendments to the Act, and can he say what form they will take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I doubt whether amendments to the Companies Act will be introduced this session, although a number of matters concerning amendments to the Act have been discussed. After certain decisions had been made as a result of discussions with the various interested bodies, other interested bodies asked for an opportunity to examine the proposals before they were finally determined. Since those bodies were undoubtedly affected by the proposals, it was considered reasonable that they should have an opportunity to examine the amendments and to make submissions to the Government. In these circumstances, I doubt whether there will be an agreement concluded between the Attorneys-General in time to enable amendments to be introduced this session.

CRAFT INDUSTRIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that at a dinner last Saturday evening (I think it was the Commercial Travellers' Association dinner) the Premier canvassed the idea of the establishment of craft industries in this State, but he did not go into any detail. Can he now say precisely what industries he has in mind for establishment in this State; have any moves been made by any groups of individuals, either out of or within South Australia, for the establishment of such industries; and if such moves have been made, what help can the Government give? If moves have not been made, what steps does the honourable gentleman intend to take towards the establishment of such industries here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The craft industries to which I referred were those which, in Scandinavian countries in particular, have proved to be industries with a high labour

use and with a comparatively low transport cost ingredient. These are ceramics, certain wood products, glassware, silverware and certain high quality clothing. In addition, Switzerland goes in for machinery of various classes which can also have the advantages I have mentioned. We have obtained much information from Scandinavian countries, in relation both to the economics of such industries and to the raw materials required for them, as well as the most economic form of size of factory and industrial organization concerned. Certain approaches have been made to the Government about the State's providing information on the availability of raw materials for craft industries of this kind, but it would be improper for me to say more to the honourable member than that until negotiations have proceeded further.

Mr. Millhouse: I suppose we'll hear something soon!

Mr. Curren: You wouldn't want to hear it!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have continually heard all sorts of sarcastic comment from members opposite (including the member for Gumeracha) who wish to denigrate this State, about how soon they would hear about the conclusion of a natural gas price for the Electricity Trust. Well, they have heard it today, and I can observe their disappointment. As the purveyors of doom, despair and disaster, members opposite have these amongst their own camp as a result of the achievements of this Government. The Industrial Development Department intends to obtain a number of feasibility studies on craft industries in some rural areas of South Australia, particularly in relation to wood products, including pine products, about which I have already had approaches from people in the South-East. It is also intended actively to promote, if necessary by submissions to the Industrial Development Committee and by offering Treasurer's guarantees on the basis of these feasibility studies, such craft industries in country areas.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope this question will not bring forth the explosion my last question did.

Mr. Hudson: You wouldn't get an explosion if you were not so questionable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier has invited me to ask this question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, Sir, if I was tempted to go off the path. Can the Premier give me information on the matter I raised during the Loan Estimates debate concerning drainage in the Garden Suburb?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report seems to have been taken out of my bag. However, if the honourable member will ask me again on Tuesday, I will see that it is back in the bag by then.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns the saline water which is at present coming down the Murray River and which, according to the press, the appropriate Minister in Victoria has now admitted was carelessly released in that State. Can the Minister of Works say whether this water is expected to cause serious delay in the pumping programme on the Mannum-Adelaide and the Mannum-Whyalla mains?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No. It is expected that, under an agreement with Victoria, we shall be able to dissipate the salt water before it gets much farther down the river.

INSURANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times in the last few weeks I have asked about the arrangements being made for deducting insurance premium payments from the salaries of teachers. I understand that the Minister of Education now has been kind enough to get me a further answer to this question, and I now ask him to give it to the House.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member has asked the question twice, not several times as he suggested. However, I have become accustomed to that sort of thing now. The honourable member is wrong in drawing the conclusion, from the letter written to the insurance company by the Assistant Under Secretary, that there is no room on the computer for additional deductions. The Chief Secretary states:

It has been the policy for many years not to extend the list of assurance companies authorized to conduct group assurance in the various Government departments. To depart from this policy would be quite unfair to numerous companies whose applications have been refused in the past and who are newcomers to the life assurance field in South Australia. The latter would undoubtedly press for reconsideration for comparable privileges.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have asked the Minister of Agriculture once, I think, a question regarding a memorandum circulated to officers in his department concerning the mileage paid for the use of their private motor cars and the franchise on insurance that must be borne if a vehicle is involved in an accident. Will the Minister be kind enough to give me a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, the honourable member asked me a question about motor vehicle insurance and, at the time, he said he had been handed a memorandum that he understood had been distributed to officers of the Agriculture Department, regarding a C.S.O. circular. He asked me whether I would reconsider the request made in the memorandum with a view to withdrawing the circular. I have received the following report:

The memorandum under review was issued following a request by the auditors to again draw the attention of officers to the requirements of C.S.O. circular No. 939 regarding insurance of privately-owned vehicles used for official purposes. The purpose of the memorandum is to fully implement the provisions of this circular, which is applicable to all Government employees who have approval to use their private motor vehicle on official duties. The form attached to the memorandum is a copy of the one received with C.S.O. circular 939.

I point out that a form was enclosed with this report. According to the report, the circular in question was issued on March 13, 1962, and that was long before I had anything to do with the matter. The report states that at no time has any officer of the department expressed concern about the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: One has expressed concern to me.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: He has apparently expressed concern to the wrong person. Officers of the department have a perfect right to approach the Director and me. The person who issued the circular at the request of the auditors was the Secretary of the department, and surely any complaint should have been made to him. As I said previously, this situation is similar to one that exists in respect of Commonwealth public servants, and I am not surprised that the instruction has operated for some time.

X-RAY FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About 10 days ago I asked the Premier a question about the imposition for the first time of charges on public

patients at Government hospitals for X-rays, and I asked whether he would obtain a report on the extra revenue that would accrue to the Government as a result of that imposition. As it is now 10 days since I asked that question, will the Premier give me a report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The request made to me by the honourable member on August 8 last was referred to the Under Secretary for a report, but it is not yet to hand.

LICENSING BILL.

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

That Standing Order No. 329 be suspended.

This motion arises as a result of certain difficulties experienced by the Government Printer. For the information of members, I point out that Standing Order No. 329 provides:

Before any Bill shall be read a third time, the Chairman of Committees shall certify in writing that the fair print is in accordance with the Bill as agreed to in Committee and reported; and the Speaker shall announce that the Chairman has so certified.

It has not been possible since 1.6 a.m. today (when the House rose) to obtain a fair print of the Bill. However, it will be possible to obtain a complete reprint with amendments in time for the Bill's presentation in another place. Having debated this Bill at considerable length, members will know the contents of the measure.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo): I have been patient in this Chamber throughout the days, nights and the early hours of the morning when this measure has been debated. While appreciating some of the points that have been made in Committee, I wish now to refer to two particular aspects that have become evident to me since the early stages of the debate. First, I believe that the debate on the Bill has developed into nothing but a legal battle, particularly concerning one member.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not be in order in referring to the debate that took place in Committee. He must relate his remarks to the Bill as it emerged from the Committee stage.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has prevented my saying one or two things which I believe should be said and with which

the people of South Australia should be familiar. However, I appreciate your ruling.

Mr. QUIRKE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is there anything to prevent the honourable member from saying what he wants to say to the people of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: My ruling was that honourable members could not go over again the debate that took place in Committee. The honourable member is at perfect liberty to refer to the whole of the Bill or to any part of the Bill as it has emerged from Committee.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the help the member for Burra has given me; he wants to assist me to say the things I want to say. The member for Mitcham has treated this Bill as a legal battle. The only thing he did was to endeavour to score off the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now referring to the debate that took place in Committee; that is not permissible. He is at perfect liberty to refer to the Bill or to any part of it.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It looks as though I will have to endeavour to find some other way of saying the things I want to say. However, I appreciate the endeavours of the member for Burra to assist me to say some of these things.

Mr. Quirke: You are not questioning my motive?

Mr. HUGHES: No. One thing I should say about the Bill, as it has emerged from Committee, is that it has become obvious that certain people stand to gain from the provisions of the Bill and, because of this, they have pressurized members in an endeavour to advance their own interests. Nobody can deny that.

Mr. McAnaney: What pressure?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not going to listen to interjections. I made few interjections during the debate in Committee because I wanted to listen to both sides of the question. I sincerely hope that this afternoon members opposite will have the decency, for a change, to listen to me. During the debate on this Bill, the general public of South Australia has been overlooked.

Mr. Heaslip: Who brought in the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: That does not matter. A large percentage of the people in South Australia has been overlooked so that the interests of those who have pressurized various members can be served. Earlier, I said that I

should vote for the second reading of the Bill to enable it to go into Committee but that, if the Bill was not amended in two important respects, I should vote against it on the third reading, and that I should call for a division. That is exactly what I intend to do. The Bill has emerged from Committee including the two clauses to which I strongly object, as the effort of the Minister of Agriculture to amend the clauses failed. I strongly object to clause 19, which provides for 10 p.m. closing. As the clause is in the Bill as it now stands, I think I should be entitled to speak about its provisions now. However, as I spoke at great length in Committee, I do not wish to repeat anything now. I strongly object also to the clause that provides for the supply of liquor at theatres. Recently the following statement was made in this Chamber:

When 10 p.m. closing was first suggested, it was said that there would be much opposition to it by the churches. However, that opposition has not eventuated, probably because, when a percentage of the people constituting a particular church acknowledges that it is in order to consume alcohol, that percentage decides the attitude to be adopted.

I am proud to be a member of the Methodist Church, of which I have been a lay preacher for 38 years, and about which I know something. This particular Church was singled out.

Mr. Hall: By whom?

Mr. HUGHES: Although I did not want to say who singled out this Church because I did not think I would have the permission of the Chair to do so, if the Leader wants this in *Hansard* then I will accommodate him. It was the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) who singled out the Methodist Church.

Mr. Ferguson: Will you say what the General Secretary said?

Mr. HUGHES: I am concerned with what the honourable member said. I know what most Methodists in South Australia think.

Mr. Ferguson: You are not in touch with them.

Mr. HUGHES: I am: it is the member for Yorke Peninsula who is out of touch.

Mr. Coumbe: Everyone except you is wrong.

Mr. HUGHES: No. I have listened intently to both sides of this argument, because the interests of all the people ought to be preserved. This is what the honourable member said:

I said previously that the churches, the Methodist Church in particular, were not opposed to the extension of trading hours.

I assure the House that many Methodists in South Australia are concerned about the stage that this Bill has reached in connection with 10 p.m. closing.

Mr. Rodda: How many Methodists are there in South Australia?

Mr. HUGHES: That is not an argument. The honourable member would know that there are many thousands. However, I do not intend to discuss church statistics this afternoon, because I do not think they are relevant. I deny the statement about the churches, the Methodist Church in particular, being neutral. If the statement was made by the General Secretary, he was not speaking for all the Methodists of South Australia. He was not speaking for me or for many other people. The letters that I have in my hand are only a few of the very many that have been written to me, and goodness knows how many have been written to the Minister of Agriculture since he moved his amendment. However, I have not received one letter stating that the writer was pleased about 10 p.m. closing being introduced. I wonder how many members could say that they have received such letters.

Mr. Quirke: I didn't get any.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Burra is honest. I say that few members have received letters of commendation about the extension of trading hours until 10 p.m.

Mr. Freebairn: What about the barley-growers?

Mr. HUGHES: The less the honourable member says about barleygrowers the better we shall get on, because I shall have something to say next Wednesday and the honourable member will wish he were not in the House. If I had been here yesterday the honourable member would have been sitting silently in his seat today. Another member is in the same category, but this Bill does not allow me to tell the House what I shall say next week about something which happened yesterday and about which every member ought to have been disgusted. If I were the Leader, I should be very quiet on this issue. I go so far as to say that the matter deals with pairs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will speak to the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: Mr. Speaker, is it right that the honourable member should keep this honourable House in suspense for a week?

Mr. HUGHES: At least I shall make an endeavour to deal with the matter but if you stop me, Mr. Speaker, you will have to blame the member for Burra for bringing the matter out into the open.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to have serious regard to the Standing Orders that they have asked me to administer. While those Standing Orders are there, it is my duty to administer them fairly and in the interests of all members. The honourable member is perfectly in order in speaking to any part of the Bill as it came from Committee. I ask him in this, the third reading stage, to confine his remarks to the Bill. What happened last week in debate on another subject had nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I ask you to allow me to say that this happened not in debate but because of an interjection that had been made by the Leader. Apparently, he directed his Whip to carry that out. I was very hurt about it yesterday.

Mr. Quirke: If you have something to say, say it, for heaven's sake.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not like to transgress the Speaker's ruling. I do not like bringing up this matter, because it was a disgusting thing. We were always under the impression that, when there was a death in a member's family, a pair would be granted. However, that was not so yesterday.

Mr. Hall: No request was made to me.

Mr. HUGHES: There was a request. I challenge the Leader to prove otherwise. It might not have been made to him.

Mr. Hall: What have you been looking at me for then?

Mr. HUGHES: The Opposition Whip is the one with whom we deal, in the same way as the Government Whip handles such matters on this side.

Mr. Lawn: The Leader knows that.

Mr. HUGHES: He knows it only too well.

Mr. Hall: Deal with facts if you want something considered seriously.

Mr. HUGHES: A pair was refused yesterday.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow a debate on that matter in the third reading stage of this Bill. I must ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill before the House.

Mr. HUGHES: I shall have opportunity to deal with the other matter later. In connection with how a certain church has been singled out on this subject, this statement was made by a certain member:

I previously said that the churches, the Methodist Church in particular, were not opposed to the extension of trading hours. That statement was confirmed by what the General Secretary of the Methodist Conference later told me. In fact, he said that the church had decided to take a neutral stand on the matter.

It seems to me that a member of this House was deputed by the General Secretary of the Methodist Church to be the church's spokesman on this matter in the House. If that is so, I am sorry to think it.

Mr. Quirke: Are you believing that the General Secretary said that to him?

Mr. HUGHES: I am quoting what was said.

Mr. Quirke: You are not accusing him?

Mr. HUGHES: No, if he said it I do not deny that the General Secretary said this to the member for Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. Quirke: The honourable member is justified in quoting it.

Mr. HUGHES: Why single out the Methodist Church?

Mr. Ferguson: I quoted the Congregational Church.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, but you singled out the Methodist Church.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't be so vindictive.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not being vindictive. Perhaps the honourable member was speaking for the General Secretary but he was not speaking on behalf of all the Methodists in South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: Hear, hear!

Mr. HUGHES: Thousands of Methodists in this State oppose 10 p.m. closing. If the honourable member was speaking for the General Secretary and acting as mouthpiece for the Methodist Church, it seems strange that I have received many telegrams and letters from Ministers and circuit stewards commending my action in this matter.

Mr. Freebairn: What has this to do with the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: It is dealing with 10 p.m. closing. Not only did I receive communications from Methodist Ministers but I also received letters from the League of Women Voters of South Australia. Members opposite should not ignore that league; they will rue the day if they ignore the women of this State.

Mr. Heaslip: We can look after ourselves.

Mr. HUGHES: I know the honourable member can. I sat in this House hour after hour, day after day, and night after night

until the early hours, and now when I want to say something against this measure I am subjected to interjections from everyone, informing me that they want to go home or go somewhere else.

Mr. Bockelberg: They have the seven-year itch.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not have it, but it is good to know that Opposition members have it. Honourable members will accept my word that I have received voluminous correspondence about this matter. As a Methodist I object when the Methodist Church is singled out for its attitude to 10 p.m. closing. The member for Yorke Peninsula has said (and again by interjection today) what took place with the Congregational Union. I do not approve of some of his statements about that union.

Mr. Freebairn: You mean you don't approve or you don't agree?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not agree: it does not make any difference whether I approve or not. The document that was supposed to have been sent to all Ministers and church secretaries states:

Concerning the two points most frequently raised in relation to the proposed legislation, namely, the consumption of alcohol and road accidents, it seems from experience in other States that (a) the total consumption of alcoholic beverages has not noticeably increased with lengthened hours . . .

That statement is contrary to what has been said in this House not only by me but by the member for Gumeracha. I quoted a statement of the Chairman of Carlton Brewery in which he said that since 10 p.m. closing there had been an increase in sales of intoxicating liquor. The member for Gumeracha and the Minister of Agriculture also gave facts different from this statement. The document continues:

and (b) road accidents attributable to alcohol tend now to occur mainly between 10 p.m. and midnight rather than between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. as formerly.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to know what road accidents have to do with the third reading of this Bill. Nothing in the Bill refers to road accidents; nothing in it refers to the Carlton Brewery. As I understand Standing Orders the debate should be confined to the Bill and not be allowed on other matters.

The SPEAKER: I hold that the debate should take place on the Bill and I hold that the honourable member is in order if he links his remarks about the consumption of

alcohol with a Bill that sets out to control the consumption of alcohol, but he must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was doing that, and I was sure I would have your protection in that matter. I am dealing with a clause which emerged from Committee and which is now included in the Bill, the third reading of which has been moved by the Premier. It seems that I shall have to start again. Certain people are wasting the time of the House on points of order because of what I am saying, and I shall repeat what was contained in the document:

. . . and (b) road accidents attributable to alcohol tend now to occur mainly between 10 p.m. and midnight rather than between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. as formerly.

This document, which was brought before the House recently, frankly admits that, because of the consumption of alcohol, accidents occur between 10 p.m. and midnight. Isn't that an admission that these accidents will continue to occur if drinking hours are extended? If that document showed that fewer accidents would occur during that time, perhaps I would not be speaking this afternoon. I have considerable concern for women and children, and if my objection is the means of saving the life of one little child or preventing only one accident, I will continue to oppose the Bill. I treasure every life on this earth, and I think I am entitled to object, having listened for hours not to good arguments but to a more or less legal battle between two men, one of them trying to score off the Premier.

I could go on, sticking to the third reading, and keep the House here until midnight if I desired, but I do not want to. I lodged my objections in both the second reading and Committee stages. Because the House did not see fit to uphold my objections on behalf not only of the people of my district but of the people of the State, at the appropriate time, if the third reading is declared carried on the voices, I intend to call for a division.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I, too, oppose the measure at this stage. I regret that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat commenced his speech in the way he did, although I have much respect for his sincerity and integrity in these matters. True, members of this House are the servants of the people who elect them, and it is the inherent right of every section of the community to make representations to this House either by

letter or by personal interview. Indeed, Parliament exists for the purpose of listening to those representations.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And the Premier welcomes them as much as anyone else.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, but I think the member for Wallaroo, perhaps in his enthusiasm for his point of view, overlooked the point that we are here to meet the public and hear representations from them. However, I admire his persistence. Although I agree that an enormous amount of correspondence was forwarded to every member on this occasion in connection with the Bill, every section of the public has a perfect right to take such an interest, and I should be pleased if the public took as much interest in the ordinary legislation of this Parliament as it has taken in this Bill. Such an interest would be a great help to this institution and would materially assist in not only maintaining but developing the lines of communication between Parliament and the people who are, I am afraid, somewhat interrupted today by the flow of other more exciting and sensational news.

I regret that the member for Wallaroo felt obliged to discuss the alleged attitude of certain churches to this legislation. I remind him that there are other people of the same religious denomination as he who have enjoyed probably as long, even a longer, association with the church of which he is a member, but I do not want to canvass that point. There is vast variation in public opinion on this matter; every person is entitled to his opinion, and I respect the opinions of persons both inside and outside this House.

I have formed my own judgment in this matter as the Bill has progressed and have come to conclusions about the Bill as it has been amended and as it now stands. I consider that it is not in the interests of the people of this State as a whole, although I accept the fact that they would not agree with me on that point. Nevertheless, since I entered Parliament I have continually expressed the view, both in this House and in my district, that I do not favour legislation that provides additional opportunities for people to indulge their weaknesses. Alcohol is not a weakness of every person, but it is a weakness of numbers of people, and on that basis I cannot support the legislation. During the passage of the Bill, both in the House and in Committee I have exercised my judgment on the various clauses, recognizing that the Bill would inevitably be

passed. I tried to maintain, as far as I could, a degree of equity between all those people interested in the trade as a whole, and that was why I voted on one or two clauses as I did.

I stated clearly on the principal clause dealing with the extension of hours that, if this matter had been introduced in isolation, I would have opposed it. However, I supported it at that time because I considered it was unrealistic to close hotels at 6 p.m. when every club, restaurant, and live theatre would be allowed to remain open until 10 p.m., midnight, or even 2 a.m. Therefore, I exercised my vote on that matter.

I intend to vote against the third reading because the Bill extends the facility for the supply and consumption of liquor to a degree that I believe we shall live to regret. I only hope that my fears in this matter will prove groundless. However, living as long as I have lived, and having studied human nature in the way that I have tried to study it, I believe that if we make something freely available to people, whether it be good or not so good, they will undoubtedly take advantage of it. Unfortunately, I think that my fears will prove to be justified and, in these circumstances, I cannot support a measure that I honestly believe is contrary to the best interests of the community of this State.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I oppose the third reading, although I originally intended to support it. I realize that, when I moved in Committee to delete "ten" and substitute "six", it would have maintained the *status quo*, but the umpire's decision had really been given, and the vote taken was overwhelmingly against me, as the voting was 33 to 3. I considered that there was no sense in my continuing to oppose the provision, having expressed my views on it. However, since then we have seen a few changes made to the Bill. In fact, about 130 amendments were moved in Committee and they have changed the whole complexion of the Bill. Originally, I believed that the Bill was to be drafted closely along the lines of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner. The Commissioner was given full powers to investigate every aspect of the licensing system in this State and the relevant legislation.

We have seen a glaring example during the debate on this measure of people speaking for vested interests. Many approaches have been made to the Premier, the member for Mitcham and other members concerning this measure,

and I have no objection to that: people have a perfect right to make representations on the matter. However, I thought the Committee bent over backwards to support the contentions of vested interests. Unfortunately, other vested interests were not considered. They were the vested interests of people who considered that this Bill was a retrograde step, and those people had just as much right as the others to have their claims heard in this place. Unfortunately, that was not the case. When an effort was made on behalf of these people to advance their interests, the Chamber was not so interested in listening to their claims.

Like the member for Wallaroo, I have been overwhelmed by the number of letters, telegrams and telephone calls I have received and comments made to me concerning the Bill. As a result of those representations, I believe some people in South Australia are certainly not in complete agreement with the Bill. We know that amendments were made to the Bill in order to help people who held a particular licence and who, unless the amendments were inserted in the Bill, would be breaking the law in some respect. Similar treatment was also given to other individuals. I believe that that is going beyond the limits of providing co-operative legislation. I think that we should have adhered more closely to the Commissioner's report.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I cannot understand why the member for Wallaroo became so excited this afternoon about something I had to say concerning the Methodist Church. At no time have I claimed that I am a spokesman for that church. However, after having made a certain statement, and after having been challenged on it, I approached someone in authority to ascertain the true position. Prior to moving the third reading, the Premier said that everyone knew the contents of the Bill, but I am sure that no member can understand every provision in this measure. Indeed, members have told me that they cannot understand many clauses in the Bill. When an alteration to the present Licensing Act was first mooted it was suggested that Sunday trading might be allowed. Although Sunday trading has not been directly provided for in the Bill—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There is a direct clause.

Mr. FERGUSON:—it has become an established principle in this legislation.

Mr. Casey: It has been going on for years illegally.

Mr. FERGUSON: As I am opposed to Sunday trading, I will vote against the third reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): This is the first time that we have had an opportunity to debate the Bill in the form in which the Government really intended. The first print of the Bill was immediately subjected to many amendments moved by the Premier. In its amended form, the Bill was again the subject of many other amendments, and only now has the Bill really come before us in the form intended by the Government. After all, this is a Government Bill which was introduced by the Government and carried by Government members. Except for the time when two Government members voted against 10 p.m. closing, I cannot recall another occasion when Government members voted against a provision of the Bill.

Also, no honourable member knows what is in the Bill. This is the first time we have had to discuss a Bill which the Chairman of Committees has not been able to bring up to date before the third reading has been moved. If the Chairman of Committees fully understands all the amendments moved, then he is due for promotion. This is the worst prepared Bill that this House has had before it during the whole period in which I have been a member. Never have I seen a Bill subjected to so many Government amendments. The Bill will have to be drastically altered before its provisions can operate; it was so hurriedly thrown together that it will be difficult for it to work. A short time ago the Minister of Agriculture said something with which I entirely agree: whatever were the principles enunciated by the Royal Commissioner, as soon as the Bill came into this House those principles were completely dropped to serve the interests of one section of the community.

Although the Bill is complicated (and I am certain that when it comes back from another place—it it comes back—hundreds more amendments will have been made to it), a few things are clearly established, each of which is sufficient to make me vote against the third reading. The Bill alters the closing time of hotels from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. As 6 p.m. closing was established as a result of a direct vote of the people who had experienced 11 p.m. closing for many years, we have no right to alter the closing time from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. The Government had no mandate to do this because the matter was not canvassed prior to the last election. Although

I do not know what would be the result of a referendum on the matter, there was certainly no public outcry for this extension of time. The main argument in favour of the extension was that the other States had it; we were told that we should provide civilized drinking facilities, but that is a broad statement.

What will be the effect of this legislation on the social life of the community over a period of years? I suppose I am square, but I still believe that many merits are associated with temperance, and that advantages can be achieved from building up the home life of the community. Money spent on the education of children is of much more benefit to the community than money spent in a hotel or club. Therefore, I see no grounds at all for extending the closing time of hotels to 10 p.m. The people who will be at an advantage as a result of this provision will be those interested in the sale of liquor; the people who will be at a disadvantage will be the wives and children of those who will have less money because of it. Nobody will deny that the Bill will lead to an enormous number of licensed outlets being available for the sale and consumption of liquor. This was foreshadowed when members opposite decided to delay the operation of one part of the Bill for three years so that one type of outlet would not crowd out another type.

Further, the Bill abolishes local option polls. I thought that the Government approved of getting the opinion of the people. Not long ago it acted in accordance with the decision of the people on another social issue. Although some difficulties were associated with local option polls, the polls enabled the community to express an opinion. However, the whole responsibility will now be in the hands of the Licensing Court. Although I do not criticize the court, I point out that the Bill will impose an impossible task on it: even a staff of 20 could not carry out the work that will result from the provisions of the Bill. The court will not be consistent in its judgments and will not be able to fulfil its functions. In the past the court has had difficulty in dealing with the amount of work before it.

This Bill legalizes additional Sunday trading. Can any member deny that, when the Royal Commissioner's report was issued, there was an outcry against Sunday trading? At that time the Premier said that that was one thing to which effect would not be given. However, this Bill gives effect to Sunday trading,

probably to a greater extent than the Commissioner recommended. Another aspect is that the Bill fixes minimum prices at which liquor may be sold. I do not know what public interest is involved in that.

Again, it provides for many outlets for the sale and consumption of liquor and includes all sorts of trading restriction in favour of one vested interest against another. Although we applaud Commonwealth legislation to control restrictive trade practices, we say in this Bill that a person shall not have a licence unless he deals with another specified person. Parliament has no right to include in this Bill a form of restrictive trade practice that would not be tolerated in any other legislation. The Bill has been badly designed and will lead to hopeless confusion. In those circumstances, I join with other honourable members in opposing the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (31)—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Nankivell, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, Teusner, and Walsh.

Noes (5)—Messrs. Bywaters, Ferguson, Hughes (teller), and Pearson, and Sir Thomas Playford.

Majority of 26 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes five unconnected amendments of substance to the principal Act. The first amendment is made by clause 3, which will enable any proclaimed district council to apply for city status. The immediate occasion for the amendment concerns the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, which at present meets population requirements for a change of status to that of city but because of extensive broad- acres does not meet the requirements of being occupied mainly for residential and business, etc., purposes. Its area is, however, increasingly assuming the nature of an urban area and its rate revenue is increasing. The area bears a close similarity to that of the former

District Council of Salisbury, for which special provision was inserted in the principal Act in 1961 by the inclusion of section 9a. There appears to be every justification for the status of the Tea Tree Gully area to be capable of being raised in view of its rapid development. Other near metropolitan districts are fast assuming an urban nature and to avoid a specific amendment in each case the amendment has been drafted so that the provisions of section 9a can be applied to any proclaimed area.

The next amendment is made by clause 5. Section 228 of the principal Act empowers the fixation of minimum rates. There are cases where a property owned by one person is situated in two adjoining areas, and only a small portion of the property is situated in one of them. Minimum rating means that the smaller portion must bear a minimum rate, which in many cases is larger than its actual value, while the ratepayer is paying rates for the portion in the other council area. In some instances the matter can be resolved by a minor boundary adjustment but, in some cases, boundaries cannot be changed. The amendment will add a new subsection to section 228 and will permit one of the councils to exempt a property from the whole or part of the minimum rate. Clause 6 makes a similar amendment in relation to district councils.

The next amendment is made by clause 7. Section 287 (1) (k1) authorizes payments approved by a council other than for a purpose specifically provided for by the Local Government Act. Such payments are limited to \$400 or 1 per cent of the previous year's rate revenue whichever is the lesser. With the exception of about seven low-revenue areas \$400 is less than the stated percentage of rate revenue. The amount has been unchanged for 10 years and is clearly insufficient for

many councils to cover expenditure for such purposes as naturalization ceremonies, public relations material, and the like. The amendment will empower the expenditure of the greater of \$400 or 1 per cent of rate revenue instead of the lower amount, and appears to be reasonable.

Clauses 4 and 8 make two substantive amendments. In 1966 the principal Act was amended by providing that a municipal council could spend revenue in insuring council members against personal injury. On many occasions mayoresses are required to attend council functions and it is considered that the council should have power to spend its revenue in insuring them in a similar manner. Accordingly, clause 8 (a) makes the necessary provision. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment providing that a person shall not be disqualified from office by reason of his wife's being insured under this provision.

Paragraphs (b) and (c) of clause 8 increase sums that may be spent by the city of Adelaide and other municipal councils for special public functions or public entertainment. The figures in section 288, which is amended, have been unchanged for over 30 years and are clearly out of date. The stipulated sums have been doubled. Clause 9 makes similar amendments to those made by clause 8 in relation to district councils, the provision for insurance relating, of course, to the wives of chairmen of such councils. Clause 4 makes the necessary consequential amendment relating to disqualification.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.40 p.m. the House adjourned on Tuesday, August 22, at 2 p.m.