

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 21, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Works give the House some details of the Government's plans regarding its campaign for successful voluntary restrictions on the use of water in South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I can add little to what I said about the matter yesterday. The voluntary campaign will commence this evening. The press, radio and television will be used to appeal to people to use what water they need, but not to waste it. Following that, it is hoped that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will appear on a radio programme so that he may answer questions raised by members of the public about the water supply. We believe that, if the normal use of water can be reduced by 8 per cent, we will be able to manage during the coming season. From memory, I believe the present storage of water is about 14,000,000,000 gallons and, with the water that will be pumped, the total water available will be about 43,000,000,000 gallons. The requirements of the State are about 41,000,000,000 gallons.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the Minister of Works of the reply he gave to the member for Gumeracha yesterday concerning the quantity of water that will be available in this State. Adding the quantities that he said would be available from the metropolitan reservoirs, the country reservoirs, the quantity to be pumped from the Mannum-Adelaide main, and the Morgan-Whyalla main, I obtained a total of under 38,000,000,000 gallons. As the Minister said that the overall requirement of the State was 41,000,000,000 gallons, this would leave a gap of 3,000,000,000 gallons, even if the reservoirs were pumped dry and that, I understand, is technically impossible. Therefore, the gap is obviously substantially higher than the 3,000,000,000 gallons. I understand also that the Minister (or the Premier on his behalf) has announced that we have to cut down by 8 per cent on the water that we normally use, or would normally be expected to use. On these figures, I wonder whether that is a sufficient margin for safety.

I therefore ask the Minister whether he has considered the calculations that I have made, and whether he is satisfied that the plans that have been announced for the contraction in the use of water will, in fact, be sufficient to get us through the coming summer.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Government are not quite as pessimistic as the honourable member. I should not care to show the honourable member's figure to anyone. It would be most unusual (in fact, almost impossible) if we did not receive some water from the catchment areas during the season and, accordingly, we are confident that with an 8 per cent reduction we shall be able to maintain supplies this year.

Mr. QUIRKE: Water is of paramount importance to this State, and we have many schemes involving pipelines running over the hills and plans to raise the walls of reservoirs. It has occurred to me (indeed, I have given this matter considerable thought recently) that it might not be such a foolish idea, as it was once considered to be, if we were to construct a tunnel through the Mount Lofty Ranges. The Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority has undertaken this sort of work through granitic formations that do not exist in the Adelaide Hills. I am wondering whether it is possible by this means to provide an assured water supply that could not be interrupted in any way (by aerial bombardment, for example, if we were ever in that unfortunate position). I wonder what such a scheme would cost.

Mr. Jennings: \$2,000,000 a mile!

Mr. QUIRKE: It could be done quite easily with big pipelines. I think such a scheme would be advantageous to the city of Adelaide and its environs, bringing an assured supply of water from the Murray River to Adelaide. I understand that the fall of a tunnel constructed in such a scheme does not present any great difficulties. Although this suggestion may seem far-seeing, will the Minister obtain a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This suggestion was considered many years ago and has often been discussed subsequently. Not knowing the figures that the department may have concerning this matter, I will ask for the details in order that we may have some idea of the cost and practicability of such a scheme.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say to what extent, if at all, water from the Torrens Lake is used for the purpose of watering gardens and lawns propinquitous thereto?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot indicate the precise extent, but I know that the Adelaide City Council pumps the water to most of its parks and gardens.

POLICE LECTURES

Mr. HUDSON: Before asking the Premier a question, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on his birthday.

When apprehended for traffic offences, some people are given a lecture at police headquarters in Angas Street rather than taken before the court. I understand that these lectures, which are arranged by the Police Force, are held regularly. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to provide information about the frequency of the lectures and about the number of people who have been requested by the police to attend a lecture rather than having to go before a court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A fairly high proportion of people is given these warnings. However, I will obtain from my colleague details for the honourable member.

WILLUNGA HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I asked the Minister of Education privately a question about the fire hydrants at the Willunga High School. These hydrants are in position and, although the fire hoses are on the premises, they cannot be placed in position without weatherproof covers. As the hoses are at present kept in a shed, they are not sufficiently accessible. Can the Minister say whether this matter will be attended to?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have a verbal report from the Public Buildings Department that the covers were removed from the boxes for painting. This work is in hand and the covers are expected to be re-installed within the next week.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently I took up privately with the Minister of Education and his office the need for attention to be given to the oval at the Northfield Primary School. Has the Minister a reply on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Buildings Department states that it is currently programmed to schedule the Northfield project in October for the allocation of funds. Subject to the allocation and approval of funds, detailed planning will proceed, with a view to the calling of tenders for the work at the earliest possible date.

ELECTRICITY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a number of occasions in the last few weeks members have asked the Minister of Works for a report about the unfortunate occurrence at the Torrens Island power station, and on each occasion the Minister has said (although he has undertaken to get a report) that the report is not yet to hand. Last Tuesday I asked him whether he had a report, because I had been told late last week that it had been prepared by the Electricity Trust. In view of the great importance of this matter and the interest generally throughout the community in what went wrong, I ask the Minister whether he has the report. If he has not yet received it after this lengthy time, will he take definite action to request it and make sure that it is available early next week?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I know of no report being available, and the honourable member knows the position: all I can do is make a request, and I shall request a report. I cannot demand one.

PORT ADELAIDE TECHNICAL SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about a fifth-year non-matriculation course at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A carefully conducted inquiry is being made by officers of the Education Department covering all the issues involved in setting up a course for fifth-year non-matriculation students at Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School in 1968. When the results of the investigation have been received a decision will be made concerning the introduction of a course.

POONINDIE ROAD

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have asked questions about the road from Poonindie to White Flat because, for a long time, strong representations have been made to me about it (and I have made representations to the Minister), but for about the last four years no further progress has been made. Yesterday, I spoke to the Chairman of the District Council of Lincoln, in whose district this road is situated, and he informed me that, in spite of inquiries by him and representations by the council to the department, no definite undertaking or promise of funds for this year's expenditure had been received. I emphasize that this is a winding, hilly, narrow and dangerous road: a school bus travels on it,

and the water tables are eroded to a dangerous extent around some of the sharpest curves. The Chairman of the council asked me to make the strongest representations about this matter, because no allocation appears on this year's programme, although it has been suggested that the work may be done by a debit order. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether funds from some source can be made available this year to commence the work? Surveys have been made and, I understand, land acquisitions have been completed, and all that is required is the money to enable the work to proceed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report as soon as possible.

ZEBRA CROSSINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, several zebra crossings were installed in suburbs in the metropolitan area, and it has been suggested that more are to be installed, as they will be of great help to pedestrians. As it has been mooted that one is to be installed on Unley Road (and this will be a great help to elderly citizens and pedestrians generally on this busy road), will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads when this zebra crossing will be installed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for this information.

CLOUD SEEDING

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Recently, the Minister of Agriculture said that cloud seeding for precipitation might be carried out in South Australia, probably in April next year. Will areas of the Murray Mallee which are desperately short of rain be included in the programme? Can the Minister say whether this operation will be conducted from the Wanbi Experimental Farm of the Agriculture Department and what plans are envisaged for contact between the pilot of the aeroplane and those at the base from which the plane will operate, if it is conducted in this locality?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No location for the operations of this plane has yet been determined. However, the honourable member may rest assured that operations will proceed in the area to which he has referred and also probably in the South-East. Much will depend, of course, on the type of cloud available for this project and on the observations of experienced officers. The honourable member may have noted that two of our officers are

undergoing special training at a school in New South Wales, and I have seen the minutes of meetings that have taken place at that school. Sir Henry Bolte has also referred to this matter and is, I understand, negotiating for a plane from New South Wales.

The honourable member will recall that he referred me to Mr. Prowse who, with Mr. Stillwell, came to see me, pointing out the special type of plane required for this purpose (a Beechcraft) and indicating that, as there were not sufficient planes in Australia to carry out this specialized work of cloud seeding, an additional plane would probably have to be purchased. Correspondence from those gentlemen indicates that a plane may now be available as from January next year and that four months' notice will be required in order to commence operations. In addition, it would be necessary to ensure that the work would continue for at least three years, in order to amortize the cost of the plane and the expense involved in plumbing work, etc., and in providing costly equipment. In order that the job is carried out properly, considerable technical work must be undertaken. One cannot simply purchase any sort of plane, as has been suggested in correspondence.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Do these types of plane need a special landing strip?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No; they can land under practically any conditions and it has been stated that all that is required is a shed (somewhere to keep the fuel) and a suitable block of land. Specially trained pilots would be required, as well as a specially trained observer, who would be one of the officers attending the school to which I have referred. If we are to engage in this work at all, it is necessary that we do so properly, and it would not be possible to commence before next April at the earliest.

NEWTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 13 about the development of the oval at the Newton Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is assumed that the "initial grant" referred to by the honourable member is the special advance of \$1,000, which may be made to schools experiencing difficulty in meeting their share of expenses for the development of ovals. The general policy concerning school ovals provides for the necessary ground formation and grading to be carried out at Government expense, and

for the grassing and reticulation of the area to be subsidized on a \$1 for \$1 basis. In September, 1965, I approved a variation to this policy, whereby I may, in special circumstances, authorize the payment of \$1,000 towards the project as an ordinary departmental provision and at the same time make an arrangement with the school committee that it repay half the cost, \$500, by contributions spread over five years at an interest rate fixed by the Treasury. This arrangement followed the granting of a loan of this nature to a new school in September, 1964. Since the variation was adopted, only two applications for this special grant have been received; one was approved and one refused.

As was the case in 1964, the recent approval was given, as the circumstances were exceptional and it was considered that immediate action was necessary to alleviate a serious dust problem. The application that was refused was rejected, because the need was not urgent. However, an additional subsidy of \$500 was provided for reticulation and grassing in the school's allocation for 1966-67. The Government has now introduced a scheme whereby the grassing and installation of reticulation systems will be provided in all new schools opened after February, 1967. All costs will be borne by the Government as a charge against Loan funds.

Mrs. STEELE: I thank the Minister for the answer that he has kindly given. The answer was in fairly general terms, as the Minister would realize, and my interest has been in the Newton Primary School, the committee of which had applied for assistance for the development and reticulation of the school oval before this recent decision by the department came into effect. I wrote in August last year asking for assistance in this regard. Will the Minister consider this matter as it particularly concerns the Newton Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that, but I understand that in my reply the reference to the school in respect of which application was refused did apply to the Newton school for the reason that I gave, namely, that it was not considered as urgent as the other applications received. However, I shall check that.

DANGEROUS DRUG

Mr. HEASLIP: On August 30 I asked the Premier whether he would introduce legislation similar to that introduced in New South

Wales to control the trade of the drug lysergic acid diethylamide (L.S.D.), to which the Premier replied:

No complaints that seriously habit-forming drugs are freely available in South Australia have come to my attention, nor to my knowledge has anything been drawn to the attention of the Government about illegal manufacture of drugs . . .

On September 12, in answer to my question, the Minister of Social Welfare said:

In summary, the importation and sale of L.S.D. are fully controlled, but the best means of prohibiting the unauthorized manufacture or possession of L.S.D. and related drugs are at present being examined.

Those two Ministers do not seem to be unduly concerned about the danger of L.S.D.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not comment.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, in answer to a question by the member for Mitcham, the Minister of Education said:

I have already discussed this matter with the Director-General of Education, and we are concerned about the possibility of L.S.D. being distributed to students in our schools.

Because Cabinet seems to be divided on this question (it seems some Ministers are concerned whereas others are not) and, in order to protect the people of this State who can obtain this drug so easily, will the Government, with the knowledge it already has and without deferring the matter further, introduce legislation to protect the young people of South Australia against the apparent dangers of this drug?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: After some of the extraordinarily exaggerated and ill-informed statements that have been made on this subject, I wonder how some people are approaching it. The drug L.S.D. for therapeutic use is not manufactured in Australia: all supplies for such use are imported. It is not considered that the drug could be made by the average chemistry student of matriculation or early university level. The drug could be made from substances, the sale of which is restricted to prescription by the Poison Regulations, by students approaching graduation level in organic chemistry with access to certain laboratory chemicals used at that level in chemistry. However, the possession of any such drug is already controlled by section 15 of the Police Offences Act, and the whole matter is receiving the Government's consideration at the moment.

Mr. Heaslip: Does the section relate to narcotics?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously has not read the section, which relates to deleterious drugs; I invite him to do so. It is an offence to carry any such drug in South Australia. "Carry" means to have drugs on or about one's person within the terms of the section of the Act. Therefore, there is already legislation on the books to control this. As the Government does not intend to rush into ill-considered legislation, the whole matter is being considered properly by the department.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Premier pointed out to the member for Rocky River that section 15 of the Police Offences Act made it an offence to carry any deleterious drug and that the penalty for such offence was \$100 or imprisonment for three months. Can the Premier say whether any legislation in South Australia makes it an offence to take a deleterious drug, including L.S.D., otherwise than pursuant to a prescription issued by a medical practitioner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but presumably, if it could be proved that somebody had taken L.S.D., it would not be difficult to prove that at some stage prior to that he had had it on his person, in which case he would come within the Statute.

LAKE LEVELS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the level of water in Lake Alexandrina?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department reports that the small overflow past the barrages was caused by the lake level (at the time some 3in. above full supply) and by winds raising the level at the gates enough to cause overflow. Every effort has been made in recent weeks to retain all water possible in the lakes at the mouth of the Murray River. It is realized that, with low flows, the lakes may drop too low for convenience to some users of water in this coming summer and no water has been wasted. Such spill past the gates as occurred was unavoidable.

NARACOORTE HOUSING

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the provision of housing for teachers at the Naracoorte High School in view of the expected increase in the number of staff there following the introduction of the matriculation course?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member can be assured that the staffing of Naracoorte High School, when a matriculation course is introduced next year, will be properly carried out without increasing the number of departmental residences. At the present time, Naracoorte is comparatively well off for departmental residences, having a total of seven. The senior establishment of the school is well qualified and the existing upper school staff with additional teachers for classes lower down can manage well the new situation of 1968.

DERNANCOURT SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 13, I asked the Minister of Works a question about sewerage by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of an area at Dernancourt bordered by Parsons Road, the Dernancourt Primary School, and vacant land on two sides, and including Karingal and Callemondah Roads. At that time the Minister said, amongst other things, that the department was aware of the growing need for sewers in this area and an approach by the householders would indicate whether or not the majority of them desired their properties to be sewerage, but that the implementation of the scheme would most probably depend on the laying of sewers in a new subdivision of the large unsubdivided area immediately to the east. I have now received a petition signed by 21 householders and indicating their desire that the area be sewerage immediately. The petition states that they understand they will be required to pay above normal rates for a period of five years, subject to this amount not being excessive and being submitted to them for final approval before work commences. If I submit a copy of the petition to the Minister, will he examine it with a view to having the area sewerage as requested?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The common practice in regard to sewerage is that, on receiving a request, the Engineering and Water Supply Department makes an examination and lays down the conditions under which an area will be sewerage. The same position applies with regard to the provision of a water supply. If the honourable member will give me the petition, I shall have the matter investigated promptly and I shall inform her of the outcome of that investigation.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not wish there to be any confusion on the front bench about this question: it relates to the Keith township water

supply. On Tuesday, the Minister of Works gave me a reply about the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in relation to the matter. The reply indicated that it was intended to drill only two more bores in the search for a suitable township water supply for Keith. A small vigilance committee has been set up in Keith to keep an eye on the matter and it has contacted me expressing concern that one of the proposed bores, as suggested by the Minister, will be in the township of Keith itself. The committee points out that at present in the township of Keith there are many bores on the deep aquifer, and that is the water from which the township supply would have to be drawn. None of these bores, with the exception of the school bore, yields more than 600 to 1,000 gallons an hour. I understand that the school bore has recently been drilled deeper, screened, and rehabilitated generally, and that 3,000 gallons an hour has been test-pumped from it. However, this does not indicate that a supply is likely to be obtained from that source at this stage. The committee points out that the town requires only a non-cooking and non-drinking supply of water as this is only an intermediate supply to serve until the main is completed. Therefore, the committee considers that possibly the quality of water being sought by the Mines Department may be better than necessary for the town's immediate needs. Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain from the Minister of Mines a report from the Mines Department stating whether it is intended to drill only the two further bores or whether the department intends to continue with a more extensive drilling programme in the area in order to explore fully all possible sources of supply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

SWAN REACH SCHOOL

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education obtained the latest information regarding the resiting of the Swan Reach school and other improvements that may be intended for the school pending the resiting?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When I answered a question by the honourable member on this subject on July 12, I said that the Director of the Public Buildings Department was to estimate the comparative cost of erecting a new quadruple unit with toilets and shelter shed at the very good 13-acre new site on Anzac Avenue, together with minor repairs of the old site, as against the cost of carrying out

considerable work needed at the old site. I said an inspection of both areas had been necessary and that officers of the Public Buildings Department were at that time estimating the comparative costs. The report and estimates of cost have been submitted and are at present being considered by officers of the Education Department. As I expect that a decision will be made within the next few weeks, I shall be pleased to convey this decision to the honourable member.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week in which I asked him to ascertain the costs involved in work on Chowilla dam and whether they included the cost of providing railway extensions, including rolling stock?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The estimated total cost of about \$5,000,000 for work on the Chowilla dam project includes expenditure on work carried out by the South Australian Railways in providing spur lines and making rolling stock alterations.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the \$5,000,000 include the sum spent by the department under the previous Government on preliminary investigation work on the dam site, that is, work undertaken prior to the signing of the agreement, which was ratified by this Parliament? Further, has this sum yet been refunded to South Australia? I understand the agreement provided that the costs involved in this preliminary investigation would be refunded to the State.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Reading the River Murray Commission's report of 1965-66, I assume that a certain sum has been refunded. I assume also that the \$5,000,000 relates to the agreement and not to any work undertaken prior to the signing of the agreement.

AMERICAN RIVER CAUSEWAY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The task of bituminizing the Kingscote to Hog Bay main road involves the provision of about 10 miles or 11 miles of bitumen road around Pelican Lagoon and near American River. However, the length of bituminizing could be shortened by a provision of a bridge or causeway across American River. This matter has been taken up over several years and the last correspondence I received on it was a letter from the Minister of Roads dated June 21, 1966, in which he pointed out that the estimated cost of a bridge was \$982,000 or possibly less, perhaps down to about \$700,000, depending on

certain investigations by the then Harbors Board. This cost compared with the cost of \$300,000 to construct a bitumen road over the long route.

Investigations were to be made to ascertain whether the cost of the bridge could be reduced. The Chairman of the District Council of Dudley has raised with me the possibility of the construction, at lower cost, of a pontoon bridge, and he has communicated with the Department of Public Works in Tasmania in connection with the disposal of pontoons of the old Hobart bridge. The Secretary of the Tasmanian department has informed the council by letter that the charge for each pontoon would be only nominal. Of course, there are many other costs involved including severing the pontoons, transport, and so on. Will the Minister of Marine take up the council's suggestion with the Marine and Harbors Department and also with the Minister of Roads so that the possibility of these old pontoons from Hobart being used at American River can be considered? Specifications are involved in the matter and one of these is the Marine and Harbors Department requirement that there be 20ft. above m.h.w.s. tide. Perhaps a lower figure could be approved by the department, because shipping, other than small boats, no longer goes up Pelicaa Lagoon. I shall give the Minister the correspondence that I have on the matter.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for his complete explanation and willingness to provide the information that he has on the matter. Money may be saved by adopting the proposal and, accordingly, I shall be happy to take the matter up with the Minister of Roads and the Marine and Harbors Department.

UNLEY POLICE STATION

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister of Works recently told me that a survey would be made on August 4 in connection with the bituminizing of the Unley police station yard and that it was hoped that work would start immediately after that survey. Will the Minister ascertain when the work will be completed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

COCKBURN SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: The committee of the Cockburn Primary School, which is on the border of New South Wales and South Australia, desires to obtain more land for a playing field. Has the Minister of Education anything to report on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Cockburn Primary School is constructed on a very limited site and, to enable the welfare club to erect additional climbing playground equipment for the use of children, negotiations have been carried out with the Diocese of Willochra for the purchase of a 66ft. x 30ft. strip of church property adjoining the northern boundary of this school. The Bishop of Willochra (the Right Rev. T. T. Jones) states that the church standing committee is prepared to transfer this small parcel of land for the purpose required, at a nominal sum of \$1, provided the department pays the necessary transfer fees. I may say that I consider that the purchase of this strip would give a valuable extension for the school, and I have approved of the purchase of the land from the Anglican Church. I express my appreciation of the ready co-operation of the church in making this land available.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a report about the establishment of a Government general hospital at Modbury?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Plans for the new general hospital at Modbury were referred by Executive Council to the Public Works Committee this morning. The plans are for a two-stage hospital: the first stage will provide general hospital facilities, maternity facilities, casualty department, associated facilities for the general working of the hospital, and a nursing home for 250 nurses, and the project has been planned in such a way that assistance for the second stage can be sought from the Commonwealth Government for the extension of teaching hospital facilities for the Adelaide University. It is expected that later there will be insufficient provision in existing hospitals associated with the medical school for resident medical officers to do their later training. Consequently, additional facilities are sought and these can be provided in the Modbury Hospital. In due course we will obtain assistance from the Commonwealth Government in this regard.

I am pleased that all speed has been used by the department in preparing these plans. Initially, the project, based on the assessment of the Town Planning Committee as to the expansion of population in that area, was for a three-stage hospital. However, a re-assessment of the population in that area was made during the design stage, and on the latest figures it was decided that by 1981 a 450-bed hospital

would be needed to cope with the demand in that area. Because of the expansion of population that has already taken place, the first stage of the hospital should be built immediately. The recommended first stage has now been presented to the Public Works Committee, as anything less would not provide sufficient facilities in the catchment area of the hospital. If that committee reports promptly, as I have every confidence it will—

Mr. Shannon: We will look at it in the same way as we always consider these matters.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure the Chairman of the Public Works Committee will realize the value of this project when evidence is placed before him and, if a prompt report is received from that committee, the work can be commenced at the beginning of next year.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In many areas of the State it is unwise and probably uneconomical to apply superphosphate to the soil at a time much in advance of the opening seasonal rains, because of the problem on ironstone soils of the locking up of the phosphate contained, caused by light rains or heavy dew. A considerable quantity of superphosphate is taken in bulk from the works, and the Railways Department has gained traffic as a result, but the problem is one of caretaking. Last year many farmers had substantial heaps of bulk superphosphate on their properties when the heavy December rains penetrated the superphosphate to a depth of about 2ft., and made the task of restoring and applying it extremely difficult and costly. Various methods, including plastic sheets, have been used to cover the heaps, but these methods are, to a degree, costly and unsuccessful. I understand that a method has been evolved of spraying the heaps with a chemical mixture that makes the superphosphate impervious to water but, although I have inquired privately, I cannot find out anything conclusive. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his departmental officers to assist in discovering an effective chemical, possibly bituminous or of some other nature, that may solve this important problem and assist the agricultural industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to do that.

PENSIONER CONCESSIONS

Mr. CASEY: Pensioner travel concessions already granted by this Government have been well received and are appreciated by pensioners

throughout the State. People living in Broken Hill have strong ties with South Australia and most families, after retiring at Broken Hill and living elsewhere, usually come to Adelaide. These people are anxious to obtain travel concessions but as they are not South Australians it is difficult for them to do so.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: A sum was provided on the Estimates for them.

Mr. CASEY: I do not think so. The bus services operating on the road between Adelaide and Broken Hill provide travel concessions for pensioners, probably because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Will the Premier communicate with his counterparts in other States to ascertain whether something cannot be done on a Commonwealth scale whereby all pensioners in Australia could be treated in the same way as individual States are treating them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask the Minister of Transport whether we can obtain reciprocal agreements between the States for pensioner concessions. It is desirable that we should provide concessions, but if we provide them for pensioners from New South Wales we should be able to expect pensioners from this State, with relatives in New South Wales, to obtain similar concessions in that State. However, I assure the honourable member that the matter will be considered to see whether we can obtain an agreement.

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain the amount of contributions required from councils towards main road grants and also towards district road grants in each of the past three years? Will he also ascertain the total grants made in each case over that period?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

PASTURE PESTS

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to the control of pasture pests, a matter to which Mr. Brian Wesley-Smith in my district is devoting himself with more than usual interest. The Agriculture Department's latest recommendations concerning pest control, set out in tabular form, give the withholding periods (or the periods considered ample safety margins between the time of spraying and grazing (or harvesting). Will the Minister of Agriculture say how these figures were arrived at? Have they been supplied by chemical manufacturing organizations that produce pesticides or

have they been calculated from the results of departmental or Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization trials or research work? Has the department undertaken any trials to ascertain whether pesticide residues are likely to build up in soils that are subjected to annual or more frequent applications of pesticides? Further, has it endeavoured to ascertain whether "chemical fallowing" results in depressed crop yields when compared with yields from crops grown on fallows where weeds have been controlled by mechanical means?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member has asked a series of questions that I should like to study. I assure him that the department has been active in this field, but I will obtain a full report on the matter.

HORTICULTURAL ADVISER

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: On Tuesday last the Minister of Agriculture, replying to a question I had asked, said that the appointment of a horticultural adviser for the Barossa Valley area would be finalized today. Has that appointment now been made? If it has, will the Minister give me the name of the appointee, his qualifications, and the date when he will commence duties?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am pleased to state that Mr. Hodge, an officer who has been with the department for some time (first associated with agriculture, but lately with horticulture, particularly vegetable crops) was this morning appointed to this position by His Excellency the Governor. This officer came from South Africa, where he gained considerable experience in horticulture, and I am sure he will be an acquisition to the area referred to by the honourable member. He is a co-operative young man as well as a good team man, which is most important when working with a group of officers as at Nuriootpa. The quality of the officers at Nuriootpa is very good indeed: they are fine young men and I am sure they will carry out the work required of them to the fullest extent possible. I appreciate the interest the honourable member has shown in this matter. It has been our aim to obtain someone as soon as possible who would do the job credit, and this aim has been achieved. Mr. Hodge will commence work as soon as possible.

POULTRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture will recall that some time ago representatives of the South Australian Poultry Marketing Co-operative called on him to

seek Government assistance. I understand that that co-operative (members of which live to the north, east and south of the city) is at present in considerable financial difficulty and that, in turn, poultry feed manufacturers are also suffering financial embarrassment. I have been asked to ascertain whether the Government could give financial assistance to the co-operative. Can the Minister therefore say whether this is possible? If he cannot tell me now, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am surprised to learn that the co-operative is in financial difficulties. At the time its representatives called on me I pointed out the procedure open to them and I made an appointment for them to meet Mr. Belchamber of the Industries Promotion Branch, whom they eventually saw. Much discussion between them and the Treasury officials has taken place and, to the best of my knowledge, advice was given to them that would have at least put them on the correct path. If they experienced any further difficulties I should have been pleased if they had approached me again.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Could they get financial assistance?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: They were shown the way to get it, although I do not know whether they did receive it. However, I will ascertain the position. Although they visited me on two or three occasions in the initial stage, it would now be about 12 months since I last saw them. They have not visited me since, although perfect relations exist between us. I would have thought that they would contact me again if they were in difficulty. Now that the matter has been raised, I will take it up with the Industries Promotion Branch to see whether they have been properly cared for and to ascertain in what way they can be assisted in the future.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr. COUMBE: Some years ago a plan was put forward to the Government to provide a roof over the Adelaide station railway yard to provide extra off-street parking. As similar propositions have been suggested and partly implemented in Melbourne, has the Premier received any approach from, or has he made any approach to, any consortium of businesses in this State to undertake this work that would not only improve the railway yard and supply off-street parking but would result in additional Government revenue being obtained? As this

suggestion has been put to me on a number of occasions, can the Premier say whether any planning work has been done on this project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I am aware, nothing has been done recently, although the project was examined on one occasion. However, I will inquire of the Minister of Transport.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence over all other business except questions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): Some time ago the Premier, said time would be given to discuss petroleum licences to be issued in respect of an area between Victoria and New South Wales. Before a vote is taken on this motion, can the Premier say when such time will be made available, as this question is becoming urgent? In the Commonwealth Parliament yesterday the Minister for National Development said uniform legislation was being prepared and would probably be available within a month. I presume this Government desires such legislation to be brought before this House before it prorogues. Will the Premier give members an opportunity to discuss this matter which is, I think he would agree, of tremendous importance to the future of this State?

Undoubtedly the areas south of Victoria have proved to be the most likely for large oil deposits, and every week they appear to be more important. How far they extend westward is, of course, a matter of conjecture. At present there is a regulation before the House which I will move to disallow if the Subordinate Legislation Committee takes no action on it. If the committee moves to disallow it, that is another matter. I refer to the formal business of the House and not private members' business. I also ask the Premier whether provision will be made for a reasonable time for the consideration of the disallowance of regulations, if any move in that direction is made.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I should like to inquire as to the position regarding matters listed on the Notice Paper today under the heading "Lapsed from Wednesday, September 20, 1967, owing to adjournment." Yesterday, I was of necessity absent from the House, but this morning I made preliminary

inquiries about the Government's intentions regarding these motions and about whether or not an opportunity would be given to conclude them or at least to vote on them or have the final reply made to them. Will the Premier make clear what the Government intends to do in this connection?

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I want to ask the Premier a question about this matter and I hope he will be good enough to reply. Last evening, I gave a second reading explanation of the Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill, which is on the Notice Paper for later today. The Premier took the adjournment of the debate. I point out that this is a Bill and, if it is to have any chance of being considered in another place, it has to be considered here in sufficient time for it to go to another place so that there is time there to debate it. I know that the usual practice of a Government towards the end of the session is to let all private members' business bank up until the last day or so, when it is far too late for any real and unhurried debate to take place and when that business is lost in a welter of Government business brought in. From the practical point of view, it is too late then to have a Bill given any consideration in another place, if it should be passed in this House.

I want the honourable gentleman to satisfy me that time will be set aside for the debate on the Juvenile Courts Act Amendment Bill in this House so that it can go to another place to be debated there. If the Premier is not prepared to agree to this, of course it will be tantamount to an outright rejection of the Bill. If it is not to be debated until the last day or so of the session, it has no hope of ever getting through and that will be tantamount to the Government's rejection of it. I ask the Premier whether he intends to go on with the debate on the Bill today, as he is entitled to do (I gave him the opportunity to do that by making the Bill an Order of the Day for today). If he does not intend to go on with the Bill, will he give an undertaking that it will be considered in sufficient time to allow it to get to the other place for consideration by that place?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): As to the matter raised first by the member for Gumeracha, it is expected that the agreement concerning the administration of the offshore areas in relation to oil-gas exploration between this State, the Commonwealth and the other States will be ready

for signature shortly. A Bill will be introduced to this House early next month; on an agreed date this legislation will be introduced in all States of the Commonwealth and in the Commonwealth Parliament. That Bill will provide specific provision for the matters that were discussed in the White Paper.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Bill might not be subject to amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, the Bill will not be subject to amendment but there will be adequate opportunity to debate it. I undertook to give honourable members an opportunity to debate these matters.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The issue between Victoria and South Australia is involved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As that issue will be included in the Bill, honourable members will have an opportunity to debate it. That this was so was made perfectly clear in the White Paper. Therefore, when the honourable member asked me whether there was to be an opportunity to debate the matter the answer was "Yes", because there will be.

Mr. Millhouse: That is straining the position.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not. The honourable member will have every opportunity to express his views on the subject. If his view is that we should reject the measure and throw the last four years' work that has been done in this State in the field of oil-gas exploration down the drain, then he will have an opportunity to express that view to the House. That would be the result of throwing out the agreement between this State and Victoria.

Mr. Millhouse: If you go into the debate with that view, obviously there will be no real debate at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The situation on this matter was perfectly well outlined in the White Paper. If the honourable member ignores the views put to this House, the Government and the people of the State by Mr. Wells in the White Paper, then he will have an opportunity to attack them. An opportunity will, in consequence, be given to honourable members in this House to debate the matter. Regarding the disallowance of regulations, I will consider the matter and see what negotiations I can undertake with the Opposition on the subject of any notice for disallowance of regulation already on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The usual procedure is that there is an unqualified assurance given that a motion for disallowance will be voted on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Normally we certainly allow a vote on the disallowance of a regulation. I point out that members opposite have been given ample time (far more time than in many sessions under the previous Government) for private members' business this session. As I have taken out figures on the matter for some years, I know that they have had decidedly more time this session than was given in numbers of other sessions by the previous Government. The member for Gumeracha can shake his head; obviously he has not looked at the figures or he would not be doing so. I will provide members with the right to take a vote on the disallowance of regulations. As to the other matters on the Notice Paper, I point out to members opposite that last evening the sittings of the House were taken out of the hands of the Government by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knew perfectly well that private members' time was allotted, and he chose to exceed that time.

Mr. Millhouse: The matter was called on by the Speaker, and I spoke.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knew what arrangements had previously been made.

Mr. Millhouse: No arrangements at all were made.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The standing arrangement between the Opposition and Government in relation to private members' business (and it has always been the case since I have been a member of this place) was that the allotted private members' time was given—

Mr. Millhouse: What were the arrangements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That Wednesday afternoons are given in this House, until the closure is moved, for the debating of private members' business. That has always been the arrangement. Although it is not an arrangement that exists in most other Parliaments, it has existed here and has been allowed. However, the honourable member chose to take the business of this House out of my hands last night and to debate private members' business in what was normal Government business time.

Mr. Millhouse: Absolute nonsense. Why didn't your Whip approach our Whip about the matter if you didn't want me to go on?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows well—

Mr. Millhouse: Why did the member for Glenelg engage in a filibuster?

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that I rose to move that the House adjourn.

Mr. Millhouse: You couldn't do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I could have done it. It so happened that the Speaker saw the honourable member first.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: The customary courtesies were ignored by the honourable member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. If the honourable member wants to take the business out of the Government's hands and dispose of business in other than private members' business time in his own way, frankly the Government is not disposed to give further time for debates or votes.

Mr. Millhouse: I see, you are disposing of my Bill. That is the effect of it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had done what he has so often chided other people for failing to do, namely, get on with his job in time to get his work done, he could have had his Bill debated. However, he left the Bill until the end of private members' business time, taking up the time of the Draftsman when we have a depleted drafting staff and a heavy programme of legislation. The honourable member knew perfectly well that there was much of his own Party's business already on the Notice Paper to be dealt with in private members' business time. If he wanted his Bill dealt with, he had ample opportunity to have done something about that previously.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have appealed to the House for order and, if I do not get it, I shall take other action.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well the standing arrangements that have been made here for many years about the allowance of time for private members' business. Indeed, because of the practice of a previous Government, I am surprised that he has had the gall to say that

he is entitled to further debate. I am prepared to discuss with the Leader of the Opposition the matter of votes but, if it is intended to try to take the business of this House out of the hands of the Government, no further consideration will be given to debates on private members' business or votes on matters they have seen fit to leave on the Notice Paper.

Motion carried.

LICENSING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 29 (clause 3)—Leave out "shall" and insert "may".

No. 2. Page 2, line 31 (clause 3)—Leave out "or" and insert "in relation to".

No. 3. Page 2, line 32 (clause 3)—Leave out "shall" and insert "may".

No. 4. Page 3, line 42 (clause 4)—Insert "(1)" at commencement of line 42.

No. 5. Page 4 (clause 4)—After line 33 insert new definition as follows:—
"repealed Acts" means the Acts repealed by this Act."

No. 6. Page 4 (clause 4)—After line 46 insert new subclause as follows:—

"(2) For the purposes of this Act one dozen containers each containing not less than twenty-six fluid ounces or two dozen containers each containing not less than thirteen fluid ounces shall in either case be deemed to contain a total quantity of two gallons."

No. 7. Page 5, lines 12 to 17 (clause 5)—Leave out subclause (4) and insert new subclause as follows:—

"(4) Subject to subsections (5) and (7) of this section, the chairman shall be appointed on such terms and conditions as are fixed by the Governor: Provided that he shall be appointed to hold office until he reaches sixty-five years of age and shall not be removed from office before reaching that age except upon an address of both Houses of Parliament."

No. 8. Page 5, line 22 (clause 5)—Leave out "suspension".

No. 9. Page 5, line 24 (clause 5)—Leave out "suspension".

No. 10. Page 10, line 3 (clause 14)—After "of" leave out "fifteen" and insert "sixteen".

No. 11. Page 10 (clause 14)—After line 18 insert "(p) 'Five gallon licence.'"

No. 12. Page 10, line 24 (clause 15)—After "1914-1960" insert "or the provisions of any other Act."

No. 13. Page 10, line 25 (clause 15)—After "licence" insert "a limited publican's licence or a restaurant licence".

No. 14. Page 10, line 26 (clause 15)—After "the chalet at the Wilpena National Pleasure Resort" insert "or the proprietor of any other premises situated upon any lands that the

Governor declares by proclamation (which he is hereby empowered to do) to be a national pleasure resort or a national park".

No. 15. Page 11, line 10 (clause 18)—Leave out "two".

No. 16. Page 11, line 10 (clause 18)—Leave out "years" and insert "year".

No. 17. Page 11, line 33 (clause 19)—Leave out "and".

No. 18. Page 11, line 33 (clause 19)—After "(3)" insert "and (4)".

No. 19. Page 12, lines 36 and 37 (clause 19)—Leave out "the proviso to".

No. 20. Page 13, line 32 (clause 20)—After "constructed" insert "and primarily used".

No. 21. Page 15, line 23 (clause 22)—Leave out "three years" and insert "one year".

No. 22. Page 17, line 35 (clause 27)—Leave out "subsection (1) of".

No. 23. Page 17, line 35 (clause 27)—After "85" insert "of this Act".

No. 24. Page 19, line 5 (clause 27)—After "rules" insert "of court".

No. 25. Page 19, line 7 (clause 27)—Leave out "The" and insert "Subject to subsection (3a) of this section, the".

No. 26. Page 19, line 7 (clause 27)—After "grant" insert "or renew".

No. 27. Page 19, lines 17 and 18 (clause 27)—After "licence" leave out "in respect of premises in the vicinity of the club premises".

No. 28. Page 19 (clause 27)—After line 18 insert new subclause as follows:—

"(3a) In the case of a club that is a sub-branch of the Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Club, if the court is satisfied that the sub-branch has, prior to the first day of August, 1967, obtained the liquor purchased by it for its purposes or a substantial part thereof from that Club, the sub-branch may continue to purchase liquor from that Club."

No. 29. Page 19, line 42 (clause 28)—After "of" insert "except between the hours of nine o'clock in the morning and ten o'clock in the evening upon a day other than a Sunday or Good Friday".

No. 30. Page 19, lines 42 to 44 (clause 28)—Leave out "during any day or time during which the sale of liquor is prohibited by law".

No. 31. Page 19—After line 44 insert new clause as follows:—

"28a. *Five gallon licence.*—Every five gallon licence shall authorize the person thereby licensed to sell and dispose of liquor on the premises therein specified, on any day (except Sunday, Good Friday and Christmas Day) between the hours of five o'clock in the morning and six o'clock in the evening in quantities of not less than five gallons to any person licensed to sell liquor of that kind under this Act."

No. 32. Page 20, line 12 (clause 30)—After "eleven" insert "o'clock".

No. 33. Page 21, line 17 (clause 31)—Leave out "half past eight" and insert "seven".

No. 34. Page 21, line 33 (clause 32)—Leave out "on" first occurring and insert "during".

No. 35. Page 22, line 7 (clause 33)—After "thereafter" insert "or such lesser period as the court may determine and specify in the licence".

No. 36. Page 22, line 10 (clause 34)—After "for" insert "the renewal of".

No. 37. Page 22, lines 10 and 11 (clause 34)—Leave out "other than a packet licence".

No. 38. Page 22, lines 12 and 13 (clause 34)—Leave out "any person applying for a renewal of his licence, whose application has not been disposed of" and insert "the applicant".

No. 39. Page 23 (clause 36)—After line 42 insert—

"(g) for a five gallon licence—ten dollars."

No. 40. Page 24, line 34 (clause 37)—Leave out "spirit merchant, brewer".

No. 41. Page 25, line 44 (clause 38)—After "licensed" insert "under this Act".

No. 42. Page 25, line 45 (clause 38)—Leave out "exempted under section 13 of this Act" and insert "otherwise permitted by law to sell liquor".

No. 43. Page 27, line 9 (clause 40)—After "to be erected" insert "and the entrance and exit of the drive-in bottle department (if any) and the parking area or areas appurtenant thereto";

No. 44. Page 28, line 24 (clause 41)—After "but" insert "if any such person did not object to the original application".

No. 45. Page 29, line 11 (clause 42)—Before "deliver" insert "at the same time".

No. 46. Page 31, line 5 (clause 47)—After "hospital" insert "recognized youth centre".

No. 47. Page 31, line 8 (clause 47)—After "hospital" insert "centre".

No. 48. Page 32, line 42 (clause 50)—Leave out "A" and insert "From the date on which such notice is given, a".

No. 49. Page 37, line 14 (clause 54)—Leave out "a" first occurring and insert "the".

No. 50. Page 37, line 19 (clause 54)—Before "prescribed" insert "form".

No. 51. Page 37, line 19 (clause 54)—After "prescribed" leave out "form" and insert "by the rules of court".

No. 52. Page 38 (clause 55)—After line 25 insert "and".

No. 53. Page 39, line 13 (clause 56)—After "hospital" insert "recognized youth centre".

No. 54. Page 39, line 16 (clause 56)—After "hospital" insert "centre".

No. 55. Page 42, line 10 (clause 61)—After "the" insert "form".

No. 56. Page 42, line 10 (clause 61)—After "prescribed" leave out "form" and insert "by the rules of court".

No. 57. Page 44, line 25 (clause 65)—Leave out "registered letter" and insert "post".

No. 58. Page 48, lines 1 to 21 (clause 66)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclauses as follows:—

"(1) Any club that was in existence at the date of the commencement of this Act, whether licensed under this Act or

not, may, upon application to the court accompanied by the fee prescribed by the rules of court being not less than five dollars and not more than fifty dollars be granted a permit for the keeping sale and supply of liquor for consumption only by the members of the club or by a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member on such portion of the club premises as is specified by the court on such days (including Sundays) and during such periods as the court deems proper.

(1a) A permit shall not be granted under subsection (1) of this section unless, in the opinion of the court—

- (a) there are adequate restrictions upon admission to membership of the club; and
- (b) there is adequate reason for the grant of the permit.

(1b) It shall be a condition of a permit granted under subsection (1) of this section, except a permit granted to a club licensed under this Act, that the liquor kept, sold or supplied in pursuance of the permit, shall be purchased—

- (a) from the holder of a full publican's licence or a retail storekeeper's licence;
- or
- (b) if it is impracticable for the provisions of paragraph (a) of this subsection to be complied with, from the holder of a licence under this Act nominated by the court;

or

- (c) in the case of a club that is a sub-branch of the Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Club, from that Club, if the court is satisfied that the sub-branch has, prior to the first day of August, 1967, obtained the liquor purchased by it for its purposes or a substantial part thereof from that Club.

(1c) In the case of a permit under this section that authorizes the sale and supply of liquor on a Sunday the club shall not advertise in the press, by handbills or by radio or television, that it has a permit authorizing it to sell or supply liquor on a Sunday or that entertainment is provided on the premises of the club on a Sunday.

No. 59. Page 48, line 23 (clause 66)—After "(17)" insert "and".

No. 60. Page 48, line 23 (clause 66)—After "(18)" leave out "and (19)".

No. 61. Page 48, lines 42 to 44 (clause 67)—Leave out "during any day or time during which the sale of liquor on licensed premises is prohibited by law" and insert "except between the hours of nine o'clock in the morning and ten o'clock in the evening on a day other than a Sunday or Good Friday".

No. 62. Page 50—After line 27 insert new clause as follows:—

"71a. Breach of permit or certificate—

(1) If the holder of a permit or certificate under this Division contravenes or fails to comply with any term or condition of the permit or certificate or any provision of this Act, he shall be guilty of an offence.

(2) If the holder of a permit or certificate is convicted of an offence under subsection (1) of this section, the court may, upon the application of the Superintendent of Licensed Premises, cancel the permit or certificate."

No. 63. Page 51, line 32 (clause 73)—Before "of" first occurring insert "of the time and place".

No. 64. Page 51, lines 33 and 34 (clause 73)—Leave out "and of the time and place of the meeting of the court".

No. 65. Page 55, line 34 (clause 84)—Before "may" insert "it".

No. 66. Page 56, lines 2 to 17 (clause 85)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclauses as follows:—

"(1) Except in pursuance of a permit granted under section 66 of this Act, no liquor shall be sold or supplied by or on behalf of a club in the club premises or kept in or upon those premises unless the club has been duly licensed under this Act.

(1a) A club licence shall not authorize the sale or supply of liquor otherwise than to a member of the club or to a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member of the club.

(1b) Except as provided by subsection (3) of this section, liquor shall not be sold or supplied by or on behalf of any club that was not registered under the repealed Acts immediately before the commencement of this Act for consumption otherwise than in the licensed portion of the club premises nor shall it be carried away from that portion of the premises of any such club.

(1c) Liquor shall not be supplied or delivered to any person in pursuance of a club licence otherwise than upon the club premises.

(1d) Subsections (1a), (1b) and (1c) of this section shall not apply to or in relation to the sale or supply of liquor—

- (a) to a club under paragraph (b) of subsection (1b) of section 66 of this Act by the holder of a club licence;

or

- (b) to a sub-branch of the Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Club by that Club under subsection (3a) of section 27 or paragraph (c) of subsection (1b) of section 66 of this Act;

and for the purposes of paragraph (e) of subsection (1) of section 86 of this

- Act, any such sale or supply of liquor shall be deemed not to have been made to a member of the public."
- No. 67. Page 57, line 18 (clause 86)—Leave out "catering for functions or".
- No. 68. Page 57, line 18 (clause 86)—Leave out "other".
- No. 69. Page 57, line 18 (clause 86)—After "trading" insert "in the sale or supply of liquor".
- No. 70. Page 57, line 19 (clause 86)—Leave out "for or".
- No. 71. Page 58, line 34 (clause 87)—Leave out "a member" and insert "to full membership".
- No. 72. Page 59, line 14 (clause 89)—Leave out "Commissioner of Police and the".
- No. 73. Page 61, line 29 (clause 95)—Leave out "95" and insert "96".
- No. 74. Page 75 (clause 129)—After line 29 insert new subclause as follows:—
 "(7a) This section shall come into operation on the fifteenth day of January, 1968."
- No. 75. Page 77, line 29 (clause 136)—After "premises" insert "unless the liquor is supplied or consumed upon licensed premises".
- No. 76. Page 77, lines 35 and 36 (clause 136)—Leave out "premises in which a dance was being held" and insert "place where the consumption or supply of liquor took place".
- No. 77. Page 81, line 38 (clause 143)—After "wholesale" insert "storekeeper's licence".
- No. 78. Page 81, line 38 (clause 143)—After "retail" insert "storekeeper's".
- No. 79. Page 82, lines 38 to 41 (clause 146)—Leave out "Provided that this section shall not apply to a sale, in a quantity not less than five gallons, of liquor to a person licensed to sell liquor of the kind which is the subject matter of such sale".
- No. 80. Page 83, lines 7 to 13 (clause 147)—Leave out—
 "or
 (b) sells or delivers to any licensed person any liquor in a quantity equal to or more than five gallons, with an understanding that part thereof shall be returned and the quantity so sold or delivered, after deducting the part returned or to be returned, is or will then be under five gallons."
- No. 81. Page 85, line 11 (clause 154)—Leave out "145" and insert "146".
- No. 82. Page 85, line 24 (clause 155)—Leave out "or" first occurring.
- No. 83. Page 85, line 24 (clause 155)—After "mother" insert "or his mother-in-law".
- No. 84. Page 85, lines 27 and 28 (clause 155)—Leave out "for the employment of such females on the same terms and conditions as males" and insert "that a female engaged in selling, supplying or serving liquor in or at a bar-room shall receive the same remuneration therefor as a male engaged in the same employment".
- No. 85. Page 87, line 11 (clause 159)—Leave out "regulations" and insert "rules of court."
- No. 86. Page 91, line 7 (clause 166)—Leave out "means" and insert "meals".
- No. 87. Page 91, line 12 (clause 166)—Leave out "means" and insert "meals".
- No. 88. Page 103, lines 1 to 31 (clause 187)—Leave out all words in the clause after "amended" and insert—
 "—
 (a) by inserting after the word "maximum" in subsection (2) of section 43 thereof the passage "or minimum"; and
 (b) by enacting and inserting therein after section 22e the following section:—
 22f. *Minimum prices for liquor.*
 (1) Without limiting any other power conferred on the Minister by this Act, the Minister may, subject to this section, by order fix and declare the minimum retail price of any type or kind of liquor within the meaning of the Licensing Act, 1967.
 (2) The power conferred on the Minister by subsection (1) of this section shall include power to fix different minimum retail prices of the same type or kind of liquor according to the quantity, manner, conditions and locality in or under which the liquor is sold.
 (3) Notwithstanding subsections (4) and (5) of this section and the fact that the minimum retail price of any type or kind of liquor has been fixed by the Minister under this section, it shall not be unlawful for the holder of a full publican's licence or the holder of a retail storekeeper's licence to sell liquor of that type or kind to any club whose licence is subject to the condition referred to in paragraph (b) of subsection (3) of section 27 of the Licensing Act, 1967, or to any club that is the holder of a permit granted under section 66 of that Act, nor for any such club to buy such liquor from the holder of a full publican's licence or a retail storekeeper's licence, at a discount the rate of which does not exceed the appropriate rate fixed under subsection (8) of this section by the association referred to in that subsection.
 (4) A person shall not sell or supply or offer for sale or to supply by retail any type or kind of liquor at a lower price than the minimum retail price of that type or kind fixed by the Minister under this section.
 (5) A person shall not buy or obtain by retail or offer to buy or obtain by retail from any person authorized under the Licensing Act, 1967, to sell liquor by retail any type or kind of liquor at a lower price than the minimum

retail price of that type or kind fixed by the Minister under this section.

(6) The Minister may on the application of any association that, in the opinion of the Minister, is fairly representative of the liquor industry, approve of that association for the purposes of this section.

(7) Notice of such approval shall be published in the *Gazette*.

(8) Any association so approved may, with the consent of the Minister, by notice published in the *Gazette*—

(a) fix the proposed minimum retail price of any type or kind of liquor according to the quantity, manner, conditions and locality in or under which the liquor is sold; and

(b) fix the rate or rates at which discounts referred to in subsection (3) of this section may be granted for the purpose of that subsection.

(9) The Minister shall not fix the minimum retail price of any liquor under subsection (1) of this section unless he is satisfied that any proposed minimum retail price fixed by an association under subsection (8) of this section is not being observed.

(10) Subsections (4) and (5) of this section do not apply to or in relation to—

(a) any sale or supply or any offer for sale or supply by the holder of a distiller's storekeeper's licence referred to in section 25 or a vigneron's licence referred to in section 26 of the Licensing Act, 1967, of any liquor authorized to be sold or disposed of by that licence;

or

(b) any purchase or obtaining of liquor, or any offer to buy or obtain any liquor from the holder of such a licence where the sale or disposal of such liquor is authorized by that licence.

No. 89. Page 113 (The Schedule)—After line 14 insert "So much of the Statute Law Revision Act, 1957, as relates to the Licensing Act, 1932-1936".

No. 90. Page 113 (The Schedule)—After line 17 insert "So much of the Statute Law Revision Act, 1965, as relates to the Licensing Act, 1932-1964".

Amendments Nos. 1-13.

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

That amendments Nos. 1 to 13 be agreed to. These make drafting amendments and useful administrative improvements, and provide for a five-gallon licence for small vigneron. This is not a provision that I am happy about but, in view of the strong feelings of certain members in another place and the necessity for getting the Bill passed, I am prepared to compromise on the matter and, consequently, I recommend that we agree to these amendments.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): It seems that many amendments have been grouped. Although the Premier says they are drafting amendments, he has also mentioned that he is not happy about one amendment but is willing to accept it. I should like the Premier to be more specific. This is an important Bill. The first amendment strikes out "shall" and inserts "may", and that surely must have more implications than a drafting amendment would have. I want to have the Bill passed as quickly as possible and I shall shorten my remarks as much as possible. On the other hand, I should like an explanation of each amendment that is not a drafting amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The first amendment clearly is a drafting amendment. As the Bill left this House, clause 3 (2) provided:

All legal proceedings and every application, petition, and appeal pending or not finally disposed of at the commencement of this Act shall be continued and completed and any appeal instituted in connection therewith and any legal proceedings or any alleged offence alleged to have been committed before the said commencement shall be instituted and completed and any appeal instituted in connection therewith dealt with under the repealed Acts as if this Act had not been passed.

The striking out of "shall" and the insertion of "may" after "Act" means that persons who have such proceedings pending but do not wish to go on with them will not be required to go on.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is not a drafting amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. What was inadequate drafting has been improved to cover the situation. It will not be mandatory upon those who have proceedings pending to go on with those proceedings if they do not want to go on. Amendment No. 6 is an amendment of substance. We provided for the sale of a minimum amount of two gallons. It was pointed out that one dozen bottles each

of 26 fluid ounces or two dozen containers each of 13 fluid ounces (the normally accepted quantity) would not make up two gallons. The amendment was moved by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill and appears to be perfectly satisfactory. Amendment No. 7 relates to the appointment of a judge. It was pointed out that the Law Society objected to the appointment of a judge for a limited period, because he might be thought to be subject to direction from the Administration in order to obtain a re-appointment.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Again, it is not a drafting amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say it was. I said they were mainly drafting amendments. A number of amendments from No. 11 on deal with a five-gallon licence. Previously we had a five-gallon exemption for a wine producer who sold to a licensee. This is for the small vigneron who in many cases sell to winemakers. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) raised this matter and pointed out that a number of smaller vigneron in his district sold to small winemakers. This is happening extensively in the McLaren Flat and McLaren Vale areas. The proposed fee is \$10. Representatives of river districts in another place complained about some unsatisfactory features of the five-gallon exemption under the old Act and, although I am not entirely happy with the proposal, I accede to it.

Amendments Nos. 1 to 13 agreed to.

Amendment No. 14.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That amendment No. 14 be agreed to.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Wilpena Chalet is situated in a national pleasure resort. Before the introduction last year of the Bill dealing with this matter no provision existed for development to take place in a national park, or for any part of a park to be leased. It is now possible for certain areas of national parks to be developed by private enterprise and, if it is considered desirable, a liquor licence applying to the accommodation provided will be obtainable. If this amendment is not carried it will mean that, before we can attract people to provide facilities that will encourage the use and enjoyment of national parks, we shall have to have amending legislation in order to provide a licence.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister is obviously trying to commercialize national parks.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Rubbish! I am trying to provide facilities for the enjoyment of those wishing to use the parks.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It would be necessary not to amend the Act but merely to alter this amendment slightly by striking out "proclamation" and inserting "regulation".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you mean declare a national park or pleasure resort by regulation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. This amendment introduces a complete reversal of the policy that has existed ever since the original Act came into force. The policy has always been not to commercialize our national parks and not to provide for the consumption of alcoholic beverages in the area concerned. Everyone knows that parks are peculiarly places that are attended by families with young children and I believe that the provision of alcohol therein is undesirable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In effect, the honourable member is suggesting that we are to create national parks and national pleasure resorts by regulation. I shall be happy if a proclamation is made every day in order to create a national park or pleasure resort. What the honourable member suggests is ridiculous, and he knows it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This clause provides that the proprietor may have a full publican's licence: we are not dealing with a proclamation for a national park. We already have dozens of places that do not have full publican's licences. The Wilpena Chalet was granted a licence to sell liquor because of its geographically isolated position and for no other reason. That was good policy, but this clause proposes that any national park or pleasure resort can have a licence. The Minister has other legislation under which he can proclaim a national park; he should not rely on this Bill to do it. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: This amendment will enable licensed premises to be established in any national park, where people will abuse the facilities. Young boys and girls playing sport at a national park will have liquor available to them, and that is not desirable. A person will merely need a leasehold of premises in the national park to compete with other people who need a freehold to trade. Special provision was made for Wilpena Chalet because it was in a remote area, but this does not apply to many

of our national parks. Under this amendment, our national parks will be used for the trading of liquor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already made clear my thoughts on this matter. I do not necessarily share the same views as those expressed by the member for Gumeracha.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am glad you said that, because Windy Point is a possible site.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I had that in mind. The amendment gives the Governor power to proclaim a national pleasure resort.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't be stupid. Power exists under the Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister should examine the words in brackets: "which he is hereby empowered to do".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can knock it out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then it is there. The Minister should not be so arrogant and impetuous. The amendment should be in the following form:

... or the proprietor of any other premises situated upon any land that the Governor has declared by proclamation to be a national pleasure resort or national pleasure park.

We want to provide by this amendment that premises on what are already national pleasure resorts can be licensed, but that is not what this amendment does. The Chief Secretary in another place moved this amendment, but it is not in a proper form. I can see no virtue in giving power under legislation dealing with licensing to proclaim national parks, but that is how the amendment is drawn. Therefore, as the amendment is in a defective form, I hope the Government will not persist with it. Although I hope that the object of the amendment will be attained, we will not attain it in this way.

Mr. CUMBE: I understand that the Minister of Lands desires to have liquor facilities available at certain national parks mainly to attract licensees to those areas in the hope that substantial premises will be erected there. There is merit in that point. The member for Rocky River pointed out that, if a full publican's licence were granted for the Wilpena Pound resort, liquor would be available at fairly general hours and that young people might be exposed to it. I believe that we should provide only restricted licences for national parks. If a restaurant licence were provided, people would have to partake of meals in conjunction with the consumption of liquor. At Windy Point and Mount Lofty a restaurant licence would be an advantage.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We have already amended this provision in amendment No. 13 to provide that it does not have to be a full publican's licence but can be a restaurant licence or another type of licence.

Mr. CUMBE: If a limited licence were granted in national parks, I could see that it would be an advantage, but I would oppose provision for hotel drinking hours.

Mr. SHANNON: Under this provision any area could be declared a national park at any unspecified time. The Loftia Park resort in my district is an ideal place for recreation and is used particularly by teenagers. Therefore, I should not like to see any liquor facilities available.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I do not think they would be made available there.

Mr. SHANNON: I hope the Minister is right. However, under this provision even the annex to the Botanic Garden could be declared a national park. I believe this provision is too wide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that something will be said about the point I have made, because it seems perfectly obvious that this amendment is not in the proper form from a drafting point of view. As I see it, the Government could proclaim a public lavatory in Victoria Square as a national park and give the proprietor a licence. Why is it necessary to proclaim a national park under the Licensing Act?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I oppose the amendment. I refer members to sections 3 and 13 of the National Pleasure Resorts Act. It seems that lands declared for use as pleasure resorts or parks are vested in the Minister, pursuant to section 5. This amendment virtually amends the National Pleasure Resorts Act by proclamation, because it empowers the Governor to declare that lands shall be constituted as pleasure resorts and that people with premises on those lands may sell intoxicating liquor on those premises. Because Parliament, by the National Pleasure Resorts Act, has prohibited the sale of liquor on pleasure resorts, Parliament ought to decide whether a person is to have a licence to sell liquor there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are we going to let this through? Is the Minister not going to try to save it by moving an amendment that makes sense?

Mr. Hudson: It makes sense.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I favour the intention of the amendment, which is to provide that, by proclamation, the lessee of premises on a national park or pleasure resort shall be allowed to hold a licence. However, I am not satisfied that the amendment does what the Premier has said it does; therefore, I should appreciate further information from him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Much has been made of a harmless amendment. The member for Mitcham, who is a lawyer, must know that this is a short form of amendment that avoids the necessity for a long amendment ruling out the provisions of the National Pleasure Resorts Act. We do not achieve anything by declaring the lavatory in Victoria Square a pleasure resort, regardless of what people think about whether it is appropriate for that purpose. This merely provides that the Governor "may" declare certain places.

Mr. Hudson: It is still subject to legislation and the lessee has to go to the court.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only power given here is power to proclaim a national pleasure resort or park. It has nothing to do with licensing. The relevant part of the amendment, leaving out the reference to Wilpena Pound, provides that "a licence may be granted to the proprietor of any other premises situated upon any lands that the Governor declares by proclamation (which he is hereby empowered to do) to be a national pleasure resort or a national park".

Mr. Hudson: You cannot leave out the words "subject to the provisions of this Act" and get the sense of the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That does not affect the point. We want to provide that the court can give a licence for premises on places that are already national pleasure resorts. Therefore, there is no reason to give the Governor power under this legislation to proclaim pleasure resorts. If the Premier can satisfy me on this point I shall withdraw my objection. This seems to me to be absolutely against what we want to do. Does the Premier intend to give an explanation?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have already given it, but you would not listen.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not prepared to go without an explanation, because this is making a mockery of the thing. Am I in order in moving an amendment to this amendment at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN: It all depends on the amendment that the honourable member has in mind.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the Government would do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot expect the Government to prepare amendments for him.

Mr. SHANNON: Is there a definition of "pleasure resorts" in any legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE moved:

To strike out "declares" and insert "has declared".

Mr. QUIRKE: I think the amendment is satisfactory. We want the capacity to be expeditious occasionally. We have been frustrated far too long by having to go through lengthy procedures to provide simple amenities.

Mr. Millhouse's amendment negatived.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Premier indicate what constitutes a pleasure resort? I cannot find a definition in the National Pleasure Resorts Act. Is there a definition in any other legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot draw the member's attention to it immediately. There is a series of opinions of the Crown Solicitor as to what constitutes a national pleasure resort.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask the Minister to reconsider the whole purpose of this provision. He said that this was inserted in another place, but he did not say that it had been inserted as a result of a Government amendment.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: So what? Do I have to do so?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would have thought that the Government's policy would be to maintain the law in respect of national parks. If it is to be changed, the Government should change it in a proper manner; it should not do it by a back-door method—by an amendment to the National Pleasure Resorts Act contained in the Licensing Bill, because that is what this means. The Minister is hoping to develop a site in the Adelaide Hills; he has thrown it open for public offer. He had said that the Liberal Government had not done anything about it, but if he consults the record he will see that that Government drew up plans and specifications and hawked them around to see whether a worthwhile operator could be obtained. That Government was prepared to build—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he must not discuss the matter he is now discussing because it is not the subject matter of the amendment. What the Playford Government did in connection with national parks has no connection with the matter now under consideration. I ask the member for Gumeracha to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The purpose of the amendment is to enable a restaurant at Windy Point to obtain a licence, as the Minister knows. Unless he can offer a licence, he will not get any applications. If it were only a question of a liquor licence for Windy Point I would not oppose the amendment, if the Minister would assure me that no proclamation would be made except with regard to Windy Point. I oppose having liquor in the National Park, Belair, and that will be the next step.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hall, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Millhouse, Quirke, and Walsh.

Noes (10)—Messrs. Ferguson, Heaslip, McAnaney, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Rodda and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 13 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 15 to 20.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That amendments Nos. 15 to 20 be agreed to. Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 21.

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

To strike out "one year" and insert "two years".

It was agreed that there should be a restriction on the proliferation of single-bottle licences for a period after the Act came into force, to allow for the changeover of present retail and some wholesale outlets to single-bottle outlets. Many applications will be received for new single-bottle licences that will intrude on the licensed hotel trade and, consequently, a sensible compromise will be two years.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. I think one year is adequate.

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

Amendments Nos. 22 to 26.

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

That amendments Nos. 22 to 26 be agreed to.

These are all virtually drafting amendments. Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 27.

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

That amendment No. 27 be disagreed to, and that the following amendment be made to the words reinstated by such disagreement by adding at the end thereof "or whose trade in pursuance of the licence could be adversely affected by the granting of the licence".

The Legislative Council struck out from the condition that may be imposed by the court (that a club shall purchase its liquor from the holder of a full publican's licence in the vicinity) the words "in the vicinity". This would create considerable difficulties in obtaining conditional club licences. The Legislative Council's objections were that the words "in the vicinity" made the provision too restrictive, that it was not a very precise definition, and that there may be persons affected who might not be considered to be "in the vicinity". Therefore, it struck out those words.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Would an objection by a licensee in the vicinity be a valid one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it would. The point is that in the objections provisions of the Act the court has a very stringent duty to maintain the economics of licences already granted and not to do something that is likely to interfere severely with existing trade. The protection previously existing to licensed publicans was that anyone wanting to get a club licence and interfering with their licensed activity had to get past local option polls. That does not now exist. These conditional licences could be very freely granted. One of the points the Royal Commissioner made very strongly was that there may be sporting clubs who want not the full activity of the fully registered clubs but only some sort of periodic activity. This would include clubs such as bowling clubs and others who want to continue the activities they have carried on illegally for some time. If those clubs agreed to buy at retail from the publicans in the vicinity, that would overcome the objections because the publicans would not then be losing trade.

Mr. Heaslip: This is almost blackmail.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why the member for Rocky River says that. People who have been carrying on with illegal activity for years are getting a privilege which

they did not previously have. I suggest that the original provision as it passed this place could be widened to cope with the difficulty the Legislative Council foresaw, and that adding the words "or whose trade in pursuance of the licence could be adversely affected by the granting of the licence" would do that. This would confine the purchase to those people who could validly object that the licence would interfere with their position as licensees. This is one of the things the court may impose. It is not bound to impose it: it is in the discretion of the court. This is one of the two conditions specifically spelt out as a direction to the court of the kind of conditions we are looking to in providing conditional licences. It is still not mandatory on the court to impose it.

Mr. HALL: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. I believe this amendment passed through the other place without any division. So far as I can see, there was no division of opinion on it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There was no division, but there was a difference of opinion.

Mr. HALL: I understand it was accepted by the Government in another place.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you think the member for Alexandra a few moments ago was not expressing a difference of opinion with the Government? There was no division then.

Mr. HALL: I happen to be talking about another place. The Premier has said his amendment would require the club to purchase from someone whose trade might be in danger. Why might his trade be in danger? A club may not want to purchase from a person for the reason that he is not a good publican, but he could still prove that his trade might be in danger. I think the clubs should be left a free choice. If a minimum price applies, it is not likely that a club will go hawking its business around. Why should not clubs be able to choose in this respect?

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier's amendment is the nearest I have heard to creating a restrictive trade practice. In a small country town the publican may be the club's worst enemy, and to say that the publican's business may be adversely affected if the club does not purchase its liquor from the hotel is going a step too far. Is the Government in favour of creating monopolies? We should leave the amendment as it was framed by another place.

Mr. HUDSON: On his remarks, the member for Onkaparinga should be supporting the Premier in this matter. Does he not agree that a further alternative will be provided?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I like the Premier's proposal less than I liked the original provision: first, we are making it obligatory for a club to buy its supplies from licensed premises in the vicinity; and, secondly, a direction is virtually being given to the court in deciding the issue of a licence. What is the position in a place such as Port Lincoln with five hotels, all of which would be considered to be in the vicinity of a club established in the town?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In that case, a fair area of choice would exist.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Quite; but I take it that the Premier is now saying that the court shall consider an application in accordance with an objection lodged by any person whose business may be adversely affected. Every one of the five hotels in Port Lincoln would argue that its business was being adversely affected and, instead of one objection being made to the court, five would be made. The proposal to insert other words in the amendment is unacceptable to me.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the Legislative Council's amendment, simply because I object to creating monopolies. What does "vicinity" mean? I doubt whether the word can be interpreted legally. Regardless of the vicinity, hotels would all object and a club could not obtain a limited licence. What the Premier suggests would merely make a bad clause worse.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. Although I was not really in favour of the original wording ("vicinity" is too vague), I am less in favour of what the Premier seeks to do. Clubs, because they have to buy liquor from a hotel, cannot make large profits, if any; they will not be able to accumulate money in order to provide better facilities. On the other hand, hotels, with the margin of profit that they enjoy, are in a much better position. I strongly oppose the Premier's amendment, because it is unjust.

Mr. CASEY: Members opposite have missed the whole point. We hear talk of a "monopoly" being granted to hotel keepers, but what about the other side of it? Hotel keepers have bought businesses to carry on lawful trading, but at present these clubs are operating illegally. What do members opposite want? They are not concerned about what is happening legally with the hotels.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you sure it is all lawful trading?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member wouldn't know. We have to go with the times. If the honourable member's company was selling liquor today, he would probably have a different point of view because his business would be protected. The member for Onkaparinga has said there is one hotel in each of many country areas. That may be true but there is probably not the same number of clubs in those places where there is only one hotel. However, the people who have bought hotels have spent money in order to be able to run a lawful business, to sell liquor for their livelihood. They are entitled to protection, but honourable members opposite do not want to give it to them. They are not concerned one iota about them; their only concern is the clubs, and they have not yet been granted a licence. This clause as it went from this Chamber was a good one, and I supported it. I do not agree to the Legislative Council's amendment, because it gives the publican no protection.

Mr. McANANEY: The clause states that the clubs must buy from a hotel with a full publican's licence. The further amendment now is that a club must buy from a particular hotel. Members opposite are not being consistent when they say that we on this side are not concerned about the livelihood of the hotel keeper. The Premier wants the clubs to buy from a particular hotel, which is giving an unfair advantage to one person who may not be providing the service he should. The member for Frome is drawing a red herring across the trail when he says that the hotels should be fully protected. One bowling club in my district operates perhaps illegally, but no more illegally than the hotels operate at present under the Prices Act, because they get a 40c rebate from the brewery on every dozen bottles, provided they comply with the conditions laid down by the Australian Hotels Association. This clause as amended by another place will protect the hotels and the individual's liberty to buy his liquor where he wants to, even at a higher price than elsewhere.

The Committee divided on the Hon. D. A. Dunstan's motion to disagree to the Legislative Council's amendment:

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

Noes (15)—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney,

Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Teusner.
Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Legislative Council's amendment thus disagreed to.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan's amendment carried.

Amendments Nos. 28 to 45.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:
That amendments Nos. 28 to 45 be agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 28 to 30 are minor amendments and do not include anything of substance; amendment No. 31 is connected with the establishment of five-gallon licences; amendments Nos. 32 to 38 are again merely minor amendments; amendment No. 39 establishes the \$10 fee for five-gallon licences; and amendments Nos. 40 to 45 are again minor amendments and could be agreed to.

Mr. QUIRKE: I refer to amendment No. 31. My head is bowed in mourning at the passing of something that has been a treasured principle of wine trade sales in South Australia. There was a time when anybody could make wine and sell two gallons of it to anybody. Without any licence, people could sell five gallons of wine to a licensee. These little, historical liberties that are precious in many ways are now being whittled away and we have in their place rigid administration. No liberty is left. If I could have my way I would kick this provision down to hell where it belongs in order to preserve some of the traditions of liberty that we have had in this country. Would there be any risk that, if Greeks, Sardinians or anybody else brought wine into this country under this type of licence, it would murder the trade in this country? Would that do anybody any harm? We have the Customs Department and the Licensing Court to prevent this. The little places concerned do not sell much wine but they will now have to have a vigneron's licence and pay \$10 for the privilege of selling five gallons of wine. Why on earth do we have to do these things? If I move to kick this provision downstairs, will any members support me?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I would have, but I do not think we could get the numbers.

Mr. QUIRKE: Then I am left to myself. I love a glass of wine and, if I make it myself, I want the liberty to be able to sell it in small quantities.

Mr. SHANNON: My heart almost bled when I listened to the member for Burra. If he moved to delete the fee of \$10, he would get more support than he realized. The cost of issuing a licence is not great and I suggest that the fee is too great.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47.

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

That amendments Nos. 46 and 47 be disagreed to.

These amendments relate to writing into the objection provisions a definition of a recognized youth centre in addition to the other institutions in relation to which there may be grounds for objection to the establishment of licensed premises in the vicinity if the licensed premises were incommoding the people who used the institutions. It is extremely difficult to define a youth centre, because I know from my experience as a former Minister of Social Welfare that premises ranging from tin sheds to large premises are regarded by people as being youth centres. These amendments could lead to much litigation and present difficulties far in excess of the virtues of inserting them.

Mr. HALL: These amendments seem reasonable, because the court will decide whether the places are proper places for youths to frequent. The difficulty about definition applies equally to hospitals. What is the difference between a hospital, a convalescent home and a boarding home?

Mr. Casey: What age would the people attending a youth centre be? You cannot define it.

Mr. HALL: No, and the honourable member cannot define a hospital.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A hospital has to be licensed under legislative provisions.

Mr. HALL: I think this should be a matter for the court to decide. I am sure that the members of another place had in mind places properly recognized as youth centres.

Mr. Casey: Do you know of any such youth centre?

Mr. HALL: Yes, the Salisbury Youth Centre.

Amendments disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 48 to 52.

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

That amendments Nos. 48 to 52 be agreed to.

These are minor amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54.

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

That amendments Nos. 53 and 54 be disagreed to.

I do so on similar grounds to those relating to amendments Nos. 46 and 47. There are further grounds of objection covering the circumstances the Leader has mentioned. Reference is made to disturbing the quiet of the locality in which premises are situated and there is a more stringent provision regarding occupants of neighbouring areas.

Amendments disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 55 to 57.

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

That amendments Nos. 55 to 57 be agreed to.

These are minor amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 58.

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

In subsection (1) to strike out "a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member" and insert "visitors under and in accordance with subsection (1a1) of this section".

I propose to explain all my proposed amendments, which I have circulated, and I suggest that we then deal with them *seriatim*. The first matter of objection is that the Legislative Council has provided that a permit may be "for the keeping, sale and supply of liquor for consumption only by the members of a club or a visitor in the presence and at the expense of a member". This opens the door so wide that it will be impossible to have any effective control. We originally provided in these permit clauses that there were to be restrictions on membership. However, the Legislative Council's amendment provides that the member can have as many visitors as he wants to have and can buy them drinks under the permit. The permit clauses were designed to restrict activities to the kinds of activity now going on, not to open the door wide to wholesale trading. The objection raised by members in another place was that some small clubs that would be seeking permits would occasionally have in the premises somebody who was not a member.

Mr. Millhouse: It would be often, not occasionally.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Even if it is often, I do not see why we should open the door to an enormous number of people. After discussion with members of the Legislative Council, I propose that each member be limited

to one visitor on a permitted occasion. This would allow members to look after their visitors on this occasion but it would not create the open slather, which is permitted as this clause stands at present.

Mr. Casey: Private clubs have this in their constitutions now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The next proposal relates to the limitation upon the purchases made by the club. Here the objection was that, if the limitation was in the form in which it left this House, there would be a difficulty where in a small area there was a disagreement between a club and a licensee. My proposal is a reasonable compromise.

I propose to restore the clause to the form in which it left this House in respect of restrictions on purchases of liquor by the holders of these permits. However, in addition I propose to insert a further allowance that the court must allow for going beyond this; clause 66 (1b) (b), as it came from the Legislative Council, states:

if it is impracticable for the provisions of paragraph (a) of this subsection to be complied with, from the holder of a licence under this Act nominated by the court;

If it is not practicable to have it confined to a particular area, then the court can act in its discretion. I propose to put that provision back where it stood when it left this House.

Mr. HEASLIP: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think members are entitled to have copies of what is proposed. I had an incorrect copy, and we do not know what is being discussed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I apologized to the honourable member when he was not here for having given him an incorrect copy,

and I looked for him to give him a correct one. I am sorry he was not here to get it. I am trying to explain the amendments so that members will have the opportunity, after the adjournment, to study them. If the court is aware that the limitation prescribed in the clauses will leave the permittees without a reasonable choice of licensees it may allow them the choice without the previous restriction. This would overcome the Legislative Council's objection and, in proper cases, it would confine the purchase by permittees, in places where they have a reasonable choice, to those persons whose trade would be adversely affected if people were allowed to buy anywhere in the State. This is a compromise.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker, I do not know why we have had this change of procedure. What about the remaining business on the Notice Paper?

The SPEAKER: The motion cannot be debated.

Motion carried.

At 5.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 26, at 2 p.m.