

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 7, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

SUNDAY CRICKET

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that the Chief Secretary has been approached by the promoters of an Australian tour by an international body of cricketers. In order to provide a tour that will give people in Australia an opportunity of seeing the best cricketers in the world, the most representative cricketers of a number of countries, it was found that the only feasible day in Adelaide was a Sunday. It was proposed that the tour provide for a day of cricket on Sunday at the Norwood Oval, in my district, and the permission of the council in that area was obtained. While it is possible that there would be a large gathering of people, at the same time it is not likely that there would be any remarkable amount of noise emanating from the Norwood Oval on that occasion. I cannot see that people in the surrounding areas would in any way be likely to be adversely affected by the playing of cricket on the oval on that day: indeed, from my knowledge of the area, I am sure that would not be so. It appears that the Chief Secretary has not been prepared to grant permission for this game as it falls within the category of case for which he must give special permission because it includes members of teams representing different countries. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Chief Secretary to see whether favourable consideration cannot be given immediately to allowing this to go ahead? Otherwise, it is possible there will be no opportunity for people in South Australia to see these international cricketers.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to get a report from the Chief Secretary for the Leader.

WARREN MAIN

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I raised with the former Minister of Works the situation concerning the old Warren trunk main and, as a result of representations made at that time, I believe action was taken to remedy the situation as it then existed in some localities. However, I have again received representations concerning this main. As the Minister of Works

knows, some years ago the Warren trunk main was replaced by a new and larger main. I understand that a contractor arranged with the Engineering and Water Supply Department to excavate the site of the old main, and he obtained the right to sell the pipes therefrom. At present, however, hundreds of these pipes are lying (in some cases they are stacked) alongside roadways and in some cases on private property. District councils in my area (and I understand also in other areas) are concerned about the presence of these pipes on roadsides. Landholders are also concerned, because some of the excavations made by the contractor concerned have not been filled in and, in addition, the presence of the pipes on their land prevents their using that land for agricultural purposes. Will the Minister ascertain what action will be taken to have these pipes removed at an early date?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have some knowledge of this situation and particularly of the contractor involved, and I have seen some of these pipes lying on the properties to which the honourable member has referred. Although this is not an easy case, I will certainly try to expedite the matter for the honourable member.

TEACHER'S SUSPENSION

Mr. HUDSON: Mrs. Dianne McLellan, now living in my district but formerly living in Hillcrest, is a home science teacher in the Education Department and attached to the Seacombe High School and, until last Friday, she was single. In mid-July she applied to the department for a day's leave in order to be married. She and her husband wished to be married at the registry office, and the problem was that, as that office is open only from Monday to Friday, between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., there was no way in which Miss Goddard, as she then was, could have been married without having time off during school hours. She was told, when her application for one day's leave was refused, that if she wished to have the day off she would have to resign and then, once she married, apply for re-employment. However, by doing this she would have lost, for example, her continuity regarding long service leave entitlements, and she did not resign. At the time, she told the department that she would be married in her own time but later discovered that this was not possible, because the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages was available to

conduct a ceremony only from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays. Last Friday she took two hours off to be married (from 1.30 to 3.30 in the afternoon). She notified the Headmaster accordingly on Friday morning but as a result of this she has been suspended. She was told (I think on the Monday) that she could resign but that, if she did not resign within a day, a recommendation would be made to the Minister that she be fired. Can the Minister of Education say whether this matter has yet reached her attention? If it has not, will she fully consider the matter and particularly take into account the difficult circumstances in which Mrs. McLellan was placed in that she could be married only between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Mondays to Fridays and the department had already refused her a day's leave of absence?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I anticipated a question of this type about this teacher from the member for Glenelg, I obtained a report. I did this after being telephoned at about midday on Monday by a representative of a television channel, who told me that this teacher had come to the station, then gave me certain information and asked whether I would comment. I said I was not prepared to comment until I had called for a report on the matter and that this would take a little time to do. However, Miss Goddard (now Mrs. McLellan) was interviewed on the channel that evening. A report was put on my desk the next morning (which was yesterday), and I had it in the House yesterday in case the member for Glenelg asked a question about the matter, as I thought he might. The report of the Director of Technical Education is as follows:

On July 11, Miss D. Goddard (as she was then) applied for leave of absence on Thursday, August 29, for the purpose of getting married. The Acting Director of Technical Education informed Miss Goddard by letter on July 17 that "it is not the policy to grant leave to teachers for the purpose of marriage", and pointed out that it would be necessary for her to submit her resignation at the end of school on Wednesday, August 28, and to apply for re-employment in a temporary capacity from Sunday, September 1. In a reply dated July 18, Miss Goddard wrote to the Director of Technical Education and informed him that she wished "to withdraw my application for leave to be married. I will be married on or before that date out of school hours." This letter was acknowledged. On Friday, August 2, Miss Goddard informed Mr. J. Waite (Headmaster of Seacombe High School) that she would be absent that afternoon to get married. Miss Goddard left the

school without permission. Mr. Waite reported the matter to the Superintendent of Technical Education, who asked him to instruct Miss Goddard on her return to school on Monday, August 5, to report to the Director of Technical Education immediately.

Miss Goddard reached this office just before 10 a.m. on Monday, August 5. I interviewed her at about 10 a.m. and asked her whether she realized she had left school without permission. She said that she knew of this. I pointed out that this was the second occasion on which she had left her school without approval. Again she indicated her agreement to this statement. I then informed her that, if she could not indicate any alleviating circumstances that would cause me to change my recommendation, I proposed to recommend the termination of her appointment to the Director-General of Education. She mentioned that previously it had been suggested that she should resign. I indicated that if she wished to resign I would hold my hand on my recommendation for a short time during the morning to give her the chance to do so, and I asked her to write her resignation immediately if she proposed to do so. No resignation was forthcoming. I had informed Miss Goddard during the interview that she was suspended pending a decision upon her case.

During the afternoon, the Headmaster of Seacombe High School informed me (and I passed it on immediately to the Deputy Director-General) that Miss Goddard (or Mrs. McLellan as she now is) was to be interviewed on Channel 7 news last evening. She and her husband were interviewed and Mrs. McLellan informed the interviewer to the effect that she was to be dismissed because she had taken two hours off to be married. Her husband made some remark concerning democracy. This morning (August 6) Mrs. McLellan appeared at Seacombe High School and the Headmaster, who had been informed throughout, refused to permit her to sign on. Acting on your instructions I called Mrs. McLellan to this office and asked her her intentions concerning the resignation which she spoke of yesterday. She said her husband would not permit her to resign, and whilst she was in my office her husband rang me saying he proposed to see his member of Parliament (Mr. H. Hudson) and, if necessary, he would see the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan). I merely answered that that was his right.

Mr. HUDSON: I was interested in the report read by the Minister because it coincided almost exactly with what I had been told by Mrs. McLellan. In the past, I have always found such agreement in facts to be a fairly reliable guide as to the truthfulness or otherwise of a person making an approach. I point out that Mrs. McLellan came to see me last evening. I also inform the Minister that on the previous occasion when Mrs. McLellan (as Miss Goddard) left the school without notice the circumstances were that her father

had to enter hospital on a serious matter about which she was considerably upset. This situation may well be a complicating factor at present as well. Therefore, both occasions on which the officers have complained appear to be surrounded by extenuating circumstances. On the first occasion (and I believe this involved the Glossop High School), there was the sudden illness of her father, and on the second occasion, when she withdrew her application for leave and indicated she would not resign but get married in her own time, she did not appreciate the fact that the registry office opened only between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., Mondays to Fridays. In view of these extenuating circumstances, will the Minister consider removing the suspension that has currently been placed on Mrs. McLellan so that she can be re-employed as home science teacher at Seacombe High School?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Minister replies to this question, I think I should make it clear, so that there will be no confusion about the Standing Orders, that identical questions are not allowed under Standing Orders. In this case, I do not think the question is identical and, therefore, I think the Minister can reply. The honourable member has raised some new matters in his second question and his phrasing of the last part of the question is slightly different from his phrasing of the first question. However, it must be remembered that identical questions cannot be permitted.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I point out that, as I said in the course of reading the report, Mrs. McLellan has been informed that she has been suspended pending a decision on her case. That means that some action will be taken, and I cannot forecast what that action will be. A certain recommendation will be made to me on this matter in due course. I point out, however, that this policy regarding leave of absence for marriage exists because teachers get so many weeks of holiday in a year. If there are any extenuating circumstances a teacher is perfectly free to air them when asking for leave. This teacher did not give any extenuating circumstances until afterwards, although the honourable member said that she did not know the registry office was open until only 4 p.m. However, that is why the department has adopted that policy. I further confirm this by saying that the action of the Acting Director of Technical Education with regard to leave of absence for marriage was based on a policy approved on April 7,

1966, by the then Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday). I therefore believe that the Acting Director of Technical Education acted with propriety and correctly, within the ambit of that approved policy.

RED SCALE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My question relates to red scale on citrus fruits. Everyone knows that the Agriculture Department has spent much money in an effort to prevent the spread of red scale, which has such a serious effect on our fruit industry. People have spent many thousands of dollars establishing citrus farms on the Murray River and in other areas. However, there seems to be no control over red scale in the metropolitan area, and owners of some metropolitan gardens are spending much time trying to prevent its spread, whereas their neighbours make no effort to do so. It is therefore difficult for people with the best intentions to prevent the spread of this menace, which is such a great danger to the industry. Will the Minister of Lands therefore ask the Minister of Agriculture whether legislation or regulations can be introduced to prevent the spread of this disease in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

SCIENTOLOGY

Mr. EVANS: A letter to the Editor by Mr. R. I. Linke of Plympton Park which appeared in the *Advertiser* on Thursday, August 1, stated that the Adelaide Scientology Centre intended to provide a five-day children's course in scientology during September this year. I telephoned Mr. W. Wilkinson at the Adelaide Scientology Centre, and he confirmed that such child classes were to be held. Having been asked the reasons for having such courses and their expected effect on children, he replied, "To improve the mental ability of children, thereby improving their capacity for life." The *Advertiser* of July 27 this year reported that the British Government had acted to restrict the activities of this cult. The British Minister of Health (Mr. Robinson) was reported as saying that the British Government was satisfied that scientology was socially harmful. Above all, its methods could be a serious danger to the health of those who submitted to it. He was further reported as saying that there was evidence that children were being indoctrinated. The article further stated that in Victoria a law banning scientology came into force in December,

1965. The Victorian Act provides that any person who practises scientology for fee or reward or who advertises as a scientologist faces a first offence penalty of \$200 increasing to a fine of \$500 and two years' gaol for a second or subsequent offence. Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, investigate what form the classes will take and whether they are harmful, and will he assure the House that there is no necessity to ban this cult or to restrict its activities?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I did not see the letter to which the honourable member has referred; however, this morning I did see a letter regarding some sects that apparently have been canvassing in the Salisbury area. I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a report.

WHYALLA HOUSING

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about housing at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been supplied with the following report by the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust:

The trust maintains frequent contact with Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla, and is aware of the estimated housing requirements over the next two to three years. The present housing shortage was largely brought about by the advancement of the company's programme during 1967-68. What was to have been expansion over a period of about three years was accelerated to bring the coke ovens and pelletising plant into earlier production. The increased demand for steel has further aggravated the housing situation, and the trust has taken steps to alleviate the situation. Since July 1, 1968, contracts totalling 211 houses for both sale and rental have been let, the contractors for which include five not previously operating in Whyalla. The trust, which formerly concentrated on rental accommodation to a large degree for expediency, is now developing a balanced programme to enable those who have established themselves and now wish to own their own homes to do so, thus releasing more rental accommodation for new arrivals.

I wish to add to the General Manager's report that I am completely happy that B.H.P. Company Limited has accelerated progress on its plant and installations. In quoting the General Manager's report I do not mean in any way to criticize the company for its action: what I have said is merely an explanation of the circumstances that arose.

STOCK THEFTS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about stock thefts in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked about the problem of sheep and cattle that last autumn were driven backwards and forwards along South-East roads. I draw his attention to section 670 (3) of the Local Government Act, which provides for regulating and controlling the driving, depasturing, feeding, and watering of livestock and also prohibits the driving of livestock in or along specified streets or roads at specified times of the day.

BANK HOLIDAY

Mr. BROOMHILL: On July 25, I asked the Premier a question about an application by the Australian Bank Officials Association to the Government to declare December 31 a bank holiday. I pointed out that, as this day fell on a Tuesday and as both the Monday and the Wednesday were holidays, many bank officers could have a substantial break over the Christmas period if it were declared a bank holiday. Many bank officers who are stationed in the country may wish to spend the break in the city and many bank officers who are stationed in the city may wish to spend the break in the country. When I first asked my question, the Premier said that this action took place in his absence and, consequently, he was unfamiliar with it. Has the Premier now made himself familiar with the decision made in his absence and, if he has, will he reconsider that decision?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I regret that I do not have with me the reply that has been prepared. It had been put in my bag but it is not there now. I will obtain it tomorrow and bring it down without fail.

BERRI POLICE STATION

Mr. ARNOLD: In the light of the present unsatisfactory conditions at the Berri police station, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary when work will commence on providing new facilities and better conditions for police officers at that town?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report from the Chief Secretary.

POLITICAL ALLEGATION

Mr. CORCORAN: Yesterday, in reply to my question on notice, the Premier said he had conducted an inquiry and had ascertained that no member of his Party had at any time alleged that I was a Communist. Mr. Speaker,

I did not ask the Premier whether any member of his Party had said that I was a Communist, and at no time have I accused any member of the Government Party of saying that. The question I asked was whether any member of the Premier's Party had said that I was subject to the influence of Communists. Has the Premier a reply to that question?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Many things were said during the Millicent by-election campaign, not all of them by one side or the other of politics. I believe that the honourable member is unduly sensitive about this matter:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have given the honourable member an answer, which is that no member of my Party has called him a Communist. As far as I am concerned, the matter is closed.

Mr. CORCORAN: In his reply the Premier said that he thought I was sensitive about this matter. He is correct: I am. The Premier has still not replied to my question. Will he inquire of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), and the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) whether or not during the by-election campaign at Millicent they made statements to the effect that I was subject to influence by Communists?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I repeat that I think the honourable member is rather sensitive; but he is not the only person who can be sensitive about rumours. I have been told that members of the Labor Party are saying that the public relations officer who assists me is a scientologist. When a question was asked in this House today by the member for Onkaparinga, the member for Millicent interjected and said he liked scientologists.

Mr. Corcoran: I did not.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: He did. He said those words in this House, and then says they are not true.

Mr. Corcoran: I did not say that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe this means that the honourable member is involved in something else in some other direction. Does he believe that my public relations officer is a scientologist? I say he is not.

Mr. Clark: We have never heard of this.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member mentioned this matter in this House today by interjection. There is not just one rumour going around South Australia: there are a number, and he knows there always

will be in relation to politics. If he desires to question a private member himself, he can do so but, as far as I am concerned, the matter is closed.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But you promised an inquiry.

The SPEAKER: Order! With great respect to the whole House, I think this question of what one member thinks of another is of no public interest.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am upset and disturbed to hear that someone in this House is alleged to have said that the public relations officer is a scientologist. I am concerned because his parents are highly respected citizens, both serving in public life, both constituents of mine who live in my street and who attend the same church as I attend; and I consider them to be my personal friends. I have the highest regard for this public relations officer as a Christian gentleman. I am disturbed, as I feel that I am accused of being one that is guilty of spreading these alleged rumours, equally with everyone else. Will the Premier therefore state the name of the person who started this rumour?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think this matter has gone far enough. Much that has been brought up by the Opposition is based on rumour alone. I brought up the parallel purely to illustrate to members the difficulty of chasing rumours in the political field. I do not accuse any individual (as I have said before), nor do I intend to accuse any individual. As far as I am concerned the case has ended, but I draw this to members' attention, as I did before: these matters can, unfortunately, go on and on. Indeed, during the Millicent by-election rumours about me circulated, but I have forgotten them. What good is it if I continue to fight this rumour? I ask members to overlook this type of rumour, but if they are not prepared to do so, then that is their business. This sort of thing is not at all one-sided.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We don't call you Fascists.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Only one side is involved, if it is involved at all. People in politics have heard all sorts of things, and if we as members, who hear this sort of thing, ask questions about it, we could fill up Question Time completely in chasing these rumours. I accept the explanation of the honourable member for Hindmarsh, and I admire him for it. As far as I am concerned, this

matter is closed. I raised that point as an illustration, as there is an unending number of rumours about political people in this State. The matter is best left at that.

NORTHERN ROAD

Mr. McANANEY: A constituent of mine with extensive commercial interests in the Northern Territory is finding it most difficult to get his goods into the Northern Territory because of the lack of suitable roads and also because of breakages to his goods when they are transported on the Commonwealth railways. What perturbs him is that he considers that much Northern Territory trade is going to other States because of these conditions. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads what plans, either short-term or long-term, are being made for a new north-south road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know that this matter is concerning the Minister of Roads, and I think I am correct in saying that he intends to make a personal inspection along the line in the next few weeks. However, I will take the matter up with him and supply all the available information as soon as I can.

RAIL SERVICES

Mr. HUGHES: My question deals with a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* of May 8 on behalf of the Government, concerning the cancellation of passenger rail services to certain country towns. On May 9 I sent a telegram to the Minister of Transport protesting against the cancellation of passenger rail services between Moonta and Adelaide, and on May 24 I introduced to him a deputation representing people from the Moonta, Wallaroo, Kadina, Bute and Paskeville areas. This deputation, which was introduced following a public meeting that had been held in the Wallaroo Town Hall, was courteously received by the Minister of Transport, who on June 24 wrote me a letter, as follows:

I refer to the deputation from the Corporation of Wallaroo and the District Council of Kadina which you introduced on May 24, 1968, regarding the proposed cancellation of rail passenger services to Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta. The Government has fully considered the representations made and I advise as set out hereunder:

While there will be no retrenchment of railway employees, and the Government is adamant on this, there must admittedly be some movement of railway personnel from the area. This will be kept to a minimum within the limits of efficiency and will have full regard to the welfare of employees.

As it was assumed from the letter that the Government wished to cancel the rail passenger service between Adelaide and Moonta, will the Attorney-General refer to the Minister of Transport the request made to me by several residents in my district that he consider having one passenger rail service operating between Moonta and Adelaide each day instead of cancelling both services?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague about this matter.

EYRE PENINSULA POLICE STATIONS

Mr. EDWARDS: Recently, while visiting my district, amongst other things I called on the Elliston and Port Kenny police stations. As I understand that improvements to buildings and fencing are to be made at these stations, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary what work is to be done and when it will be completed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: As a new primary school at Surrey Downs is being built and, from observations, is almost completed, although the playing area still requires attention, can the Minister of Education say when this school will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

ANGAS CREEK

Mr. GILES: The Torrens River below Angas Creek divides several grazing properties. When the Mannum-Adelaide main was completed as far as Angas Creek, water was pumped down the creek and allowed to flow down the Torrens River to the weir. This water prevented access from one side of the properties to the other, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, understanding the situation on two properties, built a bridge on one and a causeway on the other. However, a flood in the following winter washed away the bridge. The property owner had been told that, when the main was completed, no further water would be let down Angas Creek to the Torrens River, because this flow would cut his property in half. However, water has since been let down Angas Creek continually during the pumping season, thus causing access to be difficult during the summer months. Will the Minister of Works ask the Engineering and Water Supply Department to consider making available suitable causeways or bridges at the two properties in

question so that these people can have access to their land on both sides of the river during the summer?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be pleased to investigate this problem and obtain a report.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HURST: Because of the present unemployment figures for South Australia and the apparent delay in getting industry, particularly the building industry, moving properly, will the Minister of Labour and Industry ascertain the number employed on the Gidgealpa pipeline; the numbers of South Australians and migrants employed on this pipeline; the labour force that it is contemplated will be employed at the completion of that project; and what the Government intends to do about preference to South Australian labour?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: That is a rather involved question, but I shall be pleased to obtain the information the honourable member requires and to bring it down as soon as possible.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, I received a booklet called *Taxi in South Australia* (the official organ of the Taxi-Cab Operators Association of South Australia) from a Mr. Hassall, of Fisher Street, Malvern, who is a taxi driver in my area. The booklet contains the following comment:

Message from Mick McCoy, Manager of St. Georges Taxi Service Ltd: As you know, comprehensive insurance is a tough proposition, and only by united effort can we do anything about reasonable cover at reasonable cost. It would appear that most insurers do not want taxis, and this has become more noticeable since the Government insurance has gone into oblivion. You must agitate to your member of Parliament and the Minister of Transport pointing out that such a major industry as ours is left in such a deplorable position of not being able to get comprehensive insurance and that it believes that it behoves the Government to come to an early realization and to provide same.

As it is alleged that taxi-cab operators are unable to obtain comprehensive insurance except at prohibitive premiums, as taxis are of benefit to the public, and in order to maintain reasonable fares, will the Premier ascertain whether these allegations are correct and say whether the Government intends to establish a State Government insurance office?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The answer to the last question is "No". I shall be happy to take up the question of comprehensive insur-

ance for taxi-cab operators and to bring down a considered report, which I trust will assist the honourable member.

PESTICIDES

Mr. BURDON: A recent article in the *Chronicle* states:

Some nasty shocks are looming for Australia's farmers and the big chemical companies that keep them supplied with a rising tide of pesticides, herbicides, fungicides, hormones, antibiotics and similar compounds. The fact that the Australian Agricultural Council has quietly recommended a total ban on the use on pastures of DDT (the oldest and best-known of the modern insecticides) has gone almost unremarked. So far no State has acted on the recommendation, but senior officials of most State Agriculture Departments were in conference last week deciding how best the recommendation can be implemented. The probability is that most States will endeavour to phase out the use of DDT on pastures over a period, thus avoiding possible problems of compensation for stocks held by chemical firms, retailers and farmers, and enabling farmers to be educated in the use of alternative compounds.

The DDT ban (which follows a similar prohibition on the use of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, including DDT, on Australian sheep and cattle, introduced in 1962) is merely the first of a series of similar shocks Australian agriculture must expect in the next few years. Many of Australia's major food markets, notably the United States, are drastically reducing the "tolerance levels" of pesticides they will permit in imported foodstuffs. Even under the old, more liberal, tolerance levels Australia has had food shipments rejected because of pesticide residues. It is doubtful whether many of our major export-oriented industries, including the meat, dairying, fruit and egg industries, will be able to meet the more stringent requirements of their customers unless drastic action is taken at a Government level.

In view of the recommendation of the Australian Agricultural Council, could the Minister of Lands indicate what action the Government is taking or proposes to take so that farmers and others may be informed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a report from the Minister of Agriculture and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

MINISTERIAL LETTERS

Mr. RYAN: Last week the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) asked the Attorney-General to discuss with the Minister of Transport the delays experienced by members in receiving replies to correspondence forwarded to the Minister. The Attorney-General said that he would confer with the Minister to see whether the matter could be rectified.

The member for Enfield said the case he had mentioned was probably not isolated. I wrote to the Minister on July 24, and on Monday, August 5, I received a letter dated July 26 acknowledging receipt of my letter. It was signed "C. Murray Hill". As this matter has been raised by more than one member, will the Attorney-General take it up with his colleague to see why there is this unnecessary and undue delay in forwarding letters to members?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already taken up the matter at the request of the member for Enfield.

Mr. Ryan: It did no good, apparently.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No. I am still waiting for the reply. I shall, however, at the specific request of the member for Port Adelaide be happy to make another request of the Minister of Transport to see what was the cause of the delay in this case.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: On previous occasions I have asked questions in this House about the compulsory acquisition of about two acres of land as an addition to the Tea Tree Gully Primary School, and on the last occasion (October 19, 1967) I was advised that the Crown Solicitor had stated that the Education Department could take possession of the land; further, that the Public Buildings Department had been advised that this land was required for playground purposes and it had been requested to undertake work to make the area suitable for this purpose. Unfortunately, although nine months has now passed and although I first raised this matter on May 19, 1965 (it is probably of no interest to the Minister to know this, but it was the first question I ever asked in this House) the school is still not obtaining any use from this piece of land, which would be a useful addition for playground purposes and as a separate section for infants on which the six existing removable infants classrooms could be placed so that the infants would thereby be separated entirely from the older schoolchildren. Will the Minister of Education inquire into this matter to see whether this piece of land could be used for the purpose for which it was purchased?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I understand the honourable member's real concern about this matter and will do all I can to expedite action on it

ROADWORKS

Mr. JENNINGS: In the last few days I have received many complaints about highways being dug up with consequent inconvenience to residents and business people. I mention particularly Grand Junction Road, where the Engineering and Water Supply Department was responsible, and the Main North Road, Pooraka, where apparently the Postmaster-General's Department was responsible. I acknowledge that the recent weather may have had some bearing on this matter, but apparently the roads have not been restored to their proper condition. Will the Attorney-General be good enough to ask the Minister of Roads to arrange for a departmental officer to follow up this matter, in conjunction with other departments (including Commonwealth departments) when roads are dug up, to ensure that the roads in question are restored to their proper condition as quickly as possible?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I am sure that one of the aims of the present Minister of Roads is to see that this is done, I will certainly discuss the matter with him and see whether it can be done more effectively.

QUESTIONS

Mr. McKEE: I desire to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. I have frequently indicated to you that I desire to ask a question, but I do not know whether you purposely have not seen me until the second round of questions is reached. I indicated quite early when I came into the Chamber this afternoon that I intended to ask a question and we have now reached the second round, some members having received two calls. Would you be prepared to inform the House of your policy in regard to seeing members who wish to ask questions?

The SPEAKER: I honestly did not see the honourable member raise his hand this afternoon to indicate that he wished to ask his first question. I am sorry if I did not call on him to ask his first question until we reached the second round. It might be interesting for honourable members to note the procedure I have adopted in this regard. Concerning those who raise their hands early in order to indicate that they wish to ask a question I draw a line through the names of the members concerned so as to indicate that they have asked a question. I go through that process, trying to keep the system as evenly balanced as possible, and I change over from one side of the House to the other in

calling on members. It will be understood that Opposition members sometimes have more questions to ask than have members on the Government side, bearing in mind the number of Ministers occupying the front bench. Consequently, Opposition members sometimes ask two questions successively before a Government member is called. However, I am trying to be as fair as I can.

Secondly, on a Tuesday, for example, if a member has an early call I note that call and may not give the member concerned an early call on Wednesday, and so the process continues. I believe the system works out fairly well, although apparently the honourable member for Port Pirie has been missed on this occasion.

FISHING RESTRICTIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: Last Thursday evening I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Lake, the Senior Lecturer in Zoology at the University of Sydney, who came over here for the sole purpose of visiting Renmark to address a conference of the River Murray Development League. Mr. Lake is especially interested in the study of the native freshwater fish of Australia; he established for the New South Wales Government the fisheries reserve station at Narrandera, and he is recognized as probably the foremost authority in this country on freshwater fish. In the light of the address given by Mr. Lake at the Renmark conference, which was attended by the Minister of Agriculture and his Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department, whether the restrictions at present applying in this State to freshwater fish will be revised?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain a report from the Minister of Agriculture.

NORTH-SOUTH LINE

Mr. CASEY: Some months ago when wet weather conditions were being experienced in the North of the State and in the Northern Territory, I was asked to comment on the situation concerning the North-South railway line. At the time, I did not pull any punches in expressing my views on this matter, and I am pleased that similar ideas were recently expounded by people in the Northern Territory when they attended before a special committee of the Commonwealth Government that was

investigating this problem. The people concerned referred to this North-South line as a "hillbilly" railway line. At about the time I made the statement to the press regarding the inadequacies of the line and the problems confronting people in the area concerned, I was displeased when I read the report of a statement made by the Premier, who indicated at that stage that he was not interested in the North-South railway line in this State because he had other important matters to discuss with the Commonwealth. However, I think that in fairness to the situation, and to South Australia as a whole, the Premier should be interested in this line, for it represents one of the means of communication between this State and the Northern Territory. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Commonwealth Government and ascertain what (and when) the Commonwealth Government intends to do about the problem of either building up the line from Marree to Alice Springs or constructing a new line (taking the route considerably out of the way) from Kingoonya to Alice Springs?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I disagree with little of what the honourable member has said, and I am sorry that he is displeased with me. Indeed, that is a situation that I should desire to end. However, I think the honourable member may have placed the wrong emphasis on what I said at the time: I said (and I still stand by what I said) that if I had to choose between standardization of inner lines and work on the North-South railway line, I would choose the former as warranting a higher priority.

Mr. Casey: This is not a South Australian line; it's a Commonwealth line.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is correct, and the honourable member is also correct in saying that I should be interested in the line. I am interested in the line, but I think the honourable member realizes that there must be a limit to the success of any approach made to the Commonwealth Government in this regard. I said at the time that if one had to be chosen, the inner line would be favoured. I know that the Minister of Transport has interested himself in this matter. On his trip to the North soon he will not only study the condition of the roads in the area but also study at first hand the North-South railway line with the object of assessing its potential. I will take up this matter again with the Minister and ascertain his current views on it, knowing that he is soon to inspect the line personally. It is on his assessment of the

situation that the next approach to the Commonwealth may be based. I assure the honourable member that the Government is vitally interested in this line, as it is an essential link—

Mr. Casey: You said you weren't interested in it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I disagree. I did not say I was not interested: I gave it a certain priority, and I hope I shall always be sufficiently honest to give my views on the priorities allocated for important public work.

MURRAY BRIDGE HOUSING

Mr. WARDLE: Although the Housing Trust has built many houses there, Murray Bridge has had a housing shortage for many years. As I believe the trust recently purchased additional land sufficient to provide more than 100 building blocks, can the Minister of Housing tell me whether additional houses are to be built at Murray Bridge and, if they are, how many of them will be for rental, how many for private sale, and when they are likely to be built?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the question involves some detail, I will get a complete report for the honourable member.

SILVERTON TRAMWAY COMPANY

Mr. McKEE: I understand that transport authorities from South Australia, New South Wales and the Commonwealth met the Silverton Tramway Company in Melbourne early this week to discuss the payment of compensation offered by the Commonwealth to the company for the replacement of its railway tracks by a standard gauge line. Has the Premier any information for the House as a result of this meeting?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not have anything at hand, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

CEDUNA POLICE STATION

Mr. EDWARDS: Recently, when in Ceduna, I spoke to the sergeant-in-charge of the police station who pointed out to me the poor condition of the building. It has only one small room in which the court is held and, if anyone comes in on other business, that business has to be conducted in the same room, and this is most inconvenient. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether something cannot be done to improve this situation and, if it can be, when work will be carried out?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will make the necessary inquiries.

McRITCHIE CRESCENT SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: After being approached by the welfare club of the school, I wrote recently to the Minister of Education about the grassing of McRitchie Crescent Primary School oval. The Minister was good enough to say on July 26 that she would look into the matter and communicate with me as soon as possible. Since then I have been approached by the school committee which is most concerned that time is passing; of course, the time when the grass should be planted has now arrived. The matter of grassing this oval was raised in mid-1967, but planting was postponed because of the water shortage. Since then the committee has been advised that an area of only 390ft. x 300ft. may be grassed and that the remainder of the area is to be rubble. On looking at a map of the school area, I believe that only about half of the area originally planned to be grassed will be grassed, in spite of the fact that the committee has been informed that a subsidy of \$1,000 has been allocated for 1968-69 and that the special grant provided in May, 1967, is still available. I point out to the Minister that near this area are some shops as well as residences and that, if the rubble is put down on the area now proposed, this will constitute a considerable dust nuisance. I should think it would cost nearly as much, if not as much, as the grassing would cost and would inevitably place a greater load on the small area of grassed land which would consequently wear out. Will the Minister give special attention to the matter to see whether it is possible to have grassed the original area proposed, and will she have the matter dealt with as soon as possible?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am sorry that the honourable member's letter to me has not received attention—I cannot understand that. I have received a letter (I believe from the school committee) pointing out these problems to me, which I have referred to departmental officers for a further report because, like the honourable member, I believe it is a pity that half the area should be treated with rubble, which would overflow into the grass area. For this reason I have asked for a report on the matter; I will expedite the inquiry and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

FREIGHT CHARGE

Mr. McANANEY: The charge for freight sent by rail from the Adelaide abattoir to Melbourne was recently between 80c and 85c

which was about the same as the charge for road transport. The South Australian Railways has reduced the rate, first to 75c and now to 68c. This price reduction has made it difficult for road transport operators to compete. Of course, I am not speaking against free competition in this instance. Bearing in mind that the Railways Department has incurred heavy losses in the past, can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, say whether this is a permanent reduction in the rate charged and whether the rate is economical?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but I shall be pleased to find out for the honourable member.

CUDLEE CREEK SANCTUARY

Mr. GILES: There is a large area of inaccessible land in the Cudlee Creek area that is being cleared and planted to radiata pine. Recently notices were erected on the boundaries of this land stating that the land had been declared a sanctuary. However, this area has been regarded as a breeding ground for foxes, and the landholders surrounding this area have been troubled for some time by foxes killing lambs, taking poultry and so on. Recently one of my neighbours lost all her turkey flock but four. Will the Minister of Lands therefore consider permitting responsible people to go into this area to reduce the number of foxes, thereby reducing the loss to landholders?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is evidently under the control of the Minister of Forests, so I will put the question to him. However, I draw attention to the provisions of the Fauna Conservation Act which provides that, although a sanctuary is proclaimed, it does not prevent the shooting of pests, provided that the person doing the shooting has the permission of the owner or overseer. In this case the overseer would no doubt be the forester in charge of the area. I will therefore put the specific question to the Minister, and when I obtain a report I will let the honourable member know.

TREE PLANTING

Mr. VENNING: For some time the Highways Department had a programme of tree planting along main roads throughout the State. It recently announced that it intended to plant another 17,000 trees along these roads. In the past owners have complained of their inability to drive mobs of sheep along the roads (which are only one and a half chains wide), and several farmers with crawler

tractors have been unable to get between the plantations and their fence lines. Will the Attorney-General therefore ask the Highways Department to confer with landowners in relation to the planting of these trees?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

Mr. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Housing ascertain for me the present waiting time for Housing Trust houses in the various districts within the metropolitan area as well as the waiting period for Housing Trust flats and pensioner cottages?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The first part of the honourable member's question is unanswerable because it is unrealistic to say what is the waiting time in various parts of the metropolitan area. After all, when people apply for a Housing Trust house they often indicate a preference for a district. If it comes to a question of the south of Adelaide against the north of Adelaide, the question is answerable.

Mr. Broomhill: That is what I meant.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If we keep the question within the terms of that arrangement between us, I am quite happy to see if I can obtain the information that the honourable member wants.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Housing ascertain how many Housing Trust houses built under its house purchase plan at present remain unsold?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Certain sections of the Greenhill Road have recently been turned into a dual highway, with which everyone is pleased. However, there are sections from Goodwood Road to Glen Osmond Road that so far have not been completed. These sections of the road are not very wide and business people are parking their cars on the northern side of Greenhill Road, the function of which has changed considerably; new flats, businesses and professional offices have taken the place of older homes. People from these buildings are parking their cars on the unmade part of this section, which has not been widened. At present this section is in a deplorable state of repair and I believe it would not involve much work or expense to have it levelled to provide parking facilities until the dual highway is completed.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads to see whether help can be given to people parking their cars along this section instead of the made roadway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall see whether something can be done about it.

TAPWARE

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the specification of tapware used in Housing Trust houses and flats?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Following a deputation by the South Australian Brass Manufacturers Association on November 24, 1966, the General Manager of the Housing Trust reported to the then Premier on the trust's policy with regard to the use of South Australian materials and products and, in particular, the use of locally made tapware. The trust is still of the opinion that its function is to provide houses of a good standard at the lowest cost and, if it can still achieve substantial savings on hot and cold water installations by not restricting contractors in the purchase of materials and component parts, its policy should remain unchanged. In the report referred to it was estimated that between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of the taps being used were South Australian and, although the trust's output of houses was lower last year, it is estimated the percentage of South Australian made taps could have risen to nearly 70 per cent. On the question of plastics, the proposed expansion of the Iplex company in the plastic fittings field should not cause any concern to the tap manufacturers. Generally, plastic fittings have been accepted only for non-pressure application (waste pipes, traps etc.). It must be understood, however, that where plastic fittings have the approval and acceptance of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the trust must permit their use provided their performance is equal to that of fittings of traditional manufacture.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. ARNOLD: As I believe that school dental clinics are to be established in South Australia, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health when and where the first clinic is to be established in the Upper Murray?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report from my colleague.

MILLICENT SEWERAGE

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the payment of sewerage rates in Millicent?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: In accordance with the provisions of the Sewerage Act, sewerage rates are payable from the first day of the quarter, either after the main is gazetted as available or after the date on which connections are made to properties, whichever occurs first. With regard to the cases mentioned in Millicent, whilst the properties referred to have not been connected, the main is available for connection and notice has been given in the *Government Gazette*. Full sewerage rates are therefore payable.

PARILLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: The township of Parilla has had a water supply for some years. Recently the bore that provides the water has been condemned by the Mines Department because of the quantity of sand in the water that cannot be screened out. The township at present obtains its water supply from a private individual whose property is adjacent to the township. In this regard there are two problems. First, this person uses the water for irrigation during the summer and he requires the full use of his own bore. Secondly, there has been no indication that the Mines Department intends to sink a new bore at Parilla and, until it does, I understand that nothing can be done about the water supply. Will the Minister of Works check with the Minister of Mines and use his own good offices to ensure that everything necessary will be done to remedy the problem in respect of Parilla's water supply as expeditiously as possible and, I hope, before the bowling season commences?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be happy to consider this problem, particularly in the light of the last point in the honourable member's question.

WHYALLA SCHOOLS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Since the trend of secondary school enrolments in Whyalla indicates that a third secondary school should be ready for occupation at the beginning of 1972, will the Minister of Education ascertain what progress has been made in obtaining a site for this school and what location is currently being considered?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mrs. BYRNE: I have been approached by one of the owners of W. Duhne & Sons Proprietary Limited, sand quarry operators, of Highbury East, regarding the possibility of the purchase of its property for water storage by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It was stated at the interview I had with Mr. D. R. Duhne that this quarry or excavation is one of the largest in the State and that it has a greater storage capacity than the Thorndon Park reservoir. The site in question is zoned for extractive industry in the development plan of the State, and this agrees with the zoning by-laws of the city of Tea Tree Gully. Will the Minister of Works examine this proposition?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am unaware of the details to which the honourable member has referred, but I will certainly consider the matter as soon as possible.

SOCIAL WELFARE OFFICER

Mr. ARNOLD: As the population of the Upper Murray is now between 25,000 and 30,000, can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether the appointment of a social welfare officer to this area has been considered?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter is under consideration.

WATER ACCOUNTS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 30 regarding water accounts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: There is no requirement in the Waterworks Act for reading slips to be left at the time meters are read, and this is done purely as a service to consumers. The practice has been discontinued in Sydney, Melbourne and Hobart, and no public dissatisfaction has been encountered. The present system allows consumers to check their water consumption with that of previous periods, and where inquiries are received the full details maintained in the official register are freely made available.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: An article in one branch of the popular press yesterday, under the heading "Building As Investment", states:

Legislation to rank approved building societies as an avenue for trustee investment was foreshadowed last night by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Pearson).

Further on the article states:

"It's not easy when you've lost your reputation for growth to regain it, especially in the face of restricted capital outflows from the United Kingdom and the United States and the fierce competition from Western Australia and Victoria," he said.

Will the Minister of Housing be good enough to give the House further information on the legislation he has in mind?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The purpose of the legislation is as stated in my comment, namely, to amend the Act in such a way as will permit the various approved building societies to become an avenue for trustee investment. One or two matters in both the Building Societies Act and the Trustee Act need some examination, but the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to give effect to the undertaking I gave. I do not think there is anything I can add regarding the purpose of this legislation, for it is clearly stated there. It is something that the building societies have requested, and the Government thinks it is something that could well be accorded them.

CHANDLER HILL ROAD

Mr. EVANS: In the past, many accidents have occurred at a corner on Chandler Hill Road, Happy Valley, opposite Mr. D. Nicolle's residence, and one last year caused a fatality. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads to have this hazard investigated to see whether the danger that now exists can be decreased by the erection of signs stating at what speed this corner can be negotiated in safety, or whether the corner is to be reconstructed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague to have that done.

OPAL FIELDS ROADS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I should like the Attorney-General to draw the attention of the Minister of Roads to the continuing development on the two opal fields of Coober Pedy and Andamooka, having in mind the desirability of something more permanent being done for the approach roads to both these places. The roads to both of these opal fields constitute great problems during the wet weather, besides being particularly rough under all conditions, and the development of both places during the last year or two has been very rapid indeed. The tourist traffic now going through Coober Pedy has reached large proportions, and at Andamooka a board of

management, co-operating with the progress association, has recently embarked upon a plan for a community hotel, which again anticipates tourist movement. I am not sure whether the Minister is aware of the condition of the road to Andamooka, but I can tell him that it is very rough and in many places could probably be improved with complete re-siting. In view of the development that is taking place, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to review the situation in relation to both these roads and to see what can be done to overcome the hazards, particularly during wet weather, and to generally improve the approaches for general traffic?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: The pamphlet "Fourteen facts about Chowilla" concludes by saying:

This is only a very brief summary of the facts. Should you wish to know more details, please write to the Premier of South Australia, Box 1008J, G.P.O., Adelaide.

Senator Cavanagh wrote to the Premier on July 8 of this year in the following terms:

I was very interested to receive a pamphlet from your department containing 14 facts about Chowilla. I believe that the Commonwealth and other States should honour their agreement to proceed with the Chowilla dam, and will bring the matter before the Senate on the resumption of the Parliament. Your pamphlet concludes with "should the reader wish to know more details, please write". I would ask for any further information that you may have that would permit me to place the full facts before the Senate.

As that letter was written more than a month ago, Senator Cavanagh told me the other day that he was concerned that he had received no reply. He also indicated to me that he was concerned about the lack of action by the Liberal and Country League Senators for South Australia to press for a continuation of work on the Chowilla dam project. Can the Premier say whether a reply has now been sent to Senator Cavanagh? Can he also place before this House details of the information that would be sent in response to such an inquiry, so that members of this House may also be kept fully informed on the matter? Also, if no reply has yet been sent, can he say when such action will be taken?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That letter was sent during my absence overseas. In apologizing for not having yet forwarded the information, I should like to make the point (and I hope the honourable member will convey this to his colleague in the Senate, whose

support I am pleased to receive) that Senator Cavanagh has in no way been singled out, as I am in the course of preparing material to send to all the people who have inquired and who are still inquiring about this matter as a result of the distribution of the pamphlet to which the honourable member has referred. Therefore, in no way is there any distinction here: I stress that point. I do not want to see any distinction, and I hope the Senator will not take the matter up from that viewpoint, for I think this is a South Australian project that should be pushed by us all. I hope I shall soon be able to forward this material which, of course, cannot be lightly prepared. The details that we inserted in the pamphlet were carefully considered and took some time to check, and it will also take some time to check the additional material I wish to distribute. I see no reason why the honourable member should not see it when it is prepared, as obviously it will be placed in the hands of all interested people and will not be a confidential document. I shall be happy to bring that document to the notice of the honourable member when it is prepared, although I again stress that it cannot represent the full case in the sense of containing all technical details, which I believe is something that is beyond the resources of such distribution. However, it will be further material emphasizing the points contained in the pamphlet.

SMITHFIELD-MODBURY ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads for details of the extent of reconstructing and sealing the Smithfield-Modbury Main Road No. 99, as most traffic to Para Wirra National Park will use this road from the Main North Road through One Tree Hill?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

BROKEN HILL ROAD

Mr. CASEY: Because of the conflicting reports I have heard recently concerning the official opening of the Adelaide to Broken Hill Road (to be performed, I understand, by the Minister of Transport), will the Attorney-General ask his colleague when and where the official opening will take place?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will go further than that: I will ensure that the honourable member is invited to the opening ceremony.

WEST BEACH SCHOOL

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am pleased to know that satisfactory progress is being made on constructing the new primary school at West Beach. Last year, I was informed that this school would be open for the 1969 school year. As I have received inquiries from people living in the vicinity and as arrangements will have to be made for students who at present attend the Henley South Primary School, will the Minister of Education inquire and assure me that the new school will be open for the next school year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report.

SOUTH-EAST RAIL SERVICE

Mr. BURDON: For years many people have been concerned about the need for a modern transport system between Adelaide and Mount Gambier, particularly the provision of air-conditioned railway carriages. I understand that drawing plans for these carriages have been prepared previously, and have been submitted by the Railways Department with the proposal that an amount be allocated in the Loan Estimates to construct them. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport what is the present position concerning these desirable carriages being placed on the South-East service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

ROYAL PARK SCHOOL

Mr. HURST: Can the Minister of Education say when construction of the new buildings will commence at the Royal Park Technical High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. HUDSON: Last Friday it was reported that interest rates on house loans would be increased by $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent—for private banks from $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and for the Commonwealth Savings Bank from $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 6 per cent. A later statement indicated that the Commonwealth Savings Bank interest rate on loans for new houses would increase from 5 per cent to $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and that the Savings Bank of South Australia interest rate on such loans would increase from $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent to $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. On Monday the General Manager of the Housing Trust was reported as saying that repayments on new loans would increase by about 50c a

week as a result of the increase in the interest rate but that rentals would not, in general, be affected. I also draw the attention of the Minister of Housing to a letter published in the *Advertiser* from Mr. Quirke, a member of the Minister's Party and a former Minister in the Playford Government. That letter, among other things, states:

Yet, in an act of financial banditry the Australian Bankers' Association and the Savings Bank have increased interest rates on loans for home building. There is positively no reason for an increase in interest charges, already too high.

Can the Minister say whether he consulted officers of the Savings Bank of South Australia about the proposed increase? Also, what policy will be followed by the State Bank in relation to the interest charge on loans? As Treasurer, can the Minister say what likely effect this increase in the interest rate will have on the demand for new loans and, therefore, on the rate of building? Another aspect is the rent charged on flats. My understanding of the comment by the General Manager of the trust was that so long as Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money was used there would be no effect on the rent charged for a house built with such finance. However, I understood that a proposal, that a certain proportion of the money necessary to build flats would come from other than Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money, was being considered. Therefore, will the Minister ask the General Manager of the trust whether the increase in the interest rate will affect the rent of flats built not entirely with Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As to whether there have been consultations between the board of the Savings Bank and me, the answer is "Yes". The Chairman and the General Manager recently discussed this proposal with me and both satisfied me on the matter. I subsequently discussed with the Under Treasurer his views on their proposal and the circumstances they had put to me, namely, that although deposit interest rates had increased by only $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent there was a relationship between deposits and lending, which means the account cannot be adjusted merely to pass on the $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. I need not go into details, because I am sure the honourable member is well aware of them. However, I discussed this matter, and the general position with banking is that the liquidity of most banks has been stretched to a reasonable degree because of the help banks

have given to primary producers in time of drought and in other difficult periods. The position is the same with the trading banks, the State Bank, the Savings Bank and, I have no doubt, the Commonwealth Savings Bank. The basic reason why deposit rates were lifted was to encourage more money back into the banks. As to the other detail in the questions, I will obtain some information from the Housing Trust, particularly in respect to the increased rate on flats, etc. I will obtain a copy of the questions as reported fully in *Hansard* to use as the basis for my inquiries of the General Manager of the Housing Trust.

VERMIN FENCES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Woods and Forests Department is liable for the full cost of erection of vermin-proof fences around the perimeters of its reserves and, if it is not, for what portion it is responsible?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture for the information the honourable member requires.

MCDONALD PARK SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: As the Minister of Education is aware, the new McDonald Park Primary School is being constructed but, because of the very wet conditions in the South-East, work has been delayed. Can the Minister say when it is expected that this school is likely to open?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. HUGHES: As my question relates to policy, I direct it to the Premier. On October 3, 1967, the local government accounting regulations were laid on the table of this House and another place, and they became effective on July 1. On March 27, a Yorke Peninsula Local Government Association meeting was held at Port Broughton and on the agenda was an item under the heading "Bute Council" dealing with local government regulations. It was not in the form of a motion; it was simply set down for discussion. A legislative councillor for Midland District told the meeting that, because there had been one or two irregularities, the Government had introduced the regulations as a panic measure, with the result that a member of one of the councils called out, "Get rid of the Government, and we will get rid of the local government accounting

regulations." As a result of the remarks of the honourable member, the meeting passed a resolution protesting to the Minister of Local Government. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to have these accounting regulations revoked?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I consider it is a fair question, so I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. HURST: Can the Minister of Social Welfare tell me what is the usual day for the Social Welfare Department to post out relief cheques to metropolitan claimants?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not sure, but I think it is towards the end of the week. However, I will make an inquiry and let the honourable member know.

PROFESSOR RICHARDSON

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked on notice, the Minister of Education said that she was satisfied with the performance by Professor Richardson of his duties as Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College but that members of Parliament in making statements even about officers in the employ of the Government were simply exercising their privilege and, therefore, I presumed she would neither associate herself with nor dissociate herself from the attack recently made in another place on Professor Richardson. It seems to me that the tradition in the past has been that when attacks, implications or imputations are made in Parliament against officers of the Government, while it is true that members are exercising their privilege, just because the statements are privileged and because the officer concerned has no right of reply Ministers have, as a general rule, defended their officers. I remember one famous occasion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. HUDSON: In illustrating this explanation I remind the Premier that, when the present Attorney-General made an attack on the Prices Commissioner, he was seriously taken to task for attacking an officer who was not in a position to take action against a privileged statement. Will the Premier say whether the reply by the Minister of Education was considered in Cabinet? If it was, does this indicate that the reply is general Government policy that, when members of either House of Parliament use their privileged position to attack officers in the Government service,

Ministers will neither associate themselves with nor dissociate themselves from such an attack?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I understand the honourable member has directed several questions previously to the Minister of Education on this matter and has received replies. Therefore, I do not wish to add to those replies.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: On March 29, I wrote to the former Minister of Education concerning the Education Department's proposal to acquire a school site comprising portion of section 833 hundred of Yatala on the corner of Dillon and Smart Roads, St. Agnes. From information given me at that time by the city of Tea Tree Gully and Angove's Pty. Ltd., these two bodies had written to the Director-General of Education asking that consideration be given to acquiring an alternative piece of land across the road from the proposed site and comprising portion of section 846 hundred of Yatala. I was informed that the owners of this alternative site were prepared to sell it to the department. On April 2, I received a reply from the Minister of Education that the Land Board had been asked to provide a valuation of the alternative parcel of land and that I would be advised of any decision made. Will the Minister say whether a decision has been made and, if it has, could I be advised of it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Much investigation has gone into the matter of finding an appropriate site for the proposed school. I was considering a report on this matter only about a week ago. I will bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

RENTAL HOUSING

Mr. HUDSON: I direct the attention of the Minister of Housing to a statement made some weeks ago outlining the policy he intended to follow with respect to the building of rental houses *vis-à-vis* sale houses. I think I recall correctly—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to confer on persons of the age of eighteen years the rights, privileges, responsibilities and obligations of persons of

full age; to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1965, the Electoral Act, 1929-1965, the Licensing Act, 1967, the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1967, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The question of reducing the age of majority to 18 has been canvassed in this House before and has been the subject of some measures already undertaken here. During the last Parliament it was made possible for persons of the age of 18 to make valid wills and deal with real property. At that time there was a discussion in the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General on the desirability of proceeding generally to reduce the age of majority to 18 but insufficient work was done in the standing committee for any general conclusion to be reached by its members. However, while this matter was under discussion in Australia, the British Labour Government had appointed a Committee on the Age of Majority, and the report of that committee was presented to Parliament by the Lord Chancellor in July last year. It was a most comprehensive report. Much evidence was given to the committee, and the report was closely reasoned. It dealt with many matters that cannot be the subject of legislation before this Parliament, because it dealt with matters like custody and marriage, which are the subject of Commonwealth legislation. However, it did deal with many matters with which we can deal and it came down heavily in favour of the general age of majority being 18 for all purposes. I intend to inform members of certain sections of this report so that they can see the evidence given to the committee and the reasons that prompted it to come to the conclusion it came to, which conclusion I, too, after reading the report and from my own knowledge of evidence I have received in South Australia, would have come to. The committee's report deals little with the drinking age, because the drinking age in the United Kingdom already, as it is in Victoria and New South Wales, is 18, and not 21, as it is in this State.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You did not deal with that in the Licensing Bill, did you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I did not. When I introduced the Licensing Bill last year I was of the opinion that the desirable drinking age was not 21 but 18, and that was the view of a number of members of my Party. Indeed, the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition was at that time thinking of moving an amendment, and several members

both on the then Government side and on the then Opposition side expressed their opinion that 18 was preferable to 21 for this purpose; but my feeling at that time was that, since the Commissioner had reported in favour of the age of 21 and since we were making many substantial amendments to the Licensing Act then, we should not go further than the Commissioner had proposed, because there should be some time for the Licensing Act to be in operation for us to see how it worked before some further substantial change was made beyond those recommended by the Commissioner.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you know why the Deputy Leader did not go on with the amendment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because I dissuaded him, for the very reasons I have given the House; because I considered that many changes were being made and that the population should have time to digest them before we went further. I intend to deal with the drinking age separately, because it is not dealt with at any great length in the report of the Committee on the Age of Majority in Great Britain since it is already law in Great Britain and has been for some considerable time: one has the right to drink in a public house at 18. If the general age of adult responsibility is 18, then I think it is unwise to prescribe a higher age for the right to drink on licensed premises.

Indeed, before we brought in the licensing legislation in 1967, there was much drinking at ages between 18 and 21, which was widely reported upon. A considerable difficulty has been pointed out by members on both sides of the House in enforcing a drinking age of 21. It is much easier to enforce a drinking age of 18: the difference in appearance between those people aged 16 and those aged 18 is much more marked than it is between those aged 18 and those aged 21. It is much easier to enforce a drinking age of 18 than a drinking age of 21, and many people in the community consider it proper for people to be able to drink at the age of 18. There can be no doubt whatever that it occurs widely today. Indeed, what is happening today is that in this respect the Licensing Act is being disregarded and, when the Licensing Bill was brought in, the aim was to provide a Licensing Act that would be respected by the community; so I believe the age of 18 for drinking is sensible and accords with the wide practice in South Australia today. It is in force at the moment in New

South Wales, Victoria and the United Kingdom, without untoward results in any of those places.

I turn now to the major things that the Committee on the Age of Majority has to say in Great Britain. First, it deals with the historical background of the age of 21 as being the age of majority, and quotes from Holdsworth's *History of English Law*:

. . . the fact that the later law of infancy . . . has been constructed from the piecing together of a mass of exceptions to an archaic principle has . . . rendered it difficult and obscure. We who write history ought not to complain of survival; but in this instance we must admit the deplorable effect of this particular survival.

Later, the report states:

An authoritative work summarizes the matter as follows:

There is more than one "full age". The young burgess is of full age when he can count money and measure cloth; the young sokeman when he is 15, the tenant by knight's service when he is 21 years old. In past times boys and girls had soon attained full age; life was rude and there was not much to learn. That prolongation of the disabilities and privileges of infancy, which must have taken place sooner or later, has been hastened by the introduction of heavy armour. But here again we have a good instance of the manner in which the law for the gentry becomes English common law. The military tenant is kept in ward until he is 21 years old; the tenant in socage is out of ward six or seven years earlier. Gradually, however, the knightly majority is becoming the majority of the common law . . . In later days our law drew various lines at various stages in a child's life; Coke [in 1628] tells us of the seven ages of a woman; but the only line of general importance is drawn at the age of one and twenty; and *infant*—the one technical word that we have as a contrast for the person of full age—stands equally well for the new-born babe and the youth who is in his 21st year.

In an article in the *Law Journal* of April 26, 1872, concerning the introduction of the Loans to Infants Bill and shortly before the Infants Relief Act, 1874, it was stated:

But a time comes when the infants of the rich need legal protection. When golden-spooned infants are well advanced in their teens they are prone to horse-flesh, dog-flesh, cigars, sparkling drinks, swell attire, betting and making presents to ladies who are sometimes fair and often fragile. These habits are expensive and the paternal allowance is inadequate. Then comes the money lender. He lends to the infant of the rich on the promise of payment when they come of age. The money lender's rate of interest is high.

None of this, however, was any real excuse for the Infants Relief Act, 1874, which was short, sententious and badly drafted; the legal

wrangles about what it did and did not mean have been going on ever since. Although the Bill was later amended, its original intention was plainly to stop the rich undergraduate being dunned for his debts simply because "a jury of tradesmen" might conveniently decide that whatever he had consumed, whether duck or silverware, was a "necessary" under the old common law. We received views of every shade of opinion on this and every other subject, but all our witnesses were united in their dislike of this Act, and in their demand for reform.

Grotesque as it may seem that the weight of armour in the 11th century should govern the age at which a couple can get a mortgage or marry today, the historical background of a subject does not, of course, necessarily tell us anything one way or the other about its present usefulness. The gradual collapse of the primeval forests into coal may be interesting, but has no relevance to the question of the suitability of coal for today's fireplaces. What the history does show is that there is nothing particularly God-given about the age of 21 as such, and that things do change in the light of changing circumstances. Some written evidence from the Church of England Board for Social Responsibility puts the matter forcefully:

Historically the concept is one of property rights in and power over children, as much as of a duty to protect them.

We agree with the board's conclusion that:

The time has now come when it is in the interest of society generally as well as the individual young people concerned to eradicate from our legal system any residual traces there may be of a legal age of majority imposed for the sole purpose of furthering the interest or serving the convenience of any persons or bodies of persons other than the child himself. The law should now be examined and where necessary amended to ensure that:

- (1) no child or young person is in any way restricted in his or her capacity or independence as a citizen solely for the benefit of any other person or persons,

and

- (2) young persons should be protected, by legal incapacity to act independently, from having attributed to them legal responsibility likely to be unduly burdensome to a person of that age.

This is strongly supported by the weight of the evidence and does, in our opinion, accurately state what should be the law's objectives. The importance of looking closely at the historical picture seems to us to be this. Even this very brief survey does suggest that there may be doubt as to how accurately the ages of 21, 15 or 25 ever really reflected the needs and maturity of young people. And if this is the case, it puts into a new perspective all the arguments about whether the young have radically changed since the existing law

was formed. We shall be examining at some length the question whether the young mature earlier than they used to do, and coming up with the not very startling conclusion that some do and some do not. But our case for reconsidering the age of majority does not rest only on this. *If the law has never matched the needs of the young very exactly, we do not feel that we need necessarily prove that the young have changed before we recommend a change in the law.*

The point is not whether the law fits young people better or worse than it once did, but whether it fits them as well as it should. Much more important than comparing today with yesterday is the straightforward task of observing the young as they actually are now.

Turning to the question of "young people today", the committee states:

It is easy for those not closely in touch with young people to get an entirely wrong idea of what they are like. The very word "teenager" conjures up horror images of pop fans screaming at airports, gangs roaming the streets and long-haired rebels being rude to their headmasters; and some of the older generation react to them with an automatic shudder.

We think this is the result of two things. First, the press. "Dog bites man" is not news, "Man bites dog" is. 500 thugs vandalize a seaside town and the public gets front page headlines on it; scores of thousands lead normal, decent lives and little is written about it—if only for the simple reason that, when it is, nobody takes any notice.

We found this impression cropping up again and again in the evidence. One quotation will perhaps suffice to stand for the rest:

I look to the contemporary scene for signs of increased responsibility among the young and I see the hooliganism of "mods" and "rockers", the hysterical behaviour of pop fans, the growing number of unmarried mothers and the high proportion of pregnant brides under 21, the increase of drug taking, purple hearts and pep-pills, and the increase of venereal disease among the young, and I do not feel that this suggests any grounds for assuming that "they mature so much earlier nowadays".

It is a point of view. And those who hold it are, like this witness, inclined consistently to be against any lowering in the age of majority. They say, as she does, that hire purchase and mortgage agreements are "a rock on which many adults come to grief. Youthful optimism at the mercy of high pressure salesmanship can only end in disaster." She regards very young marriages as peculiarly likely to turn into a brake on a young man's career and an end to a young girl's dream. She points out that the school leaving age is being raised and that, with every year it goes up, the number of years in which the young can gain outside experience of the world before assuming full adult status goes down. In short, she takes a pessimistic view of the young and, therefore feels they need all the adult protection they can get. We quote her as a representative of a widely-held set of views. We have some sympathy for those who hold them,

but we think they fundamentally ignore two things of vital importance to our inquiry.

The first is the very great weight of evidence on the other side. Adults indeed come to grief on mortgages and hire purchase agreements. Yet we have had a most impressive amount of evidence, not only from the finance and hire purchase companies with an axe to grind—and the Government, I believe, only today had some evidence from just that source—

but from such solid, objective and unemotional bodies as the Association of Municipal Corporations and the National Federation of Housing Societies, that the young are often a great deal more sensible and level-headed in their dealings than many of the older generation. The raising of the school leaving age may well leave the young with less direct experience of the world; but, on the other hand, they get more instruction in the schools in the practical business of living, and we hope (and express the view more fully later) that even more such education will be built into the curriculum as time goes on. Physical maturity may or may not be a vital factor in assessing emotional maturity; but the British Medical Association, a body not exactly known for the wild and revolutionary nature of its views generally, are of the opinion that, although there is little scientific evidence of casual connection, the two are in fact going together with the young today.

And the other vital question, on which we have perhaps been forced to ponder more deeply than many of our witnesses, is whether this connection between a poor opinion of the young and a high opinion of the law's effectiveness as it stands is in fact valid. In other words, the question is not only whether the young should or should not be restrained—from marrying, mortgaging and buying electric guitars on the H.P.—but whether the law does in fact restrain them. And if it does not, could it perhaps actually be doing harm in its ineffectual attempts to do so?

Again, in the field of contract we have had impressive evidence that the young are usually quite capable of conducting their own affairs with sense and honesty. And we also have evidence to suggest that the handicap of being unable to buy, say, a washing machine on the H.P. does no good to the young and inexperienced bride; that being unable to get a mortgage hardly helps the responsible young to keep house securely and independently from the start of their marriages; and that life is in many cases made harder for the young by the very measures designed to protect them. With the law about contract in its present state of confusion, many traders find it simpler not to have credit dealings with the young at all and others only do so by dragging in some unsuspecting parent. We live, however, in a credit angled society and by imposing these restrictions on the young we are stopping them from taking their proper place in it—stopping them, as we feel, to their detriment. For we feel extremely strongly that to keep responsibility from those who are ready and able to take it on is much more likely to make them irresponsible than to help them.

On the question of responsibility at the age of 18, the committee quoted the judges of the Chancery Division and of the Probate, Divorce and Admiralty Division as follows:

Any legal system must lay down some age at which people who are not mentally defective are free to live their own lives at their own risk; free, for instance, to associate with whom they please, to live where they please, and, subject to the sanctions of the criminal law, to live how they please. Whatever age is fixed there will inevitably be numbers of people over the age whom many of their fellow citizens will consider to be unfit to enjoy such freedom. The law must, however, choose the age which accords best with the needs of the great majority. Moreover, the age which is appropriate to the conditions obtaining at one period may not be fitted to the conditions obtaining at another . . . we think that 18 should be substituted for 21 as the age at which a marriage can be contracted without consent and the Wardship jurisdiction ended.

Turning to the question of property and contracts, the committee said:

On property and contracts we find it particularly difficult to assemble the evidence for leaving the operative age at 21, since it has been swept so completely out to sea by the contrary arguments for bringing it down. However, the main case rested on two points: the dangers of credit dealing generally, and the dangers to an estate of the immature handling of its assets. We would be the last to assert that the young have any particular immunity to the snake-like charms of door-to-door salesmen or to the temptations of three-piece suites on the H.P., and we think they might even feel a special attraction for courses offering to teach them to play the ocherina in 100 easy lessons at a guinea a time. We have had many witnesses who are worried about this point, the National Union of Teachers in particular. But we think the evidence suggests that the young are at least as sophisticated as many of their elders (even some of those who say the young are not mature say scornfully that they are sophisticated); and we feel we cannot advise a form of consumer protection exclusively for the young if our only grounds for wanting to do so are that we would like to see it there for everybody else as well.

Then the committee examined the case for raising the age of majority above 21, for maintaining it at 21, and the cases for 20, 19 and 18. I do not intend to go through the other ages but I will turn to the conclusions on the case for 18 as follows:

Most of those who want to lower the age of majority favour 18. And most of their reasons are sound. We would like, however, to dispose of two which did not impress us.

(1) The hackneyed "if you are old enough to fight and die for your country" argument. Looked at in isolation this seems to us to be about as relevant to the problem in hand as was the equivalent military consideration of the weight of the armour in the 11th century; and indeed the frequency with which the young

seemed to have swallowed this argument whole was one of the factors that almost inclined us to leave the age of majority firmly where it was—not that the young were alone in this.

(2) The neatness argument: "21 is too old; 18 is right because it falls half-way between the school leaving age and 21; anything less is not worthwhile." This seems to us a superficial way of looking at the problem; we are not, after all, engaged in landscape gardening or embroidery, where a pretty symmetry is important. If after toiling away for nearly two years we had simply concluded that 21 was after all the right age we should not have considered a moment of our time or a penny of the Treasury's money to have been wasted. The job was to arrive at the right age; how much of a change this makes is neither here nor there.

The main arguments in favour of reducing the age to 18 we have already set out as arguments for reducing it at all. The age of 18 seems to us the most suitable because:

- (1) There is undeniably a great increase in maturity towards that age.
- (2) The vast majority of young people are in fact running their own lives, making their own decisions and behaving as responsible adults by the time they are 18.
- (3) Those of our witnesses who seemed most closely in touch with the young favoured 18 as the age at which it was not only safe to give responsibility, but undesirable, if not indeed dangerous, to withhold it.
- (4) This was the age at which on the whole the young themselves seemed to reckon themselves of age. Some of their arguments may not be sound; and we have already said that popular preconception was not influencing us more than we could help. Nevertheless this was a point which weighed with us. We felt that an important factor in coming of age is the conviction that you are now on your own, ready to stand on your own feet and take your weight off the aching corns of your parents', fully responsible for the consequences of your own actions. If, as we are convinced, the young on the whole react badly to the feeling that they are being "protected" past the age at which they think they can look after themselves, then lowering the age to a point which still seemed to them too high would not have the desired effect of putting them on their mettle as adults. The resentments and irritations of feeling that responsibility was denied to them would remain. We think that, given responsibility at 18, they would rise to the occasion; but, as with a soufflé, the results of waiting too long might be as disastrous as acting too soon.
- (5) Eighteen is already an important watershed in life.

Of course, the committee is there dealing with the English situation, but many similar situa-

tions can be cited in Australia. The report continues:

To mention some examples of the freedom attained at this stage, at 18 you become liable for full National Insurance contributions; liable for military service when there is conscription; able to drink alcohol in public; no longer liable to care, protection or control orders; free to carry on street trading; and, of course, you can apply for a commercial balloon pilot's licence. And by 18 you can drive a car or motor cycle, be treated as an adult when in need of treatment for mental disorder and choose your own doctor and dentist within the National Health Service. In a sentence, at 18 young people nowadays already become emancipated for many purposes of their personal and private lives and are free to order them as they will.

The general conclusions of the committee were as follows:

That the historical causes for 21 are not relevant to contemporary society.

That most young people today mature earlier than in the past.

That by 18 most young people are ready for these responsibilities and rights and would greatly profit by them as would the teaching authorities, the business community, the administration of justice, and the community as a whole.

That whatever the age of full legal capacity, the law for those under it should be reformed along the lines suggested in succeeding sections of this report.

The other conclusions are merely matters that relate to English law. The final recommendation was as follows:

We therefore recommend that in the field we have considered the age of full legal capacity should be lowered to 18.

Of course, of particular interest is the question of the age of contractual capacity, because this is probably the most important matter dealt with in this Bill. The report states:

Before rejecting the idea of different ages with different gradations of contractual capacity we considered whether we could recommend a single age, below which the law of infants' contracts would apply, and above which there would be full capacity. For reasons we have already given in Part I of this Report we decided that 18 should be the age of full contractual capacity. We believe that a convenient code of law can be devised that can apply equally well to children at primary school and to young men and women of 17. Indeed, although several witnesses commented on the anomaly of grouping together people from birth to 20 years 11 months as "infants", we had no concrete evidence of inconvenience as a result of this—other than evidence leading us to a reduction in the age of majority itself.

There is one important argument against reducing the age to 18. "What earthly chance", wrote one of our witnesses, "has a boy of 19 against the power of salesmanship of an

unscrupulous seller of insurance, or too eager vendors of cars, refrigerators, carpets or what you will? He has none." This was a theme taken up by many of our informants.

Other evidence we received tends to show that in some circumstances infancy may be called in aid as a defence to what was regarded as an unmeritorious claim. The infant would have been willing to meet his just obligations, but the fact of infancy enabled him to avoid an unjust attempt to coerce him. For example, we understand that consumer organizations have had difficulties with "inertia selling". This is described in the Third Annual Report of the Consumer Council. "The technique known as 'inertia selling' involves sending goods that have not been ordered by the recipient through the post or misleading him about the results of filling in coupons for 'free samples'. All this is thoroughly confusing to the public who are not usually aware that they are not legally obliged to pay for goods which they have not ordered but which have been sent to them." One of our witnesses told us that he himself had successfully pleaded infancy when a "record club" ignored his valid cancellation and sought payment for unsolicited records.

I may say that this does not apply only to people in Australia under the age of 21; the same sort of trouble applies at present to people over this age. The report continues:

These remarks highlight a problem that has concerned us greatly. If we regard the majority of young people as responsible citizens, some of whom are unduly hampered by their inability to obtain credit or to enter into hire-purchase transactions, so that we recommend a reduction in the age of majority to 18; how do we ensure that advantage is not taken of their inexperience? But on reflection we came to the conclusion that we were just as worried about the effect of the high-pressure salesman on people of 22 or older as we were about their effect on the 18-year-olds. We should like to see increasing emphasis on the protection of the consumer. One of the disadvantages of freedom to contract is obviously freedom to contract unwisely. Setting this in the balance against the arguments in favour of lowering the age of majority to 18 our conclusion is that the reduction is justified. We take some comfort from the fact that if 18-year-olds make mistakes they are less likely to make the same mistakes later, and we hope their mistakes will be smaller at that age.

Mr. Rodda: Are we going to protect fools from their folly?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that the whole of the law relating to the sale of goods and credit transactions in Australia needs to be revised and, from the recommendations already coming from the research project set up by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, I believe that we should see a remarkable change within two years in this whole area of law. This should apply,

however, to everyone, and I do not think we are achieving anything by providing special protection for people between the ages of 18 and 21 years, thereby disadvantaging those between the ages of 18 and 21 who want to contract wisely.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The same qualifications should apply to everyone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly. I think they should be extended, but extended to apply to everyone. The report continues:

We must confess that for a long time we considered whether it would be possible to introduce what we came to call some "residual protection" for the 18-20 age group. It became clear, however, that such protection would be self-defeating: so long as the under-21's were subject to different rules from the rest of the adult population they would be treated differently by traders and lumped together with the under-18's. No shopkeeper willingly buys a law-suit.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that full contractual capacity should be attained at the age of 18.

I recommend this report for members' reading. I have read only a few short extracts to the House. Members will see from those extracts that the report is not only succinct and cogent but also in many cases witty, and it makes very good reading. I turn now, if I may, to the provisions of the Bill itself. The interpretation clause is important because the form of the Bill, apart from certain specific amendments made to certain specific legislation where the age of 21 comes to the fore very clearly, is in the form of a dragnet measure very much in the way that the Decimal Currency Act was a dragnet measure affecting all other relevant Statutes and statutory instruments. Clause 2, the interpretation clause, provides:

"Law of the State" means any Act or law that is part of the law of South Australia, and includes a statutory instrument and any law or Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that applies in South Australia.

This would mean, of course, that, if this Bill passed, it would have to be reserved for Royal assent. Clause 2 continues:

"Statutory instrument" means any proclamation, regulation, rule, by-law, order or other instrument made under the authority of any Act, regulation, rule or by-law, but does not include any instrument or part of an instrument that constitutes an award, order, industrial agreement or determination, or that prescribes wages, working conditions or conditions of or relating to apprenticeship made or entered into pursuant to any Act.

In other words, this will not alter, by altering the age of majority, the various ages at which payment is to be made or the various ages of

apprenticeship to be achieved under the provisions of awards or determinations of conciliation or arbitration commissions or pursuant to the Apprentices Act in this State. So, this provision does not affect any of the arrangements that have been made in that way. Clause 3 is as follows:

(1) The provisions of this Act shall apply and have effect, notwithstanding any Act, law, statutory instrument or rule of law in force prior to the commencement of this Act.

(2) In the event of any inconsistency between this Act and any such Act, law, statutory instrument or rule of law, unless the context otherwise requires, this Act shall prevail and such Act, law, statutory instrument or rule shall be read and construed as being modified by or subject to this Act.

In other words, in the event of any inconsistency, this Bill, generally speaking, shall prevail. Clause 4, which is the dragnet clause, is as follows:

(1) On and after the commencement of this Act, a person who has attained or attains the age of eighteen years, and is not for any reason other than his age disqualified or prevented by the law of the State from doing so, shall be competent and entitled on his own behalf to do or suffer all or any of the following things, namely—

(a) to acquire, exercise or enjoy any right or title;

(b) to perform or discharge any function, obligation or duty;

(c) to enter into, and validly and effectively bind himself by, any contract, whether such contract is prejudicial to his own interests or not;

(d) to give receipts for money or property received by him that shall be valid and effectual as against him;

(e) to hold any office and perform duties incidental thereto;

(f) to acquire, hold and dispose of any property;

(g) to sue, be sued and join in any legal proceedings;

(h) to agree to compromise any action;

and

(i) to do or suffer to be done any other thing,

as if he were of full age.

That is to say, as though he were of the age of 21 years. If he is now disqualified from doing any of these things as the result of his being under the age of 21 years, after the commencement of this measure, if he is 18 or if he turns 18, he may do anything he might otherwise have done according to the present law when he turned 21. Clause 4 continues:

(2) On and after the commencement of this Act, where under or pursuant to the law of the State in force prior to the date of such commencement, any right, title or claim is capable of being or is to be conferred, claimed, acquired, exercised or enforced or any duty, liability or obligation is capable of

being or is to be imposed, suffered, discharged or enforced by, on, from or against persons generally or of a class, as the case may be, at the age of twenty-one years, the same right, title or claim shall be similarly capable of being, or, as the case may be, shall be similarly, conferred, claimed, acquired, exercised or enforced and the same duty, liability or obligation shall be similarly capable of being, or shall be similarly, imposed, suffered, discharged or enforced by, on, from or against such persons, as the case may require, at the age of eighteen years.

(3) Subsection (2) of this section does not apply to any right, title or claim or any duty, liability or obligation devolving on any person under a will or other testamentary disposition or as the beneficiary under any trust or deed.

So in effect this Act will not affect any testamentary instruments or any trusts of any kind; where they have prescribed the age of 21 years they will still effectually apply. Subclause (4) is as follows:

This Act does not affect any contract, indenture, or agreement entered into, or cause of action which has arisen prior to the commencement of this Act.

One can see that if it did affect any of these things there would be quite a legal conundrum as to the stage at which a contract could be repudiated upon the attainment of the age of majority. Clause 5 states:

Where a person who entered or enters into a contract before attaining the age of twenty-one years has, or, if he has died or dies, his legal representatives have, a right to repudiate the contract before or within any time after he attains or has attained that age, then, in lieu of that right, that person or his legal representatives shall have the right to repudiate that contract before or within the same time after he attains or has attained the age of eighteen years.

This applies, of course, only to contracts entered into after the passing of the Bill.

Clause 6 is as follows:

In every action on a contract entered into after the commencement of this Act, it shall not be a defence that the defendant was under the age of twenty-one years when he entered into the contract if in fact at the time of entering into the contract the defendant was of or over the age of eighteen years.

Clause 7 is as follows:

For the purposes of this Act and unless the context otherwise requires, on and after the commencement of this Act—

(a) any reference in any Act other than this Act or statutory instrument to a person of the age of twenty-one years or an adult person or a person of full age (whether expressed in those or any other words) shall be read and construed as a reference to a person of the age of eighteen years; and

(b) any reference in any Act other than this Act or statutory instrument to the age of twenty-one years, the full age of twenty-one years or full age (whether expressed in those or any other words) shall be read and construed as a reference to the age of eighteen years.

Clause 8 contains the specific amendments to certain Acts. The effect of the amendment to the Constitution Act is to change the provisions for enrolment as an elector for the Assembly to the age of 18 years instead of 21 years. The next amendment, to the Electoral Act, is a corollary of this, as it provides for enrolment and voting at 18 years instead of 21 years. If we are to accept the principle of full adult responsibility at the age of 18 years, then persons at the age of 18 years ought to have a full and effectual say in what is the law that governs them during their full adult responsibility. The Licensing Act is amended to provide that at the age of 18 years instead of at the age of 21 years people may be served with liquor in licensed premises. The Lottery and Gaming Act is amended to provide for betting with a bookmaker or on a totalizator at the age of 18 years instead of at the age of 21.

There is one matter which can be considered to be somewhat complicated in the law and which has not been dealt with directly by the Bill. I refer to the somewhat vexed question of wardship. On that subject, having had a look at the legislation in the general law my own opinion is that so far as the report of the committee on the age of majority sought to go to allow people out of wardship at the age of 18 years, that is affected by the dragnet clauses of the Bill as they stand. On the other hand, where people are under trusteeship as beneficiaries and the trust runs until the age of 21, that would not be altered, and the provisions of the Administration and Probate Act relating to the Public Trustee, since this Bill does not affect trusts, would in consequence remain unaltered at this stage. This is something that we could perhaps have a look at in Committee, if other people have different ideas on the subject. However, my own view is that sufficient has been done here.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Are you confident that you have covered all the other Statutes and branches of the common law?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I do not think there are any gaps. If the Attorney looks at the very wide provisions of clause 4, I think he will see that we have brought in everything in this way. There are still

other specific Acts which prescribe the age of 21 years for certain things; for instance, the Money-lenders Act prescribes this age in, I think, two sections. However, those sections are specifically covered by provisions of clause 3 of the Bill.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You think the Bill is a working Bill as it stands?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I do. I might say that this was not the first draft of the Bill: it has been through a series of drafts. Certainly we examined very closely the decimal currency legislation which set out to affect a whole series of Acts without referring to them specifically. We did that successfully, and I think we have done the same thing successfully here. I have not tried to tabulate every single enactment in South Australia which contains the words "twenty-one" as referring to the full age or age of majority.

The common law is also fully provided for here. If one reads the terms of the interpretation section, one sees that "the law of the State" means any Act or law that is part of the law of South Australia, and includes a statutory instrument and any law or Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that applies in South Australia. I think the Attorney will agree that that is putting it pretty widely.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you think there would be any complications through the operation of Commonwealth Statutes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only complication I could foresee would be with the Bills of Exchange Act, but of course we are not in a position to affect that Act by legislation in this House. Consequently, people will still be in difficulties about making negotiable instruments at the age of 18 years, unless the Commonwealth should see fit to follow our example in this Bill. I hope that my learned friend the Attorney-General might be able to persuade the Commonwealth Attorney-General about the wise course being taken by South Australia in this matter. Quite frankly, I think this thing has been hanging fire for far too long, and I think it is about time somebody got on with the job. It had been referred to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General before without any very satisfactory conclusions. Unfortunately, the standing committee does not have an adequate research staff, and we had to have research projects undertaken by various States in conjunction with academic bodies in order to get work done for the standing committee on many occasions.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Have you covered the reasons why no action was taken during your term of office?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some action was taken. The previous Government took action on real property, and when the Minister introduced his amendment on wills I pointed out that this was in accordance with the policy of the then Government, and that if he had not made that move we would have done so. We were grateful to him for initiating the amendment and we were happy to support it. I hope we get similar co-operation from the honourable Minister with this Bill.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should inform the Adelaide City Council that the necessary action will be promptly taken to make available the site recommended by Theatre Consulting Services for the erection of a performing arts centre. The history of providing satisfactory venues for the Adelaide Festival of Arts and the performing arts in the interim between festivals has been a somewhat sorry one. It has been clear for a considerable time that we have inadequate theatre provision in South Australia and, as a consequence, the larger productions of opera and ballet cannot be staged in this State. Many of those that have been initiated in their production in other States have had to be considerably reduced in set and action in order to fit into the stages available in Adelaide. Indeed, there is only one practical stage available for large stage productions, Her Majesty's Theatre, and for many productions performed there, particularly opera and ballet, the audience size makes the production uneconomical.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It used to be one of the largest stages in Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but stages these days are getting larger and larger for the kind of production that goes on. For concerts the Adelaide Town Hall is acoustically excellent but, again, the size of the audience in the town hall makes its use by an orchestra of any size an uneconomic proposition. Playing in the Centennial Hall means we are faced with a place which has dreadful acoustics and an appearance that suggests what it is—an agricultural display centre. It is not a concert hall; it was not designed as a concert hall; and it is

not sufficient as a concert hall. So, if we are to have satisfactory places for the performing arts we must provide them.

It was considered that action should be taken to erect what was to be called, apparently, a festival hall. Under the influence of certain councillors of the Adelaide City Council it was decided to recommend to Government that the Carclew mansion (an adamesque piece of architecture at North Adelaide—and I am not referring to the architect Adam when I say that) was the ideal site, because city people could look at it and see it there as a sort of beacon on the hill. On that site could be provided a concert hall of sufficient dimensions to provide for music presentations, some ancillary provisions for rehearsals, and perhaps a small-scale theatre.

A drawing was produced of a suggested building with a covered-waggon appearance with a roof to be constructed of copper sheets suspended on steel hawsers. Government architects considered that this form of construction would never be satisfactory and would be impossibly expensive—far more expensive than was needed for any reasonably workable and utilitarian building. Immediately one considered this design and the things that were supposed to go inside the building, one realized that what was happening in South Australia was what had happened so lamentably elsewhere in Australia: that we were proceeding without theatre architects and that the proposal both as to site and as to design was to establish something that looked good outside without our having decided, first, what were the mechanics of what was needed inside and, secondly, what were the mechanics of providing the things that should be given to audiences in the way of performing arts. We should decide first to build the centre around the concept arrived at by those who had to practise within.

We had a Select Committee and the Government granted money towards purchasing Carclew. Then there were many misgivings about proceeding with that project: misgivings by the Adelaide City Council, misgivings by the festival board, and misgivings by the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee. After we had taken office the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee heard much evidence from people who would have to work inside a place of this kind, and from people with wide experience throughout the world who would be connected with the festival. Sir Robert Helpmann made it clear in evidence that there were far too many examples in Australia of things that had

been erected without adequate advice having been given by artists, the people who had to work the theatre and performing arts, and that architects, who had no experience of working the theatre, were designing theatres. Sir Robert was able to point to a series of examples, entirely apart from the horrible example of the Sydney opera house, which had been designed from the outside in and had never been satisfactory because the design of the interior had not been the starting point. Those concerned had not decided what they wanted inside in the way of facilities, machinery, audience size, and equipment, before it was designed. The Canberra centre was a better example but, here again, there was a grave fault in that design: although it had two workmanlike auditoria, the stage in the main theatre was not workable for some productions simply because it had an enormous beam sticking out backstage and it was impossible to get 16 flats backstage where they were needed for most major productions. These are simple matters of stage working that must be considered.

An extremely expensive theatre was built at the Adelaide Teachers College. It contains expensive equipment that most people working stages today would not dream of suggesting. For instance, it has a revolving stage: that went out with the ark for any theatre technician. What is needed is reasonable access from the dressing room to the stage and from one side of the stage to the other but, when working the cyclorama in this theatre, actors have to go down one side, then outside and come in at the other end, and then come up on the other side of the stage. People who have worked in the theatre now demand that we must have something effective done, and done immediately. Any person who has been to recent festival performances must know of the grumbling of artists who come here and have to work in utterly unsatisfactory conditions.

People have to go to theatres to see shows that require delicate sound for good acoustics for the audience, and then they find a dance band kicking up so much fuss downstairs that the audience does not know what is going on in the festival performance. At a performance at the Memorial Drive a singer of world renown from the United States of America was trying to give a performance to an audience, but she was interrupted by dance band music from the sound shell on the other side of the river. In such circumstances artists become sick of coming here. They want a

festival site to provide them with the means of giving to audiences the things they have come to give, and that means that our venues must be satisfactory. Not all venues of a festival could be provided in a performing arts centre. But there are other things that a performing arts centre could do, and it is certain that, if we are to continue to attract to South Australia the kind of artists being planned by the artistic director and the director of the festival in South Australia, we must get on immediately with the job of providing the major venues for orchestras and theatre companies. We cannot leave it; we have delayed far too long on this matter.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How would you define a performing arts centre?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is defined in this report, from which I shall read extracts in a moment. At the request of the Adelaide City Council, because of the evidence given to the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee, my Government obtained a report from Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Theatre Consulting Services, of the United States. The person who was sent here to make the report was Mr. DeGaetani, a former director of the Lincoln Centre in the United States. He had had wide experience of reporting upon the conditions necessary for performing arts centres of various kinds throughout the world, their economics, and what were the general cost factors involved, to enable him to get a general estimate of the kind of costs we would be looking at.

In his report Mr. DeGaetani pointed out that certain things had to be taken into consideration before we started talking about bricks and mortar. The first was that we needed to have a continuing administration of the performing arts. I provided for him a history of Government grants to the performing arts in South Australia. It makes comical reading. What has happened is that we have had on our Budget Estimates a whole series of haphazard grants that have grown up from particular political pressures by various groups. In no way did they relate to priorities for providing adequate performing arts for the people of South Australia at the grass roots level, where every citizen could have an opportunity to enjoy them. Some of the grants made are out of proportion to the benefit that South Australia gets from them, and they are given in face of the fact that no grants are given to other people who deserve them very much more. When one takes the whole history of the giving of

each one of those grants (I have that history in detail; I provided it for Mr. DeGaetani) one sees that the whole thing just grew, like Topsy, and seems entirely comical. It is evident that there has been no effective planning in this area over the years. Mr. DeGaetani, having listed the enormous number of people whom he saw and consulted here on this matter (which list covers many pages), states:

While T.C.S. was not in a position to evaluate the quality of the performing arts in Adelaide, we were struck by the sheer quantity of activity which seems to transcend all levels of South Australian life and reflects an encouraging level of moral and material support of the performing arts by the South Australian people.

Unfortunately, the bulk of this activity is unco-ordinated, largely disparate and in many cases mutually disadvantageous. It is T.C.S.'s very strong feeling that, if Adelaide is to one day enjoy a reputation for and the benefits of resident professional activity in the full spectrum of the performing arts, it will be realizable through co-ordinated efforts on the part of the cultural, educational, business and various governmental communities.

Most recent conversations in Canberra and Sydney reveal that strong ties between the rapidly developing Commonwealth Council on the Arts and the various Commonwealth educational agencies are seen as not only highly desirable but virtually necessary. Further, it can be safely said that the Commonwealth council will welcome the formation, on the State level, of "local instrumentalities" reflecting local arts determinism eligible for Commonwealth subsidy, thus permitting the Commonwealth council to deal with a single, co-ordinated local organization relative to disbursement of funds in support of local performance activities. This Commonwealth council desire to avoid repetition of past manifestations of "big-brotherism" cannot be over-emphasized as a prime stimulus for the early development of a formal, co-ordinated performing arts agency in South Australia. The advantages to State Government in dealing with a single local council, which solicits and disburses State funds, should also be considerable.

I can confirm, from my discussion with Doctor Coombes, that we look forward to having a single co-ordinating agency in South Australia. True, Mr. DeGaetani has recommended the structure of a performing arts council which would not directly interfere with the existing festival administration but which would merely incorporate the festival administration into an overall proposal for performing arts administration. It is clear, however, that what is happening in South Australia is a reform: the festival board is changing the nature of some of its activities. It is doing this spontaneously without any direction from Government and I am

sure that it is doing it enthusiastically and effectively. I should think from what is developing there that we can find in South Australia just the kind of administration to administer the grants that can be obtained from the Commonwealth Performing Arts Council in the way suggested by Mr. DeGaetani, without proceeding to an overall performing arts council here. In other words, we can adapt our own organization to the purpose he has set out. Then, having gone through the necessity of having a body of that kind to administer the State moneys for the performing arts in South Australia, Mr. DeGaetani says that we must have an administration which will—

administer, operate, and programme the South Australia performing arts centre in keeping with the following aims and purposes of the centre:

To provide a permanent home for local resident professional theatre and music groups;

To provide performance facilities periodically and reasonably available to local amateur, semi-professional, and educational performance groups;

To provide performance facilities for appropriate portions of the biennial Adelaide Festival of the Arts;

To provide performance facilities for the Adelaide Film Festival;

We could not fit that into the Festival of Arts, because we could not obtain sufficient venues during the festival to hold the film festival at the same time as the arts festival. We had to hold it at another time, whereas we would have obtained oversea assistance much more readily had the film festival been part of our general festival. Mr. DeGaetani continues:

To provide accommodative performance facilities for visiting Commonwealth and international touring attractions;

To provide appropriate facilities for local, Commonwealth, and international conventions, conferences, seminars, etc.—

there is every reason why South Australia should seek to become an effective convention city—

To assist in the development and maintenance of an image of the South Australia performing arts centre as vital and central to the day-to-day life of all levels of South Australia and Adelaide's citizenry.

Mr. DeGaetani is recommending not something that some people, both in the city and in the country, seem to think will come out of a performing arts centre (that is, something which will be enjoyed by people who are interested only in the esoteric and which only a few can afford to see): this is something which will affect the lives of every citizen,

which is readily available to him, and in which he will wish to take part. Mr. DeGaetani continues:

To implement a "student assistantship" programme whereby students of local tertiary institutions are employed in part-time staff positions—

because he believes it is important to incorporate tertiary students into the work of the performing arts centre. Finally:

To collaborate and assist the council's other sections in realizing their objectives.

Mr. DeGaetani then has some general things to say about the South Australian performing arts centre, and on this he is somewhat pungent. He says:

While the growing needs of the Adelaide Festival of Arts must be recognized and acknowledged as the initiating stimuli for consideration of new performance, facilities, reality, practicality and vision demand that their further consideration and development be in response to greater Adelaide and South Australia's growing preoccupation with the performing arts and their present and projected day-to-day cultural needs as they can be presently analysed. In this respect, new performance facilities become organic to all levels of a community and are more susceptible to broad community moral and material support.

Mr. Riches: Would you spell that out?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He is saying that there is no point in having a piece of architecture that is related only to a biennial Festival of Arts at expensive prices for the few. If we are to have a performing arts centre, it is to be involved with the day-to-day cultural life of the whole community and related to things that happen in South Australia, not merely to people whom we bring from elsewhere.

Mr. Riches: I could not agree more, but does he say how that can be done?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. He goes on to say it at some length, as follows:

It is an acknowledged fact that on the eve of its fifth biennial the Adelaide festival does not, as yet, enjoy the moral and material support of all socio-economic levels of the community. The various reasons for this truism are well known to the local people most involved and do not warrant T.C.S. elaboration at this point. Again, T.C.S. feels that with the most recent additions to the festival's artistic and administrative direction the prognosis is quite favourable. However, there has developed in the community an attitude which can best be allegorized as, "the festival is a biennial oasis in a continuous cultural desert". While not wishing to minimize the role or the impact of the festival, T.C.S. nonetheless feels that every effort must be made to develop local day-to-day cultural activity which by its increasing quantity and quality finds attendance at live quality performance a normal everyday

occurrence not just a biennial cultural orgy, or the perquisite of a privileged few. T.C.S. feels that the new performing arts facilities should, by their title, be more identifiable with South Australia's day-to-day cultural life than with its biennial festival. Further, since the festival is, and will continue to be accommodated in a number of facilities throughout Greater Adelaide every effort should be made to avoid identifying the festival with anything less than Adelaide itself, and certainly not with any single building or centre. T.C.S. therefore recommends that the project heretofore referred to as "Adelaide Festival Hall" be hereinafter referred to as "The South Australia Performing Arts Centre".

Now, as to the components, whether or not the Council of the Performing Arts is realized, there is an inevitability to the activities just outlined. The report states:

Given that the life span of new performing arts facilities can be expected to be of the order of 50-75 years, T.C.S. has used long-range cultural programmes as stimuli for development of a schedule of functions and activities to be accommodated by the new facilities. T.C.S. recommends that the South Australia performing arts centre consist of the following: A multi-purpose, variable acoustics, theatre/concert hall, with seating capacity variable from 2,000 seats maximum to 1,600 seats minimum.

This would allow a sufficient audience size for the larger productions likely to come here and it would make them economic. At the same time, it would mean that the acoustics could be varied to an audience of smaller size for performances that would not demand as big an audience as 2,000. In other words, it is a multi-purpose hall in which a number of things can occur. Mr. DeGaetani states in his report that there is no difficulty in providing adequate acoustics for such a hall. He says that the hall would provide for the following: resident and touring symphonic activity; resident and touring choral activity; resident and touring dance activity; resident and touring music-drama activity (opera and musical comedy); appropriate musical and theatrical presentation of the Adelaide Festival of the Arts; motion picture performances; and conferences and conventions. He gives some details then of the things that are to go into that particular section of the festival. The second recommendation is as follows:

A 3,600 to 4,200 square ft. objective, uncommitted experimental hall seating up to 275.

This could provide all types of performances. The report states:

Among the activities which would be accommodated are: Drama, adult and children's, in arena, thrust or end stage configurations; experimental productions of the resident professional company; experimental

dance, and music-drama productions; chamber music performances; dance, drama, music-drama, and music rehearsals; training programmes in the performing arts; social dancing; and business and social functions.

He also recommends a 700-seat to 800-seat axial theatre. The report states:

Critical to a developing repertory company is the ability to be identified with a home. This theatre is therefore seen as the home for a resident professional theatre company pre-occupied with drama, dance and music-drama.

In South Australia we had the South Australian Theatre Company which, unfortunately, had to move from pillar to post because it had no permanent home. It could put on some performances at Theatre 62, and it occasionally used the Union Hall at the Adelaide University. Several times it used the theatre at the Adelaide Teachers College, but, of course, that theatre is buried in an academic complex that the average citizen does not easily find his way to, and it certainly is not something that is continually presented to him. The report continues:

Relative to dance and music-drama, this theatre would accommodate the productions of developing resident activity until such time as they have reached a stature to permit their accommodation in the larger theatre/concert hall. Functions to be accommodated by the theatre are:

Drama, dance, music-drama, children's theatre, motion picture (festival), conferences and seminars, and training programmes in the performing arts.

The report also deals with production spaces in the centre; it is as follows:

The centre should contain scenery and costume preparation spaces, but should not contain storage space beyond that capable of accommodating the resident company's seasonal scenic requirements. This will necessitate warehouse space for "dead" storage away from the centre.

Public Spaces: The lobby and foyer spaces should be developed on the basis of from 10 to 14 square feet a patron, and should be so designed as to permit their imaginative usage for a variety of non-performance activities, such as art exhibits, luncheons, social functions, etc.

The point he makes is that, from his experience of performing arts centres elsewhere, this kind of development can make a centre of this kind a natural part of the daily life of the community; consequently, he makes a number of recommendations regarding the site, as follows:

It is hoped that previous sections of this report will have, in effect, broadly spelled out necessary criteria for the selection of an appropriate site for the centre. To amplify them:

The centre must be literally and figuratively in the mainstream of a community's day-to-day life.

The centre must be readily and conveniently accessible to, and identifiable with, the largest possible segment of the local population.

The centre must, if possible, relate to a broader arts and humanities spectrum.

That is, other facilities in respect of the arts must be available nearby to the public. The report continues:

The centre should, if possible, use a site whose topography lends itself well to some of the fundamentals of theatre architecture.

That is to say, we should not have to incur large expenses in respect of site acquisition and clearing, and we should not have to incur large expenses in respect of excavation to provide under-stage facilities. The report continues:

The site should minimize exterior noise problems.

Acquisition of the site should not pose severe economic problems.

In view of the above criteria, T.C.S. most strongly recommends that the centre be located on the site heretofore referred to as "the rear of Government House", in that this site meets all of the necessary criteria.

I shall now give the House the history of the consideration of this site. After reading what the witnesses before the Lord Mayor's Cultural Committee had to say, it was quite clear that Carclew met few of the criteria for a site that most people involved in the performing arts demanded of a site for those arts. Carclew may look good on the hill, but it certainly is not in the main stream of community life. It requires a special trip to get out there, the parking facilities in the area are not good, and there are still considerable economic problems in regard to site acquisition. The noise problem would be considerable, because jet aircraft travelling to and from Adelaide Airport fly directly overhead and, consequently, the site seems to have none of the qualities laid down by the witnesses as reasonable criteria for a centre of this kind.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What about demolition of buildings?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The demolition of buildings is costly in itself. The next matter we considered was the possibility of getting a site that most people had considered for a long time to be the ideal site for such a centre. I refer to the Torrens parade ground. This is in a beautiful setting, in a central position, and close to car-parking facilities. There are no grave noise problems, and it would fit

into the general surroundings and have all the advantages that Mr. DeGaetani mentioned for the site recommended here.

As a result of this, I approached the Minister for the Army to see whether we could make arrangements with the Commonwealth to get the site. It is, of course, owned by the Commonwealth Government. It was an Army site at the time the Commonwealth was created; the Commonwealth took it over from us then, the title is vested in the Commonwealth, and we have no power to acquire it. The Army said it was prepared to consider swapping that site for another if we could find it another, but the other site would have to be similarly central to Adelaide. The Army said that the parade ground was used by three regiments centred upon it, that it would not be possible to move the operations of these regiments outside the city area, that it was needed for ceremonial purposes, that the Army needed to assemble its squads there for various ceremonial parades, that it was used from time to time for Army functions, and that it was necessary to have a central site for this. It would not give up the advantage of a central site, but if we could find it a central site that would give it the same advantages, it would be happy to consider making a swap.

Mr. Hudson: Perhaps we could now give the Army Carclew.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the Army would find that too much of a route march for its purposes. Unfortunately, also, it does not provide quite the space the Army wants. The second condition it attached was that we compensate it for what it called its prestige building on the parade ground site which it valued at \$400,000. As honourable members may imagine, that put some considerable obstacles in the way. We examined whether an area of land at the rear of Government House and running down to the parade ground could be excavated and re-aligned in order to provide the Army with the five acres it would require. We could get the five acres: that could be done by taking a small portion of Government House grounds north of the chauffeur's cottage, not interfering with any existing building, running along just north of the road that goes to the chauffeur's cottage, and then taking a line down through the Government House wall to the parade ground. We could take that portion and give it to the Army, and we could supply a similar area, but to level it up to a parade ground and then provide it with a new building to the value of \$400,000 would involve considerable earth-

moving and compensation costs, which it seemed to us were far too great to load on to the performing arts centre project, given the type of economies and costs that Mr. DeGaetani talked about. After all, the cost of a performing arts centre is going to be more than the original estimated cost (I fear the somewhat inaccurately estimated cost) of the project at Carclew.

Then we looked at whether we could take the site which we had thought of as an alternative for the parade ground and consider that itself as a feasible site for the performing arts centre. We thought: if we could not put our performing arts centre on the parade ground, since we could not move the parade ground to this other site, why could we not put it there? It immediately showed that it had considerable advantages, for there would be no acquisition costs at all and very few excavation costs would be involved.

Mr. Hudson: And there would be no demolition costs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so. The topography of the site lends itself admirably to theatre architecture. It has the exact relationship to the various other artistic centres in Adelaide that Mr. DeGaetani sought. It is close to tertiary institutions and could be integrated with training programmes in the performing arts in those centres. It is so close to the city that it could be part of the daily life of the community, as people would see it there, and could use it without difficulty at lunch time as well as in the evening. There will be no difficulty for people to use this centre, and it is close to car-parking facilities: in fact, it has all the criteria that Mr. DeGaetani laid down. This area could be used as an alternative to the parade ground: no-one would have bucked about our using the parade ground for a performing arts centre—why should they buck about our using this site? The area to be taken is not used for Government House purposes and is remote from Government House itself. No-one would want to interfere with the privacy of the Government House domain, and this would not happen, and we would use something that today is useless.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What area is involved?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be less than two acres of Government House grounds, and the total site would be about five acres. A small portion would be taken from the rear of Government House grounds

and would run down towards the parade ground on the eastern side of the Women's Memorial Gardens, which is a grassed slope with a walk-way through it. At present, this is not used by the public to any extent.

Mr. Rodda: How many acres is in the site on which Government House is built?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it is about 13 acres. If aerial photographs of Government House grounds are studied one realizes what a tiny portion is involved: the site is more than 100 yards from Government House and is screened by a belt of trees.

Mr. Hudson: There would be no interference to anyone living in Government House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not in any way. When large functions are held at Government House cars are parked on this land.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Could the parade ground be used for parking cars?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Government allows that to be done if it is not being used for Army purposes, and it has been used as ancillary car parking for certain festival functions. Concerning the other sites Mr. DeGaetani says:

Montefiore Hill is literally and figuratively too far removed from the heart of Adelaide, remote from public transportation, subject to regular assault by jet aircraft noises, and would prompt unreasonable expenses to satisfy on-site or adjacency parking requirements. While the parade ground and Government House site meets more of the basic requirements, it would still generate severe economic problems relative to site acquisition and development of adequate on-site or adjacent parking.

The rear of Government House site, on the other hand, would place the centre adjacent to the downtown business district, the library and gallery, and Adelaide University and Adelaide Teachers College. The two parking stations with a combined capacity of 1,500 autos presently planned for North Terrace, if connected to the centre by underground tunnels and moving walkways, could more than adequately meet the centre's parking requirements at a minimum of capital expense, except on matinee days when arrangements could be made for the parade ground to serve as temporary parking. Adjacency of this site to public transportation (rail and bus) makes it additionally desirable. The slope of the site, in addition, lends itself quite well to development of a scheme which would find public access oriented towards North Terrace with the stages oriented toward Government House. The development of an underground arcade contiguous to the parking stations and, hence, to the centre might include a commercial restaurant whose all-day operation would meet the dining requirements of the centre's patrons at no basic expense to the centre. Backed as it would be by relatively open parks and recreational areas, this site would find the

centre located with a foot in each of the best worlds. Given the acknowledged necessity for the development of strong liaisons between arts and education, adjacency of the centre to Adelaide University and Teachers College should have a number of obvious advantages that do not warrant any further elaboration.

A clear case for proceeding with this was undoubted. We had announced that we were prepared to make this site available to the Adelaide City Council and to develop it in co-operation with it as a performing arts centre. The projected costs, as Mr. DeGaetani saw them (that is, without an arcade, without parking facilities and without the fee for consulting services), would be about \$4,800,000 but, given the kind of escalation in costs that has occurred in some other major projects in Australia (for instance, the Melbourne Cultural Centre was originally designed to cost \$6,000,000 but it ultimately cost \$10,000,000), we could expect to have to pay more than \$4,800,000 to get this. It will place a considerable strain on our financial resources to get this performing arts centre into operation in the foreseeable future and we cannot afford the additional strain of going in for vast acquisition, demolition and excavation costs as well. If we have this site available to us right now, why do we not get on with the job? The only objection raised is that it interferes with the Government House domain. It does not.

The other part of the objection is that it takes some of the park lands. If we are so concerned about taking some of the park lands, we could restore some of the park lands at Carclew and take this little bit down here (the portion of the site that is park lands at the moment) in lieu of it, since we have spent money on Carclew now. However, frankly, I cannot see how the building of a performing arts centre here will interfere with the general aspect and use of park lands in South Australia. In fact, putting a performing arts centre here in a parklike setting, taking a part of the Government House grounds and that little bit of the park lands between the parade ground and Government House, will mean that the area will be far more used than it ever will be if retained in its present form.

Some members of the Adelaide City Council have long-range plans for Government House. They believe that they will get it as a general arts centre at some time in the distant future, but I think that is a very distant future indeed because to provide another Government House in South Australia will run the people into vast

expenditure. Although there are unsatisfactory features of the present Government House, there are also satisfactory features, and we cannot contemplate the replacement of it for many decades to come. So I think the objections raised on this score are unsatisfactory.

The suggestion of the Government that it is prepared to pay more money for the site at Carclew seems strange when that site has been so heavily recommended against by the experts whom we called in. It certainly was not acceptable to the Adelaide City Council. So now the council has been invited to look at alternative sites but has been told it cannot consider this one. Why cannot it consider this one, the one site that we know we can make available right now? If we are to delay the erection of a performing arts centre for as long as it will take the Adelaide City Council to replan Hindmarsh Square, and then consider how it can erect a building that will comply with some of the requirements in the report (and not all of the requirements) and fit into a redevelopment of Hindmarsh Square, involving acquisition, demolition and excavation costs, we will not have a performing arts centre by the festival after next.

Mr. Clark: We can forget about the festival probably.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are in for some competition. Look at the facilities Melbourne is providing in its cultural centre, and look at the unsatisfactory nature, the declining nature, of the venues available for the Adelaide Festival of Arts! We have fewer venues available in Adelaide today than we had when the first festival was held. In order to achieve the kind of daily cultural development in South Australia recommended by Mr. DeGaetani, we need to have a performing arts centre which can be a home for the administration that will develop the daily cultural contact with the whole of the South Australian community, country and city alike. We need to get on with the job. We can do it simply and cheaply, and I believe that the House should support this motion so that we can get on with the job and get together with the City Council to design a performing arts centre for this State at the earliest possible moment.

The Hon. R. S. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 8, at 2 p.m.