HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 4, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My question relates to two points arising out of the reply of the Minister of Education yesterday to questions about student teachers' allowances. In her first reply, the Minister said:

I believe that the new system is far more dignified for students who are in their late teens and at a stage when they are having to consider budgeting, and in this way they are treated as adults.

As the students are now being treated as adults, can the Minister say whether the Students Representative Council was consulted concerning this change before it was decided on? In replying to my supplementary question the Minister said that students would get exactly the same amount overall under the proposed scheme of being paid $85 a year instead of the amount paid under the previous arrangements. As this reply indicates that the exact cost of travelling expenses and of supplying textbooks under the present arrangements must be known to the Minister, will she state what the costs are for 1968, giving each cost separately?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a break-down of the specific items referred to by the honourable member. The Students Representative Councils of the teachers colleges were not informed of this decision in advance, but it may interest the honourable member to know that I am receiving their representatives on Friday, and I will discuss this matter with them.

LAMB INDUSTRY

Mr. FERGUSON: Following my question last week in which I expressed concern about the lamb industry because of the low prices being received at markets by producers (and I believe the price is lower at today's abattoir market), I read with interest a headline in the *Stock and Station Journal,* as follows:

New Zealand lamb imports causing serious concern to New South Wales State Lamb Committee.

This statement has aroused interest among South Australian lamb producers, as shown by the fact that I was questioned many times about this matter during the weekend. I understand that the lamb imported from New Zealand has represented less than 1 per cent of the total quantity consumed in Australia. However, greatly increased costs, coupled with what I believe would be the lowest prices received for lamb for several years, mean that the producers will not be able to withstand any competition from the New Zealand industry. Will the Minister of Lands therefore ascertain from the Minister of Agriculture whether any New Zealand lamb has been imported into South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am aware of the position obtaining in the lamb industry and, of course, of the question asked recently by the honourable member. I visited the lamb sales this morning and noted a decline in the market value. I will obtain a report for the honourable member in reply to his specific question. Although I do not want this to be taken as being a final comment, I point out that following the honourable member's recent question I inquired about the importation of New Zealand lamb, and I have only just received details of the quantity imported between January and June last. Unfortunately, I do not have any more recent figures than these. Between January and June, under 600 tons was imported (I have not the precise figures), and I should say that that would represent a total of about 30,000 lambs, which is not a big quantity. Almost none of the New Zealand lamb reached South Australia, although a few tons may have been involved (less than 10 tons, anyway); I could not account for a small quantity in the information I received, but it would have been negligible.

However, New Zealand lamb could well find its way into the State, and I am making urgent inquiries through the Minister of Agriculture about whether significant quantities are likely to come on to the market. Although observations show that this has not been a significant factor in the decline in lamb prices, that does not mean that this may not cause a decline in the future. The present decline in prices is another matter on which I will obtain as much information as possible, and I will bring it down to the House probably in the next week of sitting.

RIVERTON-JAMESTOWN SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN: Many years ago the railcar service from Riverton to Spalding was discontinued and a road service from Riverton to Jamestown substituted. I am pleased to say that this latter service is working successfully.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport how many passengers were carried on this road service for the year ended June 30, 1968; how many parcels were carried on the service for the same period; what were the running costs; and what was the total revenue obtained?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this information is available.

THEVENARD FISHING RAMP

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the Thevenard fishing ramp?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A most comprehensive plan was prepared some time ago, but the cost of its implementation is beyond the finances available in the foreseeable future. However, investigations are now being made into the feasibility of constructing a small fish-landing ramp as an interim measure with a view to providing local fishermen with improved launching and landing facilities at Thevenard. The urgency of the project is fully appreciated.

REFLECTORS

Mr. GILES: While travelling after dark last Monday, I noticed that some traffic islands were not fitted with reflectors or "cat's eyes", as they are sometimes called. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether it is possible to have these reflectors fitted to all traffic islands?

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

WHEAT STABILIZATION

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister of Lands informed me yesterday that he had a reply to a question I asked the Minister of Agriculture through him on August 28 about the Government's policy on the recently announced modified wheat stabilization agreement. Will he give that information to the House?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister has told me that negotiations are still proceeding between the Australian Wheat Federation and the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry. This State has kept in close touch with other State Ministers of Agriculture, and it is expected that, at the next meeting of the Minister for Primary Industry with State Ministers, the final decision will be made. This State will introduce legislation after agreement has been reached. That is as far as the Minister can take the matter at present.

LOWER MURRAY ROAD

Mr. WARDLE: My question concerns the decision regarding the route of the road from Blanchetown to the Lower Murray. There are two possible routes, one from Blanchetown through Walker Flat (over the Walker Flat ferry) to Mannum and the Lower Murray, and the other from Blanchetown *via* Bow Hill to Murray Bridge. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the route this road will take has been decided?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out for the honourable member.

MEADOWS COUNCIL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about moieties being charged at Clarendon by the Meadows council?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the Local Government Act empowers a council to levy charges on adjoining owners for roadworks. This power refers to roadworks in a municipality or within townships in district councils. The works referred to by the honourable member were carried out by the District Council of Meadows in the township of Clarendon, and the council has levied charges on the adjoining owners. Although the matter is entirely one between council and ratepayer, I understand that the council would favourably consider permitting payment of the charges over an extended period, if the ratepayers would make an approach to the council.

IRRIGATION

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 29 about a cheaper electricity rate for weekend pumping in my district?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Electricity tariffs are not confined to particular uses of electricity: the tariff applying to irrigation applies also to numerous other activities. Furthermore, the trust has an obligation to treat consumers alike. Consequently, any reduced tariff for irrigation at weekends would have to be applied to other uses of electricity. The loss of revenue involved could be made up only by increasing other tariffs. The trust does not consider that this could be justified.

Under the present tariffs, irrigation (and other activities) can already take advantage of 70 hours a week of reduced charges for night-time use.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. VENNING: Because of the congenial conditions in recent weeks for excessive plant growth and the possibility of serious bush fires occurring during the coming summer, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture what additional publicity and what co-operation with Mr. Kerr and his department are expected?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer that question to the Minister of Agriculture and get a reply.

BARMERA HOSPITAL

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say when the Minister of Health and members of the Hospitals Department staff intend to visit the Barmera Hospital and submit to residents of the Upper Murray proposals for the future of the hospital?

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

COONAWARRA ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the Coonawarra electricity supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member referred particularly to frost control, and the report from the Electricity Trust states:

Electricity extensions to the Coonawarra wine-producing area will be built during the current financial year and lines are now being surveyed. The work is being planned to ensure that electricity supply to the wineries will be made available in time for the next vintage in approximately March, 1969. In one case arrangements are being made to provide an early supply to a vineyard that has no alternative means of frost control. It would not be possible to do this for all applicants, but the position is covered by existing frost control measures.

SPALDING GOODS SHED

Mr. ALLEN: Much trouble is being experienced at the Spalding railway goods shed because of the presence of vermin and cats (I mention cats specifically because I do not think cats come within the definition of vermin). The position is so bad that a vermin-proof safe has been supplied for the protection of smallgoods but, unfortunately, no latch is fitted to the door of the safe. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to take the necessary action to have this goods shed made vermin proof?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister whether he will do that.

AGRICULTURAL COURSES

Mr. FERGUSON: In the Loan Estimates debate I referred to the provisions of agricultural courses at some secondary schools, particularly those in country areas. Much interest has been shown in this matter in country areas, particularly in my district. Can the Minister of Education give any general information about the introduction of these courses in certain secondary schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member approached me earlier on this matter and I obtained a report for him. Because he considers that this matter is of interest to other members, he has asked the question and I am happy to answer it because the reply may be of interest to members who would like to see agricultural courses started at schools in their districts. There is a shortage of teachers of agriculture in the Education Department at present. Vigorous efforts are being made to recruit sufficient applicants for training to become teachers of agriculture. The field from which teachers of agriculture can be drawn has been enlarged, because these teachers can now receive their specialist agricultural training either at university or at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. However, there is a keen demand by a number of country high schools and area schools to introduce agriculture into their curriculum offerings but the number of students being prepared at the teachers college is not sufficient to enable agriculture to be introduced into each of these schools for more than two years. The popular demand for agriculture as a subject at a number of high schools is clearly understood by the department, and teachers of agriculture will be appointed as soon as possible.

IRRIGATION LICENCES

Mr. WARDLE: I believe that, as from February, 1966, it has been necessary to apply for a licence to increase irrigation on areas along the Murray River from Mannum to the river mouth. Can the Minister of Works say how many permits have been issued since February, 1966; what acreage is involved; and whether Dehy Fodders (Australia) Proprietary Limited at Meningie has a restricted licence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Being aware of the problems to which the honourable member refers, I was considering this matter only a few days ago. As I do not have the exact figures and details with me now, I will obtain these as soon as possible and bring them down to the House.

KINGOONYA ROAD

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Three travellers from Alice Springs have told me that the Pimba-Kingoonya section of the highway is in poor condition. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he is aware of the condition of this section of the highway and whether maintenance is to be carried out on it?

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

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: On the freeway in the Adelaide Hills the Highways Department has made a practice of using 44-gallon oil drums as road markers to protect motorists from going over the embankment until guard rails have been erected. These drums have been painted white, which is a suitable colour for normal weather conditions, but during the winter months of heavy fog and poor visibility the drums are difficult to see. As I believe we will have another winter next year, even though this winter is nearly over, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the drums could be painted yellow instead of white in order to help drivers on this hazardous stretch of freeway, particularly during the winter months?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly do that.

Mr. EVANS: I have had many requests from people living in the path of the hills freeway to ascertain when the Highways Department intends to purchase their properties or to tell them what part of their properties will be required. Some owners have had their properties on the market but, on being informed by the department that it would require all or part of the land, the owners have had to take the properties off the market, although at this stage the department has not offered to purchase them. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport how much land situated in the path of the hills freeway is expected to be purchased by the Highways Department in the financial year ending June 30, 1969?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the freeway will skirt my district, I appreciate the difficulty to which the honourable member refers and I shall be happy, both in his own interests and in mine, to seek the information he requires.

ANGAS CREEK

Mr. GILES: On August 7, I asked a question about bridge crossings over the Torrens River between Gumeracha and Angas Creek. I had been given to understand that two bridges had been erected by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but I have since found out that at least four timber trestle-type bridges have been erected. These were washed away, but the Minister, in his reply, said that the E. & W.S. Department was not legally bound to give access across the river. Because the department has set a precedent by giving people access, will the Minister of Works review his decision so that access can be given to people with properties on both sides of the Torrens River?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I replied to the honourable member's earlier question, now that he has given me fresh information and because the points he has raised involve legal consideration, I will obtain a considered reply as soon as possible.

SOIL DEFICIENCY

Mr. FERGUSON: Some years ago the Agriculture Department undertook research into soil deficiencies in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula and, as a result, a great improvement was achieved in the production of cereals and in pasture growth. This improvement applied not only to southern Yorke Peninsula but also to other districts in the State with similar soils. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture what additional research is being undertaken on southern Yorke Peninsula to increase production further in these calcareous soil types?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask my colleague, but I understood that the major problem was solved by adding manganese to the soil. However, if the honourable member would furnish additional information on the problems that still remain this would help the Minister of Agriculture prepare a reply.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: On May 7 this year I received a letter from the Minister of Education informing me that a contract had been let for new toilets at the Clare High School. The Minister stated that because of inclement weather the

contractor might need the full 12 weeks allowed in the contract. The 12 weeks allowed expired at the end of July, and after inspecting the toilets this week I find that they are far from finished. Can the Minister say whether an extension of time has been granted to the contractor and, if it has been, whether the high school council has been notified?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I remember this matter well but, as the question concerns the building of a toilet, it would be more properly replied to by the Minister of Works.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Because of the interest that has been displayed in the proposed fluoridation of the Adelaide water supply, will the Minister of Works say what countries have already introduced this form of legislation?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member was good enough—

Mr. Hudson: Do you want to prolong Question Time?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: If I wanted to do that I could take my time from the member for Glenelg. The member for Albert was good enough to inform me that he required this information, and I have a list that will not take long to read. The Governments or Administrations of the following countries have approved fluoridation: Canada, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, Holland, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Philippines, Formosa, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaya, and most South American countries. Fluoridation units are operating in the following countries: Argentine, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Columbia, El Salvador, Formosa, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaya, New Zealand, Panama, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Sweden, United States of America and Venezuela.

WINE INDUSTRY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago I asked the Minister of Lands to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the survey being conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics into the wine industry in Australia would visit the most excellent wine districts in the District of Light to take evidence. As I understand the Minister now has a reply, will he give it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I informed the honourable member yesterday that this reply was available, but as so many questions were asked no time was available for him to ask it then. The Minister of Agriculture reports that the survey by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, covering an economic investigation of a sample of wine grape-growers, commenced early last month. Growers in the Murray River districts are being interviewed at present, and I am informed that interviews in other areas, including the District of Light, will be carried out later.

GERANIUM SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Considerable problems which have arisen in disposing of effluent from the drainage system at the Geranium school have been investigated by officers of the Minister of Works Department. Will the Minister obtain a report on the progress made and on the present proposals to improve the position?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will get a report on the problem.

GUMMOSIS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether research is being continued into the disease of gummosis, the ravages of which make uneconomic the growing of apricots in many non-irrigated areas of the State? If it is being continued, will the Minister ascertain whether there have been any recent developments in methods of combating this disease?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a report from my colleague.

OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Because of the extremely wet winter the foundations of the dressing shed of the swimming pool at the Oakbank Area School have sunk badly and, as the walls have cracked to such an extent that they are likely to fall, they are extremely dangerous. Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question whether something cannot be done to repair this damage?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: No, but I will get one for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter, dated September 4, 1968, from the Leader of the Opposition:

I propose on the meeting of the House this afternoon to move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2 o'clock on Friday, September

6, 1968, in order to discuss a matter of urgency, namely the withdrawal by the Government of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report until such time as the Government has considered the report and accepted the report in general principle subject to amendments arising out of objections.

The answers to questions yesterday revealed that the proper decisions have not been taken in relation to the report and that if it remains published then grave damage to the value of the properties of many hundreds of citizens will be done quite possibly to no purpose.

Is the proposed motion supported?

Several members having risen:

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until 2 o'clock on Friday, September 6,

in order to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, the withdrawal by the Government of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report until such time as the Government has considered the report and accepted the report in general principle subject to amendments arising out of objections.

When the report of the Town Planning Committee for the metropolitan development of Adelaide was published in 1962, it accepted that there was to be in Adelaide a substantial expansion of the metropolitan area; that there would be, in fact, an urban sprawl which higher density redevelopment would not prevent; and that, therefore, additional provision would have to be made, as in other concentrated urban areas, for the mobility of people within the urban area, if substantial periods of their lives were not to be taken up by the mere difficulty of moving from one place to another in an urban area. At the outset, the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide Development Plan proposals were criticized for their freeway system, and traffic engineers suggested that there were other means of providing freeways or that patterns of freeway, expressway and public transport should be developed different from those in the original plan, because it was clear that there were considerable disputes about the traffic patterns and that greater investigation would have to be carried out than had been carried out over the period of preparation of the development plan.

In consequence, the previous Government commissioned the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, with a team of oversea consultants, to investigate the matter and to report. That study was in progress at the time that our Government was in office, and it continued pretty well throughout the whole period of office of the Labor Government. The initial conclusions of the study were reported to the previous Government in some broad aspects in November last, but it was not possible for the Government, before it left office, to receive the detailed proposals of the study or a complete report on all matters of principle concerned in the study, simply because it was not possible to print the report and have it ready for consideration by Ministers in the time. The report, which has now been printed, contains radically changed proposals about metropolitan Adelaide transportation from those in the original development plan. It consists of a series of plans for freeways and expressways, for other urban road development, and for development of public transport. Bound up essentially with this plan are the proposals for its financing because, unless it can be financed within the terms of money conceivably available to South Australia, the plan is of no use whatever. An essential and intrinsic part of the report is the question of its financial feasibility: if it cannot be financed, then the project needs to be re-examined so that we can produce proposals that are within our financial competence in this State during the next 18 years.

Mr. Broomhill: That should have been obvious to the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course. Prior to our leaving office, no detailed proposals concerning the financing of this plan had been put before our Government. There was a discussion in November last on the general outline of proposals of the plan with an estimate of the total overall cost, but the detailed proposals concerning how this was to be financed had not been discussed either with Cabinet or with Treasury officers. This was something that needed to be done when the study was fully printed: it could be examined by Ministers; it could be examined by other departments concerned; and specifically, of course, it could be examined by the Treasury. Instead of this report being examined by the Government and the Government deciding whether this was within the terms of the financial competence of South Australia (and therefore was a conceivable plan for implementation in the next 18 years), the whole report to Government was simply holus-bolus foisted on the public. The people were handed the report and told that they could look at it for six months.

Let us look at what the public now knows about this report: it now knows that the original proposals in the Town Planning Committee's report, which has been adopted under the Planning and Development Act as the development plan (the authorized plan), has been put aside; that four different proposals were examined by the consultants on the study; and that the present proposals are the cheapest they examined, according to their estimates of cost. Indeed, there is in the view of the consultants a reduction from the sum total of $490,300,000 for the Town Planning Committee's proposals to $436,500,000 for these. But the Town Planning Committee's report had not originally gone into detail concerning the financing of this aspect of the proposals any more than it had done concerning the acquisition of open space, a subject which bedevilled the last Government considerably and which led to the proposals, made before the last election, for a special metropolitan Adelaide addition to land tax in order to finance that part of the plan.

But the public knows now that there is a whole series of freeway, expressway and public transport proposals that will, if they are adopted, cut swathes through existing and recently-developed properties within the metropolitan area. We do not know whether the Government even intends to adopt these proposals. Instead of knowing whether these things were seriously put forward as an integral series of proposals to the public which would be put into effect, subject to amendments in terms of objections made (which would necessarily be fairly minor but which could result in some changes in route in some areas), we simply have the proposals before the public, and we do not know whether any of them have been adopted. When we asked whether, in fact, the Government had accepted these proposals in principle, we were told:

> The Government has neither accepted nor rejected the report. Further consideration will depend upon submissions received during the period of review by local authorities and the public.

Apparently we are for six months to hear objections from the councils and the public upon the plan but, as no part of the plan has been specifically adopted in principle by the Government, we do not know how serious the Government is in putting it forward. If, at any stage, the plan is submitted, with the consent of the Government, by the Commissioner of Highways to the State Planning Authority for amendment to the development plan, then we have to go through an entirely new process. We asked about this. We pointed out that, under the Planning and Development Act, this proposal meant a significant amendment of the development plan, which is an authorized plan under the Planning and Development Act. Therefore, entirely apart from the question of acquisition of the land for freeway and expressway development, in order to allow the land use regulations to go on or in order to be able to carry out the provisions of any interim proposal for holding operations under the Planning and Development Act, there will have to be an amendment to the development plan so that the land use regulations are valid.

In order for that process to be gone through, the plan has to be adopted by the State Planning Authority. It then must be published again to the public and objections invited from the public and councils, and then it has to go to the Minister to see whether he approves, after the report of the State Planning Authority on the objections that have been lodged. The Minister then has to decide whether he will report to the Governor-in-Council, and it is then decided whether it will be accepted or referred back to the State Planning Authority. If we are to provide as the Government now proposes, there will be a six-month period for looking at this plan, and no-one knows at present whether or not it is accepted. It is hanging like Mohammed's coffin, somewhere between heaven and earth. Having received objections, the Government will then report to the State Planning Authority, republish the plan and invite objections all over again. This is an extraordinary procedure. In the meantime, the people whose properties would be acquired if the new proposals were adopted would be in the unfortunate position that, in many cases, they would not be able to sell their properties or, if they were able to get buyers, then, because of the risks involved to the acquirers of those properties, the properties would be considerably devalued.

Mr. Clark: They won't be able to sell their properties anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True. Also, they will not know whether they can improve them. Members on this side (and I imagine this applies to members on the Government side, too) have been telephoned by people who have asked whether they can build on to their house a carport or whether it is worthwhile their undertaking white ant extermination.

People affected by these proposals just do not know what they are to do about the future of their properties. Of course, it is true that, whenever a plan is published that is to be subject to objections, citizens are affected in the interim, but surely the thing to do in relation to that is to see that the minimum harm occurs to them in these circumstances. The way in which that should take place is that the Government should decide whether or not this report is accepted by it in principle. This is stated in the report of the Commissioner of Highways to the State Planning Authority (the Planning and Development Authority under the Act), and then the report is published in those circumstances, people knowing that it is the Government's view that this should be accepted in princip'e. However, that is not happening.

Now, I shall turn to the decision the Government should be taking about accepting or not accepting this report in principle. If the report is to be feasible then it must be feasible in terms of the money we can raise. I can say only that I cannot conceive that the Under Treasurer had these proposals given him before they were published because, knowing that gent'eman (and he is one of the best Treasury officials, if not the best Treasury official, in Australia), I assert that he would have immediately raised objections to the terms of these proposals. No-one who knows the exigencies of State finance could have looked at these proposals and done other than laugh.

Let us look at what is in the financial proposals. These matters should have been examined by Cabinet before they were published. A very high proportion of the moneys coming into the Highways Fund from all sources is to be used in relation to the M.A.T.S. proposals. At page 191 of the report, there is a graph of the estimated future revenue of the metropolitan district and of the remainder of the State as against other expenditure in the metropolitan area. Anyone knowing the history of freeway and expressway development in other major urban areas must immediately see the fallacies in this graph. I cannot conceive that these fallacies are not obvious to the members of the transportation study. I know the terms that I would have used to them had it been shown to me.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Wasn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it was not, because the report had not been prepared in detail to give to the Government. Our Government had not received the report in detail: it was not printed and therefore we could not read it. We all had to have copies of this darn thing to look at it, and we were informed that the earliest time we could look at it was when it was printed, because not every member could be provided with a typed copy. The plans had to be prepared and that could not be done other than by printing, which was the quickest and cheapest way of doing it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: One would think you could have looked at the manuscript.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were not sufficient copies of the manuscript available to the Minister.

Mr. Corcoran: We wanted to look but insufficient copies were available.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You didn't look at it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General is carrying on with his usual nonsense. This report had not come to our Government, and the Attorney knows that. If he is trying to suggest that it had come to our Government or had been presented in any detail at all by the study consultants before we left office, he knows he is telling an untruth.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You say you couldn't study it while you were in office because you didn't have a copy!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We did not have copies available to Cabinet while we were in office.

Mr. Corcoran: We had a look at it. We were briefed on it. You told us this yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were informed at the Cabinet meeting referred to in a reply given yesterday that it was impossible for the study consultants to present this report to us in sufficient detail for us to read until it had been printed. We were told what the general outlines were but we could not get the material involved in the report until it was printed and available for everyone to read.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That's a pretty hollow explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney is trying to avoid the fact that his utter administrative incompetence and that of every other member of Cabinet is harming the people of South Australia because of the Government's refusal to look at this report before publishing it. Now the Government is trying to foist the blame on to us. We would never in any circumstances have released this report to the public before considering it and making a decision on it. However, this Government

has done that, and the harm thereby caused to the public is incalculable. I ask whether any member opposite seriously puts this proposal forward. According to the graph, the expenditure on metropolitan roads other than those contained in the transportation study proposals will decrease for 18 years. Let us consider the reply given to us yesterday on that matter, as follows:

The Chairman of the Steering Committee reports that it is expected that departmental road works undertaken in the metropolitan area over the 18-year period will progressively become those indicated in the M.A.T.S. Report.

Anyone who has taken any trouble to study expressway and freeway development in any other major city must know that that development increases the use of other metropolitan roads, because the very existence of expressways and freeways creates a demand for usage of these other roads. The increased mobility occurring because of freeways immediately increases the overall use of other roads within the area.

Mr. Corcoran: But they've told us already that there will be less money available. They will get grants from time to time, but the majority of the money available will be devoted to this plan.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right. The majority is to go into the M.A.T.S. proposals, and the other expenditure on metropolitan roads is to decrease.

Mr. Riches: How will the country people fare?

Mr. Hurst: What about the man on the land?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We were told during the last two years by members opposite, who waxed extremely eloquent on this score, that in relation to transport South Australia had to maintain a cost situation competitive with other States, that we could not place imposts on transport, and that it would be grossly unfair particularly to place these impositions on country citizens.

How do members of the transportation study intend to close the gap that is evident from their own estimation of the proposals, if we make assumptions that their estimates of costs and available finance are correct? Neither of those assumptions can be made, but let us make them hypothetically for the present and see what is intended. They say that other sources of additional funds available to the State Government are loans, State motor tax and road maintenance contributions, and advocate that motor vehicle registration fees be increased by 10 per cent, that driving licence fees be increased from $2 to $4, that road maintenance contributions levied on a ton-mile basis on operators of trucks of a load capacity greater than eight tons be altered by the removal of the major exemptions at present provided in the legislation, and that the load limit be reduced from eight tons to four tons (and not just for metropolitan users of roads but for everybody in the State).

Mr. Riches: Including people on Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, this tax will be collected in the sparsely settled areas of Eyre Peninsula, and down in the South-East. The Premier, when cavorting in the Deputy Leader's district, talked about road maintenance contributions and charges, and about what our Government was doing in relation to them. I am sure that the people in the South-East who have attended protest meetings about road and rail transport co-ordination will be interested in the proposal about the road contributions involving a reduction of the load limit to four tons and the removal of the major exemptions. I am interested in whether members opposite are as inconsistent on this matter as they have proved themselves to be on so much else during the time they have been in office. We are interested in whether members opposite propose this. They are the Government, and they are putting this forward. What do they propose? Is this what they say? If it is, how do they account for what they said to people in South Australia in the last two years about these two matters? The road finance proposals are strange enough, but let us look at the estimates of cost in this regard. First, members of the study have proposed legislative alterations in compensation procedures, and they state at page 197 the following:

Compensation for land acquisition is based on current market values. Where this falls short of replacement cost, as may occur in the case of older residential properties—

and many others as well, I would say—

hardship may result.

I'll say it will!—

Compensation in the form of a replacement property may be warranted in such cases. Present legislation does not appear to recognize this problem.

When we asked about this (because, if we are to alter the basis of compensation legislation in South Australia to replacement cost rather than market value, a quite significant alteration in the cost of acquisition will occur), we were told as follows:

The Chairman of the Steering Committee reports that the recommendation concerning compensation for land acquisition to which reference is made is possibly that relating to replacement cost and market value. Existing legislation allows for payment in excess of market value in certain circumstances and this matter was taken into consideration in arriving at the cost estimates.

I do not know about the Chairman of the Steering Committee, but the Government must know very well that existing legislation for allowing moneys to be paid on occasions in excess of market value does not provide for payment at replacement cost, and on very rare occasions has anything been offered in the way of replacement cost for properties acquired. I can remember only one occasion, and that was when Sir Alex Downer's property was acquired. These proposals, as they stand, seem to have been based on some vague estimate of the cost of acquisition, because, if the legislation proposed in the report is to be implemented (and it appears to be an integral part of the report), then it is well nigh impossible to estimate with any accuracy the total cost of these proposals.

Mr. Virgo: The Premier said last week that the Government doesn't know how many properties will be acquired.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right. On the simple question of escalation of costs in that way, it seems strange that they come down with such precision about the amount of shortfall in the available finance. Then again, in relation to escalation of costs, the report is extremely strange. Members of the study suggest that it is not expected that the unit costs of roads or departmental works will increase during that period and, whilst they say that they have allowed for escalation of costs, they do not say how they have done that. The report goes on:

Having regard to the expected increase in scale of road works in the metropolitan area with the opportunity to let larger contracts and make more effective use of larger plant, it is not acknowledged that unit costs for road construction will escalate in the future in keeping with the escalation of costs generally. Furthermore, it is noted that unit costs of departmental works have generally not been increasing in recent years. A decision to base cost estimates on present-day unit costs was made with the above factors in mind.

Do members of the study seriously contend that unit costs will not increase over an 18-year period.

Mr. Corcoran: They have said that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have. They then say that the proposal is based on present-day unit costs and on present-day unit costs over the 18-year period, so their estimation of total costs as against the money to come in seems strange. Then we get the proposals for extra tax, which will considerably disturb our competitive cost structure in relation to the costs of transport, and then we come to the railway proposals, which are even more strange.

Mr. Virgo: They're not strange; they're wicked.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, like the wicked sisters in the pantomime. The expenditure estimated for the railways proposals is $79,050,000. An arbitrary allocation of the money that would normally be available in the 18-year period is $11,000,000, so there is a shortfall of about $68,000,000. This is not a small sum for the State to find and if we look at the possible sources of additional funds we come to one of the strangest statements ever to appear in a document from a Government, talking about finance as an integral part of the proposal. That is what it says. We were told that the Chairman of the Steering Committee had reported that the proposals concerning finance were regarded as an integral part of the M.A.T.S. plan and that they had been published for review by local authorities and the public. Although these proposals for finance have not been adopted, they are the only proposals before the public, which has to evaluate the plan according to the proposals before it. The Government says on one hand, "We have not adopted this, but look at this and judge the plan, on the basis of whether we can do it, by looking at the proposals for finance." I do not think members of the Government read the proposals before publishing them. The report continues:

Possible sources of additional funds—Many different methods have been used to finance rail rapid transit projects in North American cities. The 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act allows the United States Government to contribute up to two-thirds of the capital investment in transit facilities. Several States, including New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania as well as the Province of Ontario in Canada, have various programmes for subsidizing transit facilities in metropolitan areas. A more direct method of financing, which is in common use in cities in the United States, is being utilized by Boston, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco. The administrating public agency levies taxes against properties within its area.

The Government has not said what it will do about the acquisition of open space in the metropolitan area (a matter that is desperate for us at the moment) but, if that is

not to be financed out of additional land tax, it is difficult to see how it can be financed. If the Government does that, can it impose an additional tax on the unimproved land value in the metropolitan area as well for the rail rapid transit system. The report continues:

In other centres, such as Cleveland and Chicago, revenue bonds have been used to finance the construction of rapid transit facilities.

The Government knows that that would be prohibited in South Australia under the terms of the Financial Agreement. The report continues:

The State of California has allocated funds from tolls collected on the San Francisco Bay Bridge to finance the construction of a rapid transit tube under the Bay since it is expected that construction of the rapid transit system will postpone the need for an additional bridge.

We do not have a bridge of that kind for which we can substitute subway transport, and I do not know whether the Government thinks that by putting a toll on the bridges over the Torrens River and the Port River it will raise enough money to finance the $68,000,000 needed for the rail rapid transit system.

Mr. Virgo: The Government might reopen the toll gate at the gum tree!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If it does, perhaps the Attorney-General will advise it of the effect this will have on the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act:

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Are you criticizing the report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am criticizing you for releasing a report that you should not have released.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader should say "the honourable member", not "you".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry: I am criticizing the honourable and gallant Attorney-General. The report continues:

Other means of subsidizing transit facilities on a year-to-year basis have been used by various public agencies. In Boston a two-cent tax on each package of cigarettes has been imposed.

If the Attorney-General had read the report before it was published I presume he would have told Cabinet that an extra tax imposed by a State Government was illegal. The report continues:

San Mateo County, in California, now taxes each vehicle at an average rate of $8 per annum for this special purpose.

Will that be done in South Australia, in addition to the $10 increase in registration fees recommended for financing the highway proposals?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Will you answer one question? Did you authorize—

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ignore the fact that I was asked a question. My Government authorized the printing of the report so that we could read it. If we had had an opportunity to read the report, I can assure the honourable member that within 12 hours it would have been back on the table of the transportation study, telling it to think again.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You should have done that before the report was printed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If I had had even a manuscript available to me to consider before my Government left office I would have taken a copy with me, as I did with many other documents. I did not have the report, and I never saw it. The report continues:

The cities of Seattle and Tacoma, in Washington, have the power to add a $1 tax on each monthly utilities bill.

Will the Government follow Sir Henry Bolte's lead and place a special impost on every gas and electricity bill to pay for the rail rapid transit system in the metropolitan area? What will that do to the position regarding our competitive electricity costs? If the Government is serious in asking the public to consider this proposal, then it must be seriously putting this forward to the public because, in the terms of the reply of the Chairman of the Steering Committee, it is an integral part of the proposal to do something like this. The proposals I have read out are the only proposals for meeting the $68,000,000 shortfall in the estimated cost of the rail rapid transit system. The report continues:

The preceding examples give some indication of the importance placed on rail rapid transit by Federal and local authorities. While none of these schemes may have practical application in Adelaide they may suggest means which are feasible.

In other words, the Government will say, "Have a look at this, boys, and come up with some answer if you can, because we cannot." The report continues:

Representations will undoubtedly be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance.

No doubt they will! The Premier has made various representations to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for this, that, and the other thing. When the Prime

Minister visited Adelaide during the State election campaign he said, "It will be more convenient to have everyone in the family by having a South Australian Liberal Government, because then we will get better co-operation." What sort of co-operation have we seen?

Mr. Corcoran: I notice he is not visiting the family on his present trip.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I wonder whether he will be here tomorrow to applaud the Budget. We have not been able to get support for South Australia even in that. At the Loan Council meeting and the Premiers' Conference last year in Canberra I got complete support from the Hon. Robin Askin and the Hon. Sir Henry Bolte in demanding a meeting of State Housing Ministers to get the Commonwealth Government to start discussions with us to implement the provisions that exist in the United States and Canada and get the support of the Commonwealth on the acquisition of development land. That is an essential feature for development if the development plan is to be carried out. But we cannot get the Commonwealth to meet us even on that. No doubt, Commonwealth financial assistance will be looked to in this matter. No other State has been able to get Commonwealth assistance and there is no indication that the Commonwealth will change its views while its present Government, supported by members opposite, is in power.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Western Australia had a similar proposal before the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The report continues:

> At the same time, however, all possible sources of additional revenue should be thoroughly investigated.

Of course they should but, in order to come up with an argument to the public that this is a feasible proposal and something that people should, therefore, consider seriously, the obligation on the Government is to show that it can be done—and at the moment this report shows quite clearly that, in terms of finance available to South Australia, it cannot be.

Mr. Hudson: Then why are the people in the way of this plan being disturbed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. If this cannot be put into effect, our future planning is proceeding wrongly and the people have been scared out of their wits unnecessarily by the publication of this report.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Are you saying that the whole thing should be scrapped?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I am saying that there are valuable provisions in the report arising from the investigation of traffic patterns and demands and the forecasts of the need for traffic patterns within the developing metropolitan area, given the promotion of the development plan that was accepted unanimously by this House. What I am quarrelling with is that in the latter provisions of the report, coming up with some proposal for amending the development plan, we have not a feasible proposal before us. In these circumstances, the report should not have been published until the Government was satisfied that what it was putting before the people was something that could be done. If we cannot do it, it is monstrous to harm the people who have been harmed by the publication of this report in the way in which it has been published. I am certain the Minister of Roads and Transport is sorry that the report has been published because I am certain that he is certain, as I am certain, that the gun has been jumped and that the proper processes established under the Planning and Development Act have not been complied with. This report should have been sent to Cabinet and all members of Cabinet should have read it in detail and then consulted with the officials of their departments about its effect upon their departments—and particularly the Treasury officials. Then the report should have been sent back to the M.A.T.S. people indicating that there were unsatisfactory things in it and that they would have to reconsider those sections—but the Government did not do that. When it got this report, it was the first time that the full report had been before Cabinet. I cannot conceive that the Government has read it. If it has, it has been extraordinarily careless.

In these circumstances, I believe this report must be withdrawn and reconsidered. The Government must make up its mind about a feasible proposal. Feasible proposals are vital for the development plan if people are to get the advantages of the urban existence to which the development of this area commits most of them overwhelmingly. Then, when the Government, in consultation with oversea officers, officers from Government departments and the steering committee, has developed a feasible proposal it should be sent to the State Planning Authority for processing in the manner provided for by the Planning and Development Act.

Mr. Corcoran: People would then have a chance to lodge their objections and they would know which way they were going.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Then the report should be printed. Obviously it would be supported in principle by the Government, because Government departments would be putting it forward to the State Planning Authority. It would be published and the people would know what the future was and that these were definite proposals being put before them; they would know how the Government proposed to finance them and what the future would bring in the way of taxation, charges and imposts to raise the money necessary for implementing these proposals. None of these things has happened. Therefore, the report must be withdrawn so that these things can happen and the Government can go about doing what it should have done in the first place.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I support the Leader of the Opposition. I agree with every word he has uttered in condemning the Government for releasing this report prematurely without having any of the required answers and thrusting undue worry and concern upon the people who are both directly and indirectly affected by this report. The Premier has said in reply to questions I have asked and in the press that the Government neither supports nor opposes the proposition, but there is one question that it should consider: if the Government is not supporting this scheme, why are the Minister of Roads and Transport and Cabinet allowing officers of the Highways Department to go around South Australia advancing this scheme? That question must be answered. The Government is supporting it or it would not have these officers out and about. It should have the courage of its convictions and stop speaking of finance, as it has been doing for the last three weeks since the plan was announced. I am surprised that the members of the Government have not been a little more conscious of the public attitude on this matter.

Mr. Broomhill: They are strangely quiet today.

Mr. VIRGO: They are. Attention has been drawn, not only in this House but also in the press, to the feelings of the people. I mentioned here last week the resolution carried by the Marion council, and the Premier expressed appreciation of my having brought it to his attention. I wonder whether the member for Mitcham has paid attention to the views of the Mitcham council. They were discussed on Saturday morning during an inspection tour, when the Attorney-General and the Minister of Roads and Transport were present. Reference was made to this matter. In fact, the first step taken on that tour was to point out the wanton destruction that the Hills freeway would cause the people of Mitcham, the electors that the Attorney-General represents. It is only reasonable to expect the Attorney-General to support the people he represents, and not sit, as he is at the moment, with a cynical look on his face. I deal now with the inconsistent answers I have received to my questions on this matter. I honestly believe that members opposite have not read the report. This was clearly indicated last evening when the Treasurer said that all metropolitan train services would not travel under King William Street. That is not so. With $570,000,000 involved, the Treasurer should have read the report. I am convinced that this plan, if implemented, will be the Sydney opera house of this State, and our children and grandchildren will be paying for it for years. I asked the Premier whether every possible alternative had been looked into in relation to this report, and he replied as follows:

All possible alternatives for the Noarlunga freeway were considered and the one finally adopted was considered to be the most acceptable, considering both monetary and social costs.

That is only a repetition of what was in the report. Experts considered the Town Planning Committe's report and evolved M.A.T.S. No. 1, M.A.T.S. No. 2, and M.A.T.S. No. 3 before the final report was made. Other alternatives are not referred to in the report, but they all should be thoroughly investigated before we embark on the wholesale destruction of man's greatest pride, his home. Irrespective of what Government members think, I believe that a man's home, no matter how humble it may be, is his castle. Unfortunately, the report, if implemented, will cause the wanton destruction of this asset, and I believe that not all alternatives have been investigated. Until this is done we have no right to proceed to implement this report. As the Leader said, it should be withdrawn immediately, so that the people whose houses are to be destroyed may be relieved of their worries.

Another aspect in the reply given to me by the Premier should be considered: he spoke about considering both monetary and social costs. I assume that when the Minister of

Roads and Transport, whose report the Premier was giving, used the term "social costs" he was speaking about the social benefits of the area concerned; that is, community of interests. I emphasize to the Premier what is contained on page 113 of the report, which is as follows:

The well-being of the community as a whole should be considered above that of competing and sometimes conflicting interests. In formulation of an overall plan, therefore, a statement of goals is necessary.

Further, it states:

A transportation plan should provide for safe and efficient movement of people and goods while preserving the social, aesthetic, and cultural amenities of the community.

But these are the things that the plan will destroy. It will break asunder the community of interests that exists. How many Government members realize what will be destroyed if the plan is introduced? The suggested rail service will destroy a church, the pastor of which did not know until this morning that this would happen. Additions are now being made to that church building. This is not planning but lack of planning. The suggested railway line cuts through the only oval in the area, and this is used by the children of the Black Forest school for their sporting activities. This will happen in addition to houses being destroyed. In a short span of a quarter of a mile the monstrosity (I cannot describe it in any other way) of the Noarlunga freeway effectively knocks over another church that has been built for about five years, 80 Housing Trust pensioner flats (I do not know where these people will be re-housed), an elderly citizens clubroom, a meals-on-wheels kitchen, and a kindergarten. How is this preserving the social, aesthetic, and cultural amenities of the community? The whole thing is hypocritical. I asked the Premier whether the Government would accept the responsibility of finding houses of a comparable standard for those people who will be affected by the implementation of the scheme. His reply was as follows:

Where the house is required for Government operations, such as provision of roads, it is normal to compensate the owner in cash, making due allowances for indirect costs attributable to such factors as removal of furniture . . . etc. Beyond the services normally offered by the Housing Trust, it is not expected that the Government will become directly involved in the location of alternative housing for those displaced.

This is not good enough: the question cannot be disposed of as simply as that. In fact, after the Premier had provided the reply we read in the newspaper that the Minister of Roads and Transport had suggested that an amount in excess of the market value might be payable. This is, in fact, substantiated by the Premier's reply yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition. So, here again we have a conflicting reply on these all-important questions. What compensation is it, when a person who has invested in a house is merely given a parcel of cash and told that instead of living within four, five or six miles of the city he must move out to a place 10, 12 or 15 miles from the city? This will inflate the cost of land. In fact, I know that someone fairly close to the Government is interested in land sales, and I cannot help drawing certain conclusions. This will happen, and members opposite know it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What conclusions do you draw?

Mr. VIRGO: The Minister may draw his own conclusions, and I will draw mine. If he wishes to draw conclusions, that is his business, and I am not interested in his conclusions. I am interested in the fact that people in the District of Edwardstown and people in the District of Mitcham, about whom the Attorney-General should be concerned, will lose their homes.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You got off that fairly quickly.

Mr. VIRGO: No, I did not; I have been on this and I will stay on it until the Government comes to its senses, and it certainly has not yet done so. I asked the Premier whether the Government would provide maps showing subdivisional boundaries, so that we would have a clear indication of the properties affected by the M.A.T.S. Report. His reply, strange as it might seem, was that there was no map available, and his concluding words were:

The number of actual properties involved cannot be determined.

If the number of properties cannot be determined, how can the Government say what will be the cost of acquisition? Is it nothing more than a wild guess? This is the only conclusion we can draw. I wish to turn now to the question of rapid rail transit, which I believe is the worst and most stupid feature of the plan. If members opposite have considered the report, they know that the existing railway line from Edwardstown to Goodwood is to be discontinued and in its place a great swathe is to be cut through the Wunderlich tile factory and through some houses. Also, the one oval that we have in the area will be cut in two and will be useless for sport.

This swathe will then cut through more houses and a church and finally link up with the existing Glenelg tramline. The Premier's reply on this matter was perhaps the most astounding of all the replies I received. He said that the proposed relocation provided for the improvement of a difficult level crossing at the intersection of Cross Road and South Road and the connection of the Brighton railway line with the proposed King William Street underground line. The report says that this will save building an overpass at the intersection of Cross Road and South Road at a cost of $1,000,000. Apparently, this is too much to spend for an overpass. But let us look at the cost estimates at the back of the report! If members opposite work it out for themselves they will find that the cost of the new route is about $4,500,000. In other words, the recommendation is: let us save $1,000,000 by spending $4,500,000!

If this is the type of economics that is to be inflicted on us, I do not know where this State will finish up. The strange part is that the overpass at the intersection of Cross Road and South Road was to cost $1,000,000 but we find that an overpass over Cross Road or over South Road or over First Avenue (there are three of them) is to cost only $280,000. Certainly, they will be a little shorter. However, it is extremely difficult to try to justify stupid statements of this nature. One of the many letters I have received is from the committee of management of the Edwardstown District Cricket Club, which is affiliated to the Edwardstown Junior Cricket Association. The club voices its protest to the Government about the proposed new freeway that is planned to cut through the Glandore Oval, for it says that the suggested route would mean the eradication of four buildings and a considerable area of turf and would result in the ending of the useful life of the oval. Members opposite should know that two of the four buildings referred to are occupied by the Mothers and Babies Health Association and the Boy Scouts. The other buildings affected are occupied by Meals on Wheels and the Elderly Citizens Club. Pensioners' cottages are also affected. This is the amount of human consideration involved in this report!

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Would you abandon the report altogether?

Mr. VIRGO: No, but, like the Leader of the Opposition, I would not be a party to releasing it until all the information required by the people affected was available. I would not have released the report until every alternative to the demolition of houses had been considered. In other words, the Government had a responsibility to satisfy itself beyond any doubt whatever that there was no other scheme available, but the Government has not done this. It cannot even answer simple questions about it. The Government was looking for the limelight and was trying to promote itself before the public as a forward-planning Government which had the welfare of this State at heart. In fact, all it has proved to the people is that it will foist upon the people schemes that will do nothing more than destroy their peaceful living conditions. The Government has committed an unpardonable sin in releasing the report without either having made its attitude known or having the answer to the many hundreds of questions already asked. The irresponsible action of the Government has resulted in the serious devaluation of properties and has caused considerable inconvenience to people living in the direct path of and adjacent to the various routes. The public is entitled to know the Government's attitude, and the Government cannot continue to sit on the fence. I believe that, if it is honest, the Government should immediately withdraw this report, inform the public that it intends to investigate it further, and examine all its details before presenting it again to the public.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): There are some strange but revealing inconsistencies in the two speeches we have heard in support of this urgency motion. There have been other things too: listening to the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), we have heard a generalized filthy smear delivered against unnamed members of the Liberal and Country League and an allegation that people close to the L.C.L. will profit financially out of the plans of the M.A.T.S. Report. I categorically deny that that is so. I point out to the member that his attitude will be gauged inside this House and outside it by the standard that he maintains in this Chamber. Just before he sat down, the member for Edwardstown almost cried about the fact that those connected with a church had learned only this morning that their property might be affected by the implementation of the M.A.T.S. Report, even though the report has not yet been accepted by the Government and even though those connected with the church, as well as everyone else concerned, have some months within which to make representations to the Government. The Leader said that his Party would never—

Mr. Virgo: Why don't you refer to the report?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown has made his speech.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader says, "We would never have let the report out without approving it." He would not give a person three months or five months (whatever is the remaining period) in which to approach the Government in connection with the report: he would have given until yesterday! That is what the Leader has said.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I haven't said anything of the kind.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: They were the exact words of the Leader in this House, and I challenge him to deny that tomorrow when he reads *Hansard*. He said, "We would never have let it out without approving it."

Mr. Corcoran: You are only displaying your ignorance when you talk like that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There was also a revealing contradiction here: the Leader of the Opposition was apparently unable to study the report because he did not have a copy. Although his Government spent $650,000 on the report, the Leader did not know anything about it. Well, that is in line with the financial management we had come to expect of the Labor Party when it was in office. It spent $650,000 on a report about which it knew nothing. Having spent $650,000 of the taxpayers' money on something that took three years to prepare, the Labor Party suddenly finds when the report is printed that it is unacceptable. It is a pity that members opposite during their three years in office did not exert themselves a little more than they say they have exerted themselves in the last three months. Let us return to the statement that the Opposition when in Government could not examine the report because it did not have a copy.

Mr. Virgo: Let us return to the report!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown has made his speech.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Why should the public be denied the knowledge of what is contained in the report? If the Government receives a report in order to study its ramifications, why should not the house-holder have a similar opportunity to study it and perhaps to suggest an alteration? Why would the Leader of the Opposition and members of his Party deny the public this opportunity? Indeed, they have clearly said today that that is what they would have done—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —even though they said that they could not at the time because they did not have a copy of the report. The public needed to know the contents of the report and, according to our belief in taking the public into our confidence, we have published the report in the proper manner. That course has been greatly appreciated by the public, despite what members opposite have said here. An article appearing in *Local Government in South Australia* states:

The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study began in 1965 and has taken three years and $650,000 to complete. Its findings and recommendations, which have now been released by the Government, are contained in the M.A.T.S. Report . . . *Local Government in South Australia* has thought this report sufficiently important to devote enough space for a complete summary in this issue to acquaint all elected members of councils and its other readers, each individually, with the contents of the report, before the first council meetings in September.

Of course, I am terribly sorry if we have done wrong in informing the councils of the plan and enabling them to discuss it! The report continues:

This surely is a generous offer indeed, and no civic-minded citizen is going to miss the opportunity of a lifetime to have some small part in the shaping of the future of his State.

I think that effectively voices the views of the majority of councils and councillors in South Australia, and I completely disagree with the Leader and the member for Edwardstown who said that we should have accepted the report before we released it. That is not the way we do things, whereas the Labor Party's attitude relates clearly to a rejection of public participation in these matters. The Leader said in the House today, "We would never have let the report out without approving it".

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You know perfectly well what I said. You are not going to lie about me here or anywhere else.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is what he said.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't lie.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the Leader does not like his own words, that is not my fault. Did he or did he not use those words?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I said this should have been dealt with under the Planning and Development Act, and you know that. Don't lie about something else. Why don't you tell the truth for once in your life!

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have dealt with the contention that the report should have been approved before it was released and with the contention of the member for Edwardstown about church authorities having a better warning—

Mr. Virgo: When did you deal with that?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —although he subscribes to the belief that the report should have been approved beforehand. I have also referred to the fact that the Labor Government spent $650,000 on this report but did not examine it, because it never had a copy, although it let the project run to $650,000. Members opposite say that if they had read the report they would have sent it back but, as they did not read it, they could not send it back.

Mr. Corcoran: It wasn't available.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Opposition spent $650,000 but thinks in retrospect that the report should have been sent back. The Leader said that the report had been foisted on the public.

Mr. Ryan: Like you were as Premier!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: He then went on to say that the public now knows. Of course, the public now knows about the plan, and people will be given an opportunity to make representations.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you approve it? Do you think it can be implemented?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: When the report was released the Minister and I said that the public would be able to study it and to make representations; that the debate could take place in this Chamber; and that when all these things were done a decision would be taken. We clearly made the overall decision that we would take the public into our confidence and allow them to make whatever representations they desired to make. Indeed, we want to make the public aware of our thinking, and we will continue to do so. If the Leader of the Opposition does not like the public being brought into Government planning, he has a few shocks in store for him, because we intend to bring the public further into the field of offering advice and suggestions to the Government, and the Leader will become well aware of those plans as time passes.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): Mr. Speaker—

Members interjecting:

Mr. CORCORAN: I have a perfect right to reply to something that the Premier has said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. CORCORAN: The Leader of the Opposition spoke and, although the Premier had a perfect right to get up then and reply to him, he chose to sit down. Now that the Premier has spoken, I have a perfect right to reply to what he has said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker, and on-one else, will decide who will speak in this Chamber. This debate must cease at 4 o'clock, so I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Corcoran) to speak to the motion.

Mr. CORCORAN: I certainly had no intention of doing otherwise, Sir, because I wanted to comment briefly on some of the things the Premier said. First, the Premier claimed that the Leader of the Opposition said that no opportunity would have been afforded the public to study the plan now available to them had the Labor Government still been in office. The Premier knows that that is a complete untruth. Indeed, he knows that the Leader of the Opposition was responsible for piloting through this Parliament the Planning and Development Act, and he knows that, if this Party had been in office, proper consideration would have been given to the M.A.T.S. Report. The necessary steps would then have been taken to put the plan into effect through the Planning and Development Act. This would have enabled people to lodge, through their councils, any objections they might have had to the plan. Had that been done, at least the people would have known that the Government approved of the scheme in principle.

The public of South Australia would have known that the Government had considered it a feasible plan and how the plan was to be financed. Obviously, this Government has not considered the financing of the plan. Indeed, I asked the Premier what discussions had taken place, prior to the report being released, between Treasury officials and the people responsible for this plan. He replied that Cabinet had discussed it and that Ministers had examined it in August, 1967. But we had not looked at the report as it has been released. We were briefed by the Highways Commissioner and another officer regarding what was likely to be included in the report, but we did not at that time discuss in detail any financial proposals, because the final report was not available to us and we did not know what was involved.

I am certain, however, that, if the Labor Party had been in office and this report had

been submitted to us, this sort of consideration would have been given to it before it was released for the public to view it and to lodge necessary objections. We would have known what land acquisition was involved, but the present Government does not know that. It has simply said, "We have a report that cost $650,000. Let us put it out and let people chew their cud on it, and we will think about it when everybody has raised an objection."

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order No. 137 I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been charged in this House this afternoon by the Premier with having suggested in this House and publicly that the provisions of the M.A.T.S. Report should never have been made public in order that the public could lodge objections to its provisions. I have never suggested any such thing at any time. I made it perfectly clear (as I make it perfectly clear now) that I believe this should have been dealt with in the terms of the Planning and Development Act, which provides quite specifically for the publication of proposals, put forward by the Planning and Development Authority as feasible for amendment of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, to the councils and the general public, and the acceptance and consideration in terms of the Statute of objections and proposals for amendment and of the material put forward. That has always been the position on this side of the House. I introduced and carried through this House the Planning and Development Bill, which provided for that kind of proposal to the public.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 7. Page 509.)

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): This subject (the age of majority) has become a matter of much interest throughout many communities in the world today. This has obviously happened because of the greater involvement of people younger than 21 years of age in community affairs than has occurred in the past. Of course, it is also associated with the earlier maturity, both mentally and physically, of today's young people. No doubt considerable debate will result on this subject as the session unfolds.

I am sure that there are a number of varying views on whether the age of majority should be reduced from 21 years to 18 years. Indeed, a number of surveys which have given varying opinions have been conducted in the community. Also, a number of associations have expressed views on the matter. There have been suggestions of compromise from some quarters: that any reduction should be gradual, and that the age should be reduced to either 20 or 19 years rather than to 18 years. Although some people want to compromise in this matter, I believe that the general argument centres on the contention that the age of majority should be reduced to 18 years.

At one stage I think the Leader used the words "a dragnet term". If he did not, I do so now. This term brings almost every aspect of the effect of the age of majority into the field of alteration. I believe, for this reason, that the Bill is somewhat faulty. A number of these matters should be considered separately from the one that is uppermost in the mind of the general public, namely, whether the voting age should be 21 or 18. For some people, this is a different question from that of lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18. I believe it is a different question also in the business and legal spheres.

Much has been written, and reports are available, concerning such proposed reductions. I do not intend to speak at any great length on this subject. I wish to refer the House to a discussion that took place at the recent Premiers' Conference in Canberra during which an important point was made. My impression of what was said in the discussion was that this point was subscribed to generally by the Premiers of the States of Australia, so I believe it is worth putting on record the minutes of this meeting which, of course, was held in public. They are headed "Reduction of the Voting Age and the Age of Legal Liability from 21 to 18 Years". This matter was initiated by the Premier of Tasmania (Mr. Reece), who said:

This matter has much wider implications. It arises from the fact that in a number of countries now the voting age is 18 years and has been for a long while. Some of these countries are in the Asiatic region. Support for the proposal has been evident in my State in recent times and I understand it is also supported in the United States. On

June 26 a newspaper carried this very short statement:

> President Johnson, seeking to overcome the generation gap, announced yesterday he would formally ask Congress later this week to lower the voting age in the United States from 21 to 18. Mr. Johnson said this, on ratification by the States as a constitutional amendment, would give the vote to 10,000,000 young men and women who are adult in every sense of the word.

We must admit that many young people today at 18 years of age have a better understanding of community affairs than many of us had at 28 years.

I do not know why he chose "28 years", but I think we would subscribe to that contention without generally subscribing to any choice of views such as are laid down. Mr. Reece continued:

There is another side to this question. In Great Britain in recent times an inquiry was conducted into the age of liability and the report of the inquiry recommended that the age of the liability be reduced from 21 years to 18 years. This, of course, is a separate question but one that needs some examination. It may properly be considered by the legal representatives of the States and the Commonwealth. However, if we are to consider lowering the voting age from 21 to 18 years, it is necessary for us to act uniformly. We have a common interest in the roll of electors for both Commonwealth and State elections and I do not think we should move on this unless we have complete agreement between the Commonwealth and the States.

Mr. Reece then put the case for the reduction in the voting age from 21 to 18. He said:

I would like to think that we could make some arrangement to consider the proposal that the voting age be lowered to 18 years. I hope the age of liability also will be reduced to 18 years. If support is needed for this suggestion, I refer the Premiers and yourself, Mr. Prime Minister, to the report made in Great Britain after a very exhaustive examination of this matter.

More or less replying to the debate, the Prime Minister said:

I suggest that if other Premiers feel that there is any advantage in the Attorneys-General discussing this matter, those discussions might take place. If the State Attorneys-General desired, the Commonwealth Attorney-General could listen to the discussions. There would be no commitment arising out of the discussions. I think that is the best way to deal with this matter.

Sir Arthur Rylah, speaking on behalf of Victoria, said:

This matter has already been discussed by the Attorneys-General. At the suggestion of the New South Wales Attorney-General the matter was referred to that State's Law Reform Commission. The Attorneys-General Conference is still awaiting a reply. I feel that if anything is done in this way it has to be done as a package deal.

Mr. Brand said, "Whatever we do, let it be uniform." Mr. Gorton then summed up the position (and no Premier disagreed with him) by saying, "I think that meets the situation." The most important fact arising from that discussion was that no actual opposition to the reduction in the voting age was voiced by any Premier. I gathered the impression that the conference had quite good support for this move. However, the overwhelming belief was that such a move should be uniform throughout Australia. Of course, electoral rolls would have to be brought together and administered. Also, if this State acted alone in this respect young peop'e aged between 18 and 21, having the vote in State elections, would expect to be able to vote at Commonwealth elections. There are always some people who do not fully understand the rights and duties of voting.

An even greater problem arises in connection with the way people move about from place to place, and this applies especially to young people. Some young people, who had been given the vote in this State, might visit another State and might not wish to vote in an election in this State. Then there is the difficulty in relation to postal voting which would be even greater for persons under 21, who had been given the vote in this State, in States in which such people did not have the vote. In the interests of uniformity, I agree entirely with the views expressed by the Premiers and their representatives at the conference. However, I have nothing against a reduction in the voting age, provided it can be introduced uniformly. On this basis I oppose the Bill. Whether or not the Bill has other desirable features remains to be seen. The legal and technical aspects of reducing the age of liability in all matters must be considered. Nevertheless, I oppose the Bill because there must be uniformity on this very important matter.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I support the Bill. I do not support it merely because it has been introduced by the Leader of my Party, although I congratulate him on introducing it. I support it for a number of reasons. The Premier said he would support a reduction in the voting age if other State Premiers also supported it and if legislation was uniform throughout Australia. Although I would like to see that happen, it is unlikely at this stage. I can see no reason why South Australia should not take the first step in this connection.

I support the Bill because I can see no reason why adulthood should not commence at the age of 18. In fact, 18-year-olds make up a large proportion of the work force today, and as we accept their contribution in this respect we should also grant them the right to participate in making decisions which affect their livelihood and future. We consider them responsible enough to shoulder arms to defend our country.

Regarding defence, the Commonwealth recognizes 17-year-olds as adults: it continually advertises for people in this age group to join the Army, saying that it will pay adult pay to people aged 17. Of course, at 20 young men are eligible for conscription, and many of them are forced to take part in oversea conflicts in which they are reluctant to participate. For this reason alone, every honourable member should support this motion. If we consider these people to be men enough to defend us in time of war, we should not argue about recognizing their capabilities to make decisions on matters that concern them.

I do not disagree with service training for young people, because it does much for them physically and otherwise, but I object to conscripting young men to take part in an undeclared war. In such circumstances, I think those concerned should have the right to participate in decisions regarding this conscription issue, particularly concerning the conflict that we have involved ourselves in at present. I consider the action taken to be no more than police action, and young people should have the right to say whether they want to be involved in this conflict.

Young people also make a large contribution to the country by way of taxes, and they attract considerable attention from the consumer goods industry. They make a large contribution to the economy of the State. I think most honourable members agree that those of them who desire a drink already enjoy this privilege. Evidence proves this to be so every day, and it is impossible to police the present law. Other States, realizing this, have lowered the drinking age to 18 years, and there is no evidence that these decisions have been bad. I think honourable members and the public agree that we should not make or retain laws that we cannot enforce.

There are many reasons why we should support this measure. We should extend the privilege to this age group because, as we accept their contributions and place heavy responsibilities on them, we should show our appreciation by recognizing them as adults. Today young people do not have the challenges that some of us have had. I was young during the time of the Second World War, and that was a challenge. The depression was another challenge to the young people, and they met the situation fairly well. Most of the young men aged 18 had left home in search of work, and they faced the challenges that confronted them. I consider that we should extend the challenge to young people today, because they will accept it and do credit to themselves.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): As the Premier has done, I oppose the Bill (not the motion, as I think the member for Port Pirie said it was) and I want to make clear, also as the Premier has done, that we do not oppose necessarily the principle of reducing the age of majority.

Mr. McKee: Of course you do.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let me say it straight out, if that will help the member for Port Pirie. We do not oppose the general principle of reducing the age of responsibility from 21 years to 18 years, but we consider, first, that this Bill is no good (and I shall deal with that matter soon) and, secondly, that this matter should be dealt with not in a package, as the Bill purports to do, but sector by sector of the law. As the Premier has made clear, many different matters are involved. If one agrees with the provision about having a drink in a hotel at the age of 18, one does not necessarily also agree with such a person having the right to vote. One may agree with both provisions, but one does not necessarily agree.

Many areas of the law are involved and should be considered separately, as the Government intends to do. I hope I have made quite clear that we do not oppose the general principle of a reduction of the age, but that we do not agree that this is the way to do it. Of course, I do not think anyone on the Opposition side believes that this Bill will float. When it was introduced it was not even printed. It had been thrown together, quite obviously, by the Leader in a considerable hurry, in the hope that by introducing any old Bill, full of imperfections, and so on, he would get some political benefit for his Party.

Mr. Casey: What are the imperfections that you refer to?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have a whole list of them. The honourable member may not agree with them all, but I am sure he will not disagree when he looks at his own Bill file and sees that his own Leader today has started the dreary old process that we knew so well when he was in office of putting on file amendments to his own Bills. Let the honourable member look at the quite extensive amendments that the Leader has put on the Bill file today, in support of my contention that the Bill is full of imperfections.

Let me say one other general thing before we get to the detail of the Bill, and I say this in support of my contention that we are not opposed to a reduction of the age in certain fields. It was I, when a member of the Opposition, who moved an amendment to the Wills Act Amendment Bill introduced by the previous Government. I sponsored an amendment to allow of a person of the age of 18 years or over making a will in South Australia, and that amendment was accepted by the previous Government.

Mr. McKee: Give your reasons for opposing this Bill.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already given them, but I will give them again if the member for Port Pirie has not been able to grasp them so far. First, this Bill is no good and, secondly, I do not consider that the whole matter should be considered as a package: the various facets should be considered separately. I have said that twice for the honourable member and I hope that even he is able to grasp the reasons that I have given.

It was I as a member of the Opposition who moved an amendment to allow the making of a valid will at the age of 18 years. I think all members of the then Opposition supported the amendment of the Law of Property Act introduced by the previous Government to allow of certain property transactions being entered into by persons of 18 years of age and over, so we are not opposed to this. However, the Leader has rather changed his ground. Knowing that this matter had been discussed at a conference of Attorneys-General (and the Premier has quoted from the minutes of a Premiers' Conference to that effect) I have made a search of what was said at Attorneys' conferences about this. I do not intend to quote anyone but the honourable Leader, because it would not be fair to other Attorneys to quote their views.

This matter was discussed at the Hobart conference in January, 1966, and the general feeling there was, as the Premier has put it, that if there were to be any significant change at all, the change should be Australia-wide. That was generally agreed, but what did our then Attorney-General say about this? He said, "We have a Bill before the House now which reduces the age for making a valid will to 18." He did not say that it was my Bill. One would have thought that it was his, but that does not matter. He was pleased to take some credit for it in another State. He went on to say, "We do propose to reduce the age for making valid transactions under the Real Property Act to 18." In fact, he subsequently introduced an amendment to the Real Property Act. He continued, "We are considering reducing the age of voting under the State Electoral Act to 18." That was in January, 1966, but it took him until July or August, 1968, to do anything about it.

Two years ago he said that this matter was being considered, and then there was an interjection by one of the other Attorneys-General and our Attorney-General then continued. I ask the member for Port Pirie and other members who support the Leader so diligently in all he does to consider this statement by the Leader, "We are not so happy about reducing the age of commercial responsibility and contractual law to 18." I think the word "not" in the following statement is a misprint and should read "now", and I shall read it with that correction. Our then Attorney-General said, "There is now such pressure upon youngsters to enter into hire-purchase agreements." So, in fact, when the Leader was Attorney-General in January, 1966, he had some significant reservations about reducing the age from 21 to 18. Perhaps I should explain my position to the member for Port Pirie and should read again, "We are not so happy about reducing the age of commercial responsibility and contractual law to 18." Yet that is precisely what the Leader purports to do in the Bill he has introduced.

Mr. McKee: That was two years ago.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I see! Let me ask the member for Port Pirie whether he thinks his Leader was right or wrong in January, 1966, and whether he thinks he is right or wrong today.

Mr. McKee: He is right today.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: So, he was wrong in January, 1966?

Mr. McKee: I didn't say he was wrong.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He cannot be right on both occasions.

Mr. Hurst: When was the law last amended?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is common law by and large. There has been no significant statutory amendment to it. They were a few general comments about my position on this matter and on the rather inconsistent positions taken by the Leader. Now, coming to the Bill, which I have said is no good, I must justify my criticism of it.

Mr. McKee: Particularly the voting side.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not have any strong views against this, nor do I have any strong views necessarily in favour of it. I do not regard it as significantly different from the drinking age or any other facet of the problem. As soon as the Bill was introduced (and it was introduced in haste in typescript form when we first got it), I referred it to the Law Society because it is something that would make a sweeping reform of one part of the law of this State. I also discussed the Bill with the Parliamentary Draftsman and with the Crown Solicitor, the experts on whom, naturally, the Government relies largely in these matters. I have had a number of reports from these authorities. I propose to quote from them, but I wish to make it clear before I do that the quotations I shall give to the House I adopt as my own views and take the responsibility for them, but I hope that members on both sides will realize that the quotations I give and the views I express have a substantial backing to them. As I make these quotations, I will not necessarily disclose from which source they come, but they come, as I say, from those whom I consulted about this matter. Let me begin with this particular quotation on the general implications of this Bill:

The law relating to infants and infancy is well established in, and forms a substantial portion of, our common law and Statute law and before any attempt is made to make any sweeping and radical change in that law, as this Bill is designed to do, it would be essential to examine the implications of that change in relation not only to infants themselves but also to persons other than infants who would be affected by such change. These implications can only be examined by making a study of all the common law and Statute law of South Australia, and this would require months of research.

I may say that the general opinion given to me by lawyers is that this Bill makes such sweeping changes in the law as to be quite dangerous.

Mr. McKee: How will they be dangerous?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let me quote a little more.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the Attorney-General quoting from?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already said I am quoting from a number of sources but that I adopt the quotations as my own opinions, and by that I stand.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is the honourable member proposing to quote at this stage?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have said that I propose to quote several opinions I have had from several members of the Law Reform Committee of the Law Society.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the Attorney-General sit down for a moment? I cannot allow the Attorney-General to quote the Parliamentary Draftsman. It has been held previously that there can be no reference to the Parliamentary Draftsman, and I ask the Attorney-General not to quote any opinion that has been expressed by the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I certainly will observe that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That would apply also to any quotation from the Crown Solicitor. If the Attorney-General does propose to quote the Crown Solicitor, he will have to table the whole document that he has received from the Crown Solicitor.

Mr. Jennings: We might get the other side of the story, then.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I thought I had made it plain that I did not propose to disclose from whom I was quoting, and that I wished to adopt—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney mentioned earlier that he had opinions from the Parliamentary Draftsman, the Law Society and the Crown Solicitor, and that is why I am drawing his attention to this matter.

Mr. Hurst: The Attorney-General has been told about it and now he should clarify the position.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I certainly defer to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not quoting any of these gentlemen.

Mr. Jennings: People have been thrown out of here for not doing that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Is that so?

Mr. Jennings: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: To try to satisfy the Attorney-General, let me refer to Erskine May, Seventeenth Edition, page 458, where it states:

A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a dispatch or other State paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the table.

I mentioned earlier that the Attorney-General has to lay the whole document on the table if it is from the Crown Solicitor. Further, at page 459, we see:

The opinions of the law officers of the Crown, being confidential, are not usually laid before Parliament or cited in debate; and their production has frequently been refused: but if a Minister deems it expedient that such opinions should be made known for the information of the House, he is entitled to cite them in debate.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Very well.

Mr. Hurst: You must say something original now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I thought that was what I was doing. Never mind—it does not matter. I can make the comments I want to make on the Bill in just the same way. I think my best plan is to go through the Bill clause by clause and try to say something about those clauses that I consider particularly dangerous. I deal first with clause 3.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, in view of what you have stated to the House, I ask that the documents from which the Attorney-General has quoted be tabled.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Wallaroo will be in order in his request if and when the Attorney-General identifies the document as the Crown Solicitor's opinion and if he quotes from it. I refer again to Erskine May:

A Minister who summarizes a correspondence, but does not actually quote from it, is not bound to lay it upon the table.

If the Attorney-General identifies the document from which he is quoting as the Crown Solicitor's opinion, as I have ruled earlier he is bound to table it. So far, the document has not been identified.

Mr. HUGHES: In view of your remarks to him and your quotations from Erskine May, the Attorney-General immediately refrained from continuing to quote from the document. That indicated to me that he must be quoting from one of the sources you have mentioned, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If the Attorney-General gives an undertaking to the House that he has not quoted from any of these sources, I have no point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I mentioned earlier, the Attorney-General must table the document from which he is reading if it is the Crown Solicitor's opinion and if he identifies it as being the Crown Solicitor's opinion. He said earlier that he has had an opinion of the Crown Solicitor but, so far, the document from which he is quoting has not been identified by him. If he identifies it as being the Crown Solicitor's report or opinion, he must table it.

Mr. HURST: The Attorney-General did in his earlier remarks refer to the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Crown Solicitor, together with that document from which he has quoted in this House. With great respect, I think the Attorney-General should either withdraw or table the document, because it is difficult for us to distinguish from which document he quoted—whether that of the Parliamentary Draftsman, the Crown Solicitor or some other body. His earlier remarks led up to a quotation from those people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I mentioned earlier, the Attorney-General has expressed certain opinions to the House today but he has not identified the particular documents, whether those opinions are from the Crown Solicitor or from the Parliamentary Draftsman. I pointed out earlier that he must table the opinion of the Crown Solicitor once the document has been indentified and he cannot refer to or quote any opinion from the Parliamentary Draftsman. If the Attorney-General quotes from any of those opinions, I ask him to table them if those opinions are identified. He can summarize generally an opinion that he has received, but as soon as the document is identified he will have to table it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: After these lengthy points of order, perhaps I can proceed. I assure you, Sir, that I have not transgressed, as the members for Wallaroo and Semaphore hoped I had, nor do I intend to transgress. Naturally, I defer absolutely to the ruling you have given. If I were to quote from the report of the Crown Solicitor I would unhesitatingly table it, but I shall not quote from it. Perhaps I can say that there are several matters in it to which I will refer in my own language, and will, as I said earlier I intended to do, adopt the points that have been made to me as my own. Apart from reports I have had from my officers there have also been reports from individual members of the Law Society. Unfortunately, the Law Society has not had the opportunity to consider the matter in detail and to express its view. This, because of the matters to

which I referred earlier, will take considerable time and that time has not yet been available to it.

Mr. Hurst: Has it expressed an opinion?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Law Society has not, but individual members of the society have.

Mr. Hurst: You could get 1,000 variations.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I could, but perhaps the honourable member would be interested to know that the opinions I have had are, to date, all to the same effect, although there are variations one from the other, that it would be quite dangerous to pass a Bill of this nature without examining all the ramifications of the various proposals. I now deal with one of them, which arises out of clause 3. I do not know whether the Leader has considered the question of inconsistency with Commonwealth legislation. Clause 3 (2) provides:

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.

Let me remind members that in several areas of law the Commonwealth has legislated—bills of exchange and matrimonial causes, to name two. What is to be the position if we pass this Bill and there is a conflict between its provisions and those in Commonwealth Statutes? As the Leader knows we are powerless to affect anything which the Commonwealth may validly put in its legislation. This situation would lead to untold confusion in several fields of law.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Instance some of them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Bills of exchange, cheques, and matrimonial causes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why should there be confusion?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because the general rule of the law is that 21 is the age of majority, and that applies in every State and runs through Commonwealth Statutes.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Only in some things: it is different for some States.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader knows as well as I know that we could not affect anything that the Commonwealth does. For instance, there are other Acts—the Bankruptcy Act, and the Patents Act, to name two—which are Commonwealth Acts, and anything that we try to do by this Bill, if conflicting with Commonwealth legislation, must fall to the ground. Surely the Leader would acknowledge that this would or could cause much confusion. The Premier referred to the Electoral Act and the differences that would be created between States.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There are differences between the States. This is a weak excuse.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The differences in this legislation are more serious than those in the Electoral Acts. It shows how absolutely essential it is to have a uniform approach if the legislation is to work satisfactorily.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What would you have said if I had put that excuse up about your amendment to the Wills Act?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I did in the Wills Act what I suggest we have to do here, that is, I introduced a specific amendment to a specific Act on one topic, the making of wills. We were able to legislate on that matter, and the Leader knows that. I suggest that this is exactly what we should be doing in every department of the law, and not trying, by a dragnet-type Bill, to cover everything before we know what ramifications will flow from it. Today, the Leader has placed amendments to his Bill on the files, as he often did when he was Attorney-General. Many ramifications were not considered by the Leader when he introduced this Bill. I refer to another error that the Leader has left in his Bill. Part IV (7) of the schedule refers to section 95 of the principal Act (that is, the Lottery and Gaming Act), but I think it should be section 55. Perhaps the Leader would be kind enough to check that and place another amendment on the file if he finds that I am correct.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you find these are major errors?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. We do not oppose the principle of the Bill but we oppose the way in which the Leader is introducing it.

Mr. Corcoran: Why not be fair dinkum about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have outlined the reasons why it is opposed, and I suggest that, if the Leader is to introduce a Bill, he should make sure that it is correct before doing so. In this case it is difficult

indeed to introduce a Bill that will not be full of imperfections when it tries to cover so wide a field of the law.

Mr. Broomhill: You have referred to one minor imperfection.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already referred to the Commonwealth legislation and to the inconsistencies that would undoubtedly arise between this Bill, if it were passed, and the Commonwealth legislation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How would the inconsistencies arise?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is the very matter that should be properly studied over a considerable period, so that we may find the inconsistencies and cover them. This is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition has not done.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Give us transactions where this will arise and where confusion will occur.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already mentioned four Commonwealth Acts where this could happen.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Give us specific instances of transactions where confusion could occur.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to do so, but I have no doubt that in these and many other fields there may be very serious inconsistencies.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you had done your homework you would be able to point to inconsistencies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am concerned to spell out the general principles of my objections to this Bill. Let me refer to some specific matters in clause 3 that the Leader of the Opposition, apparently, has not taken into account. When I mention these matters I am not quoting either the Crown Solicitor or the Parliamentary Draftsman: I am quoting from a private opinion given me on this matter. The opinion states:

The implications of section 3 have clearly not been thought out by the draftsman of the Bill. A few of the things it would affect are:

(*a*) powers of appointment;
(*b*) wards of court;
(*c*) infant partners;
(*d*) the law relating to perpetuities—is this now to be a life in being and 18 years thereafter?

The Leader knows that the present rule provides that this law is now in respect of 21 years thereafter. The opinion continues:

(*e*) the law relating to accumulations because this will reduce the period of minority referred to in Section 60 of the Law of Property Act;

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It does not affect a single will or instrument.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader will have a chance to reply. The opinion continues:

(*f*) the law relating to undue influence where infants are concerned;
(*g*) the law relating to adoption; and there are many others.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you agree with the opinion just quoted?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I agree with it to this extent: there are many ramifications of this Bill that are at present unknown, so there would be many serious consequences if we passed it at present. All these ramifications should be thought out before we pass the Bill. It is perfectly obvious that the Leader of the Opposition has not thought them out.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense! I have thought them out. The person whose opinion you quoted has not thought them out.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. It is certainly an opinion that I adopt for the purposes of my argument. Let me sum it up. Much work and thought must be given to this matter.

Mr. Clark: It has been given.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader of the Opposition was not here when I pointed to the inconsistency between his attitude in 1966 and his attitude now. He should study the implications of his remarks at the conference of Attorneys-General in 1966 and his remarks on this Bill. No doubt it caused him to think long and deeply. We believe that this matter must be tackled in the foreseeable future in this State. We must look at each sector of the law separately, as I did in the case of the Wills Act Amendment Bill and as the Leader of the Opposition did, when he was Attorney-General, in the case of the Law of Property Act Amendment Bill. When the Law Reform Committee, which will be appointed soon, is functioning, I will refer a number of these matters (which do not concern policy) to it for investigation and for advice to the Government. This is the best and most practical way of achieving our aim, which is to reduce, in certain fields anyway, the age of responsibility.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): We have been listening to opposition to this Bill from the Attorney-General, who has been

building up in his usual inimitable style some kind of bogy in order to knock it over. Obviously, if some minor amendments are necessary because of the points made by the Attorney-General, then surely they could be made in Committee, and the Attorney-General could have the honour and glory of moving them. No-one is stopping him. However, there is more to it than that.

Mr. Clark: He would not have introduced the Bill, though.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, but he is now going to be most enthusiastic in pursuing this objective by referring the matter to the Law Reform Committee. I do not think anyone here is particularly convinced by his legal arguments, because we all know how legal opinions can differ on these matters. We have complete confidence in the legal opinions of the Leader of the Opposition *vis-a-vis* those of the Attorney-General. On the average, the Leader's opinions are superior to those of the Attorney-General. Consequently, we are not very worried about the little bogy he built up in order to knock it down.

The only other objection we have heard this afternoon from members opposite is that this legislation should be part of a package deal and that we should seek agreement among the States on this matter before anything is done here. We all know that in the past agreement between the Commonwealth and the States has been virtually impossible to obtain, and where it has been obtained it has taken many years to obtain it. Surely it would be desirable for South Australia to start the ball rolling so that the matter could become a topic that excited interest throughout the Commonwealth. In this way we would obtain agreement more quickly than we would otherwise obtain it. If, however, someone says, "We must get agreement before any State takes action," then no State will take action. This is an old argument to prevent action but, when it suits members opposite, they say, "You don't need to postpone doing something until someone else does it: let us show initiative." On this occasion, however, because they do not want this Bill to pass, they say, "We must wait until everyone agrees."

I believe that, if someone starts the ball rolling, others will become convinced about the value of the legislation and we will then get agreement. The very statement that we must do nothing until there is agreement means nothing, and if everyone takes that attitude no-one does anything: everyone waits for everyone else to act. It is perfectly obvious what will happen if everyone adopts this attitude. After all, if it is right for us to do this, it must be right for everyone else to say, "Let's do nothing until we reach agreement." We therefore never reach agreement, and the Attorney-General, who is logical on occasion (when it suits him), knows that this is true.

Although members opposite who have spoken to this Bill have not opposed the actual reduction of the age of majority from 21 to 18, I think that it is worth while saying something about the value of this reduction, because there is opposition to the reduction from certain people. There is no particular sanctity about 21 being the age of majority; when one examines the circumstances in which 21 became accepted, it has no relevance whatever to present-day circumstances. In fact, I think most of us who have examined the matter know that the age of 21 was connected with the ability of people to carry arms, to carry the weight of heavy armour, to wield a lance, and so on. This was one reason in the early days for the adoption of 21 as the age of majority. In fact, the Roman historians tell us that the Barbarians (that is, of course, our ancestors; we sometimes forget that) considered that the age of 15 was sufficient for a person to be called "grown up", because they regarded people of 15 as being able to work and they said that this age was sufficient for a person to have reached the age of majority.

However, circumstances were different concerning those in the higher echelon of society, where people had to carry armour, and so forth, and 21 was declared the age of majority. Of course, later on, in 1660, military tenure was abolished and the holders of land would all have come of age at 15 because that age was accepted, apart altogether from the need to carry arms. To prevent this, Charles II enacted a Statute that a father could appoint a guardian until his child was 21, but that was done to ensure that young fellows would not squander their patrimony. It was not done because people thought 21 was a mature age. We read that later on, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the age of 21 was regarded as a suitable age of majority, because in that period property was a major consideration and, here again, as the owners of property were anxious that their successors should not squander the property, 21 was considered a good age of majority.

The historical background shows that there is nothing sacrosanct about the age of 21 and that the reasons for declaring 21 as the

age of majority in the past have no relevance at all to the needs of people today. In fact, the real reason for the need for this change is the fact that our young people are now more mature than they were at a similar age years ago, and they are much more ready and are better fitted to accept responsibility than they were years ago. I am a great believer in giving young people responsibility as soon as it is possible to do so. I have in mind a police boys' club in Griffith that I inspected some years ago. To my mind, this is one of the most successful youth organizations I have ever seen. The secret of its success is that all possible responsibility is placed on the lads in the club to run it themselves, with a minimum of interference from adults. These young members have accepted that responsibility, and they impose sanctions on those who misbehave themselves.

Those on whom the sanctions are imposed accept those sanctions, because they are imposed by people of their own age without the interference of adults who often try to brainwash younger people concerning a particular line of conduct. Members of this police club accepted the responsibility of running their affairs, and I have not the slightest doubt that much of the trouble these days concerning people in their teens arises from the fact that they have not been given sufficient responsibility to run things on their own account. I am satisfied from my acquaintance with people of all ages that students in their teens today have a greater sense of justice and equity than have many adults in the community. In addition, some of the students' biggest exhibitions of revolt (if one cares to put it that way) are the result of their disgust with the double standards displayed by many adults. Students have a much better sense of the fitness of things than have many adults, and I believe that they should be given the right to vote at 18. They should be able to express their opinions politically, believing that they can give those opinions some weight through the ballot box.

Indeed, I should be happy to see some younger men in this Parliament, far younger than those we have here at present, because I believe that the mixture of their youthful attitudes with the attitudes of older men would benefit the House generally. This is particularly so concerning another place because, if there is a Chamber that requires some youth in it, it is another place.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is not the attitude you used to take towards me when I was young.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Attorney-General is making a great mistake there; I do not think I had much experience of him when he was in his teens, although I have always thought that, having achieved his present age, he has not reached that stage of maturity that one would have expected him to achieve since he was in his teens.

Mr. Clark: Would you give him a vote?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Oh, yes. I am always concerned at the conformist attitude (a reactionary attitude, in fact) of some adults, who seem to imagine that everyone who wears clothes that may be a little "way out", or everyone who has a beard or perhaps long hair, is some form of delinquent. Obviously, the gentlemen whose paintings we see on the walls of this Chamber would not have had much of a go if they had lived today; they would have been "rejects" in the minds of certain people because, obviously, they do not bear the hallmark of present-day conformity. Actually, all these differences in appearances are valuable; fashions change gradually over the years, and most of us conform only because we do not wish to have people looking at us too closely and believing that we are a little unusual. We desire to be inconspicuous most of the time.

Young people who are different are merely expressing themselves. They feel a need to be a little different, and there is no reason why they should not. We find that when the people concerned get a little older they realize that there is not much point in being the object of attention all the time, and when they have reached the age of, say, 24 they usually behave much the same as most others behave and dress much the same as most others dress. Indeed, at that stage, they are hardly distinguishable from anyone else in the community. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with that at all; it has applied throughout the ages. The Commonwealth member for Boothby seems to think that, because a professor has a beard or looks a little unusual, he cannot effectively teach his students, but that is sheer nonsense and a completely reactionary attitude.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member get back to the Bill?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This is an important matter when considered in relation to this Bill, because much of the objection

to the reduction of the age of majority to 18 years comes from people who say, "Look at these young people with their long hair and pop records. What sense of responsibility have they got?" Probably, many of them have a greater sense of responsibility than adults, bearing in mind the mess that the world is in, both economically and socially, today. Because they have a poor opinion of what is going on in the world (much of which is a result of what the adults have done), they should, therefore, be excused if they desire to protest in this way. As adults, we should ask ourselves whether we are more to blame than is the younger generation.

I have heard it said that the young people would be subjected to pressure from hire-purchase companies if they were given full responsibilities at 18 years. However, I have found that adult people fall into traps when buying commodities just as anyone else does, and I do not think that is an argument for not reducing the age of majority. Indeed, I believe that if one has faith in the young people, especially those in their teenage years, one receives a good response. There is no reason why young people of this age should not be given full responsibilities so that they can then exercise them.

As the honourable member for Port Pirie said, this is a challenge. Indeed, the depression and the war were a challenge to our young men, who answered that challenge. Surely it is a civic challenge to reduce the age of majority from 21 to 18 years. I am certain that, by so doing, we will get a good response, both socially and in every other way, from our young people. Obviously, some might not measure up to their responsibilities but, on the other hand, some adults do not measure up either. That is no reason for opposing a reduction of the age of majority to 18 years.

I am pleased to see that, so far, members opposite have not actually opposed such a reduction in the age of majority; their objections have been on other grounds. Whether their objections have been raised merely to defeat the Bill, only they know. However, there is no doubt that this is a desirable measure and that it should receive the full support of all members.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the general principle of reducing the age of majority. This is happening throughout the world, and there is no doubt that it must come. If such a move could be implemented uniformly throughout Australia, I should be prepared to support it. A number of people in this building who spoke on the Licensing Bill said that to reduce the drinking age to 18 years would be a realistic step. However, this matter should be dealt with as a whole when all the people of Australia agree on it.

The member for Whyalla referred to uniformity. That is what the Opposition preaches all the time: it wants everything uniform. However, it would be inconsistent to go ahead now in this matter. I agree with the member for Whyalla that we want younger people, particularly younger Opposition members, in this Parliament. Members opposite have not changed their general outlook since the 1930's although great advances, both in our economic and social lives, have been made since then. Indeed, a few younger people in Parliament would make a big improvement, particularly on the other side.

True, younger people are becoming mature at an earlier age. In a Gallup poll conducted in 1949, 55 per cent of the 21-29 age group voted Labor. However, the modern youth is an independent type who thinks for himself and who wants to know the reason for everything. I see that in the latest Gallup polls the 15-20 year old group has, over the years, swung to Liberal. Of course, this shows a sign of maturity and independence. The ratio of 41 per cent for the Liberal and Country Party to 27 per cent for the Australian Labor Party in a poll conducted in February is even more favourable for the L.C.P. than the position among the adults, 41 per cent of whom voted for the L.C.P. and 37 per cent of whom voted for the A.L.P. Therefore, politically they are growing up and maturing much more quickly than they did before.

We on this side support the idea that young people are more responsible. Indeed, a 19-year-old law student who was interviewed recently in Adelaide showed great signs of maturity. I refer to Miss Maria Grobowskie, who was born in England of Polish parents and who has just completed the first year law course at the University of Adelaide. Addressing a weekly meeting of the Rotary Club of Adelaide, she is reported in the *Advertiser* of November 30, 1967, as having said:

> If the experience and knowledge of adults could be combined with the enthusiasm and idealism of youth there was a chance for success in the world today.

Young people today are more tolerant and are more willing to discuss matters and to listen to the opinions of other people. We had a

demonstration recently of the way other people think, and we certainly want to be able to discuss matters amongst ourselves and to come to a common conclusion for the benefit of mankind. The *Advertiser* report continues:

Aspects of youth which adults criticized were those which caused adults to look back on their young life as having been so pleasant. Fashions for which youth was criticized were designed by adults, who also promoted the noisy records. And who provides the finance for them? she asked.

The youth of today was in urgent need of sexual education and education on the dignity of human life. The modern miss was incredibly naive about sexual relations, and the young man of today lacked responsibility and respect towards the female sex. The decisions to be made in youth were the most important of life, for these formed one's character.

"I hope when I become a mature adult that I will still find joy in the world, and life will continue to be an exciting voyage of discovery," Miss Grobowskie said.

Members talk about who is young and who is old, but I do not think it is a matter of years. Indeed, I feel quite young among this group when I hear some of the old ideas expressed here. One only becomes old when one is satisfied with things around one and accepts them as satisfactory. As long as one can see that there is a need for improvement in the world, one is still young.

I was rather surprised that the result of the Gallup poll showed a majority opposed to reducing the voting age to 18. Is that because the older generation does not understand the increased knowledge and maturity of younger people? It was said that, if the age at which hire-purchase contracts could be made were reduced to 18, young people would be exploited. However, figures of the position in England show that this section of the community honours its commitments. Apparently young people have shown a greater degree of responsibility than has been shown by other people. For these reasons, when legislation is introduced throughout Australia to lower the voting age, I will be proud to support it. However, we do not want to rush in at this stage just to be the first with the most. My opinion of modern youth is supported by Mr. A. M. Ramsay, who has been promoted to one of the leading positions in South Australia. He is reported as saying:

They question things. If they get a good answer they accept it. Give them a poor answer and they reject it. Young people today work much harder than I did.

I agree with that. I attended the university some 30 or 40 years ago and at that time the children there were mostly children of wealthy parents and it did not matter whether they got through. Some took 10 years to get through a course. If a student failed one subject he continued with another. However, today youngsters attending the university often have parents whose resources are limited and know that they must work hard to get through; they realize that if they do not do this they will not get a second chance. Mr. Ramsay continues:

It has been the experience of the Y.M.C.A. in introducing teenage activities for both boys and girls, that as young adults they did not commit themselves to one thing. Young people prefer not a total commitment to one body but take interest in specific activities.

Through their attitude, young people are able to get a broader view of things. They discuss with others the pros and cons of a matter, something which perhaps some older and middle-aged people are not prepared to do. Older people tend to be intolerant and to have closed minds. I noticed in a recent report that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland said that some student actions were increasingly alienating the public. Perhaps these actions were those of only a few. If I have a complaint in connection with young people, it is that I cannot understand why the Student Representative Council at the Adelaide University does not take some action against the few nuts who desecrate things and do other stupid acts. The saner majority at the university should take action in their own interests. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland is reported as saying:

In the microcosm of the family, parents no longer seem either able or willing to impose that degree of discipline over their children which they expect universities to enforce when their children become university students.

As I have said, there are more irresponsible parents than there are irresponsible children. If parents do not take an interest in what their children do, they will run into trouble. If parents take an interest in children and give them a degree of responsibility, 99 times out of a 100 the children respond. The Vice-Chancellor continues:

Young people are idealistic, hardworking and deeply concerned with human suffering. They try to face social problems with complete honesty. What is alarming is that all too often the conflict with authority is backed by a vocal, militant minority who flout democratic methods and seek to impose their opinions, the ideas of a very few, on the very great bulk of students as well as on the university.

That is not only the failing of youth but also a failing amongst older people. Many

people try, without any logical reason, to impose their opinions and ideas on others. I maintain that youth nearly always responds to responsibility. Young people are the hope of the future. As the member for Whyalla said, the world is not in a very satisfactory state. Perhaps, with the assistance of young people, we can develop a greater sense of duty to the community. Instead of looking at our own sectional interests, perhaps we can try to solve wider problems. Perhaps we can try to find some common ground for the various ideologies of the world. Our hope of achieving these things rests with the younger generation, because my generation has too much regard for sectional interests. An example of this sectional interest has been the situation in South Australia in the last few years, where the Government tried to help one particular section of the community. Another political Party in Australia has tried to protect one particular section and has finished up by doing that section untold harm.

I support the principle in the Bill, believing that action will be taken on it throughout the world. However, I am not prepared to support the Bill until uniform legislation can be introduced in other States. We do not want to cause confusion at election times by having people eligible to vote at one election and ineligible to vote at another. I believe there is a strong move in Tasmania to have this matter dealt with at a Commonwealth level.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think voluntary voting should apply?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, if young people were permitted to vote at 18 it could be on a voluntary basis. Of course, in a democracy all voting should be on a voluntary basis. Why should people be compelled to vote if they do not want to? When people are compelled to vote they are deprived of an essential liberty.

Mr. Lawn: Does the same principle apply with regard to fluoridation?

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is trying to lead me into discussing a subject not covered by the Bill. I will not do that. I support the Bill in principle, but believe that this should be done on an Australia-wide basis.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): The last speech was the most peculiar of the three we have heard from the Government side this afternoon, and that is undoubtedly saying something.

Mr. Clark: It was better than usual, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: It was a great improvement, but it could scarcely be other than that. I do not think we should compare it with former episodes, because that may put us in danger of completely mixing our values. I do not want to say much about what the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said, because I found his speech beyond comprehension. I could hear only little parts, but he was good enough to not bash our ears too much. In fact, I wondered why he bothered to speak at all, unless to fill in a certain time to serve his Party although the Party would be better served if he did not speak. His was the most peculiar of the three peculiar speeches from the Government side because he supported the principle of this Bill but said he intended to oppose the measure. The other two speakers (the distinguished Premier and the Attorney-General) said that they were not opposed to the Bill but that they were not going to support it (there is some slight difference there), whilst the member for Stirling is not supporting it but not opposing it. The other two gentlemen are not opposed to the principle, but are opposing the Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: You are getting more confused than usual.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not confused. I think the attitude taken this afternoon by members opposite would confuse anyone who was listening. However, one thing beyond any dispute was that those honourable members were not going to vote in favour of the second reading of the Bill. I do not know why, because they have not made this clear. The Premier spoke for the Government on the Bill with consummate contumely. He regarded this important Bill with such contempt that he rose to speak without knowing what he was saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to the honourable Premier as such.

Mr. JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Premier spoke very loosely about an important Bill that the honourable Premier obviously had not considered. He spoke on only one aspect—uniformity in voting laws. Surely this is something that the honourable Premier of this State, a Liberal Premier, should not talk about more than he has to.

Mr. Lawn: Hear, hear! He doesn't believe in uniformity.

Mr. JENNINGS: He does not believe in uniformity of voting laws. In this State we have an Upper House, to vote for which one has to have certain qualifications.

Mr. Clark: Even then you're lucky if you get a vote.

Mr. JENNINGS: One is very fortunate if one has a chance to vote, even so. Candidates for election to the Legislative Council have to have a special qualification: they have to be at least 30 years of age. To vote for the Upper House of the Commonwealth Parliament one has to be at least 21 years of age. Voting is compulsory for everyone over the age of 21, so where is the uniformity in voting laws throughout the Commonwealth? Certainly, South Australia has not contributed anything to the uniformity of voting laws in the Commonwealth. In fact, any uniformity that we have attempted to impose on the electorate of South Australia over the years has been resisted.

Mr. Lawn: South Australia is out of step with Victoria and Western Australia, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: We are out of step regarding the age of majority, and in other respects, too.

Mr. Lawn: What do you think they fear?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the fear is that people will vote against them. This is what they always consider when they are discussing the electoral and general voting laws of the State. This is why we have this iniquitous gerrymander. We have it not to serve the country people, although we have been asked to believe that at times, but to ensure that as far as possible those people opposite, the establishment, the governing classes, shall remain on the Treasury benches unless about 56 per cent of the people vote them out.

Mr. Rodda: You're getting the old poison cart out now.

Mr. JENNINGS: I certainly did not intend to speak in this way, but if I am encouraged by some of my friends, including the member for Victoria, I can continue in this way for a long time. One of the most peculiar of the many peculiar statements made by the Premier referred to voting: he did not speak of anything else. He is getting rather conscious about voting, and I think he is getting extremely afraid of the next election, with good reason. He talked about the greater mobility of people in these days.

Mr. Clark: What's that got to do with it?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know, but he thinks that, because young people between 18 years and 21 years of age have greater mobility, they may be in Western Australia or Victoria when an election is held and the electoral people may not know where to find them: further, these electors may not know their voting responsibilities. This is one of the most specious arguments that I have heard. It is so absurd that one would not expect it from a Premier, even such a Premier as we unfortunately have in this State today. I was going to talk about the honourable Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse). However, I have only a minute, and I am afraid that I would take much longer than that to talk about him on this matter, so I shall content myself for a while (probably a fortnight) and ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. R. Loveday:

(For wording of motion, see page 747.)

(Continued from August 21. Page 750.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I hope I can please my friends opposite rather more on this matter than on the last; I think I can do it this time.

Mr. Broomhill: We want no legal jargon.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No; I always talk in layman's language.

Mr. Broomhill: Have you a good opinion?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have a good opinion on this and I have been well briefed by the Minister of Local Government.

Mr. Lawn: Not the Law Society?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, not the Law Society, but it is an equally good source. I assure the member for Adelaide that I intend to say something about the motion but perhaps, before I give my reasons, the honourable member and other honourable members opposite will be glad to hear that the Government intends to support the motion. The petition before the House has been signed and duly certified to have been signed by a majority of the ratepayers residing in the area of the City of Whyalla Commission. The Government's view is that the will of the majority of ratepayers in the area should be respected. Therefore, it supports the petition.

However, Whyalla is a rapidly expanding city and effective and efficient local government at Whyalla will take some time to establish.

Extensive inquiries must be conducted and discussions held with residents at Whyalla and representatives of the large industrial companies and commerce. A close investigation of appropriate boundaries and wards is required. Attention must also be given to the position of the executive staff of the present commission fairly and effectively to deal with the many transitional problems that may arise before local government, under the provisions of the Local Government Act, is established at Whyalla. This is requested in the petition.

If the House accepts the petition, the Minister of Local Government is bound to place a Bill before Parliament to provide for the establishment of local government at Whyalla. The Government proposes to appoint a committee to investigate and report on all matters arising out of the proposed change. The necessary Bill can then be prepared. The members of the committee (subject to availability) will be: (1) the Director of Planning and Chairman of the State Planning Authority (Chairman); (2) the Surveyor-General or his nominee; (3) the Chairman of the City of Whyalla Commission; and (4) the Secretary of the Local Government Department. The Government considers that such a committee will bring together knowledge of local affairs, skilled planning and local government knowledge to ensure that local government is introduced at Whyalla in the manner and at the time best suited to the needs of the city and the surrounding areas.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I am pleased to hear from the Attorney-General that the Government will support the motion, because it is obvious from the Act that the proposed change entails certain things being done in accordance with the Act and the provisions of the Act being complied with. Therefore, the people of Whyalla will be pleased, in view of the petition presented to this House, to find that their prayer will be granted and that not only will a Bill be introduced to put into effect the prayer contained in the petition but also a committee will be appointed to deal with the transitional stages of moving into full local government. The petition contained in its prayer a request that a committee be appointed, and I am interested to hear who will be its members. I understood the Attorney-General to say (and I should like him to correct me if I am wrong) that the committee would consist of the Director of Planning, the Surveyor-General, the Chairman of the City of Whyalla Commission, and the Secretary of the Local Government Department.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Yes—the Surveyor-General or his nominee.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Attorney-General said that this would take some time. Whilst I appreciate that what is proposed will require much inquiry and consultation, I hope there will be no undue delay in consulting the people and organizations in Whyalla about the details of the transition. The transitional stage itself will require a consideration of the number of wards and the type of full local government, because the Local Government Act provides some options in regard to local government and careful consideration will be needed to see what will meet the needs of a rapidly growing city like Whyalla.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How many ratepayers are there on the roll at Whyalla?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The latest roll of ratepayers, compiled as at July 1, 1967, showed 6,545 ratepayers, but that number would have increased somewhat by now as additional people are coming into the city at the rate of about 2,000 a year. So it is obvious that, with the wards, consideration will have to be given to the rapid expansion of the city and allowance made for a local council that will not become ill-balanced in such a rapidly growing place.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you think the ward system is the best?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I should think so. During the period I was on the commission, the problems that sometimes arose from ward representation were overcome by close co-operation between the three elected members of the commission. We always got together on all matters affecting the city and reached a common policy that we considered was most beneficial to the whole city; we never proposed matters for our own wards to the exclusion of benefits for other wards. If this approach is made by people in local government, we get the very best results in local government. I have been somewhat annoyed from time to time when people have looked at the City Commission and said, "Ah, yes; this has functioned well because Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has appointed people from the company." I have always appreciated the work done by the B.H.P. appointees on the City Commission

because they have, on the whole, been particularly good men; but the assumption that, because they are B.H.P. officers, they are, as it were, the fount of all wisdom and the elected members are only (as the *Whyalla News* suggests, according to one gentleman commenting on the situation) "put there to give the opportunity of the public voice being heard", is, in my opinion, writing down the elected commissioners and the service they have given this body for many years. Had it not been for the work of the elected commissioners, particularly in the early years, the commission would have folded up. The elected members have rendered as signal a service as have the nominated members. People have considered that this has been a competent local government body. During the 20 years that I was a member every elected member, with the exception of one for the short period of two months at the commission's inception, was either endorsed or supported by the Australian Labor Party, although Party politics were not introduced. This good example of local government came out of that situation; it was not because three of the members were nominated by the company.

Recently, an attempt has been made to make political capital out of this issue. I have always been amused to hear it said that people in local government should not show their political affiliations, particularly when I remember that members of the Adelaide City Council are, invariably without exception, endorsed by the Liberal and Country League, but I do not criticize the council's actions because of that. To say that because people have political affiliations they should not be interested and active in local government has no bearing on the situation. This has been used against me from time to time as a member of the commission and against other members, but it is without foundation. People who advance that argument are indulging in Party politics. When people consider the past history of the commission they should remember that the work of the elected members has been equally as valuable as has that of those members appointed by the company. When full local government rights are granted, there is no reason why officers of the company should not seek election as individuals. The company will not sponsor them.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: In their own right.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of course, and no-one would object. Those associated with the A.L.P. and interested in local government in Whyalla have said that they would welcome these people standing for elections. It is not true to say that when Whyalla gets full local government it will be just Party politics because people who stand for election have political affiliation. We want to see full representation of the people in local government in Whyalla, and we believe that can be achieved. I am pleased to know that the prayer of the petitioners has been granted, and I am confident that this move will benefit the city of Whyalla. I am sure it will encourage an interest in local government by people in the city. At present, they do not consider that the commission fully represents the community. There will be a greater community interest, and competition amongst good citizens to show their feeling of responsibility by standing for election to the commission. Matters affecting the city will be discussed more competently, and out of this competition amongst the people a good group of citizens will be assembled who will do their best for the city.

Motion carried.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 1. Page 435.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): The Opposition is pleased to support the change made by this Bill, although it does so with certain reservations.

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

Mr. HUDSON: Members on this side view seriously the Government's action in reducing the amount of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money at the same time as the limit on loans advanced under the Homes Act is to be raised from $7,000 to $8,000. Opposition members have already made it clear in the debate on the Loan Estimates and by means of questions that this Government's action in reducing the sum available for housing at the same time as there is an increase in the average loan can only have the effect of reducing substantially the number of houses built.

Mr. Broomhill: There has been no denial from the Government about that.

Mr. HUDSON: That is correct: it is explicitly recognized. Indeed, it has also been explicitly recognized by the Treasurer that the building industry is at a low ebb. During the three or four months in which this Government has been in power there has been, if anything, a decline in house and flat approvals.

compared with the figures for the first three months of this year, and the building industry is badly in need of stimulus rather than action that will further depress the level of activity.

One aspect of this Bill needs to be noted because it will limit the effectiveness of the Bill in raising the limit of loans on cheaper houses. Section 7 of the principal Act at present provides that the Treasurer may execute a guarantee of up to 95 per cent of the value of a dwellinghouse provided that the amount of the loan on such purchase money does not exceed $6,000. He may, under the principal Act, execute a loan of more than $6,000 and less than $7,000, provided that the amount of the guarantee does not exceed 85 per cent of the value of the dwellinghouse. The amending Bill, however, alters only the $7,000 limit to $8,000: it does not touch the $6,000 limit at all. Therefore, if the amendment is accepted by the House the Treasurer can, up to a limit of $6,000, guarantee up to 95 per cent of the value of a dwellinghouse, and he may guarantee 85 per cent of the value of a dwellinghouse, provided that the loan does not exceed $8,000.

The effect of section 7 (2) I of the principal Act has been rendered almost completely useless by the refusal to increase the maximum amount of a loan from $6,000 to $7,000. Today there would very few houses in the metropolitan area 95 per cent of the full value of which would be less than $6,000. Obviously, there was some case for an increase in that limit as well. However, the Treasurer has seen fit not to raise the limit, claiming that facilities for guaranteeing repayment of such high-ratio loans (95 per cent of the full value of the dwellinghouse) are available through the operations of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. The Government has already indicated that it is its policy to encourage people, as far as possible, to obtain such high-ratio loans through the corporation. In fact, of course, while these are pious words, they are little more than that, and the general effect of these amendments will be more or less to remove permanently from the availability to most borrowers the possibility of obtaining a 95 per cent loan. In effect, the Bill helps some borrowers reduce second mortgage obligations and thereby eliminate some of the deposit gap that currently affects so much house purchase. But at the lower end of the scale concerning low value houses it does nothing to eliminate the deposit gap, because it is not possible to go to 95 per cent except where 95 per cent will be less than $6,000, and this will cut out the greater percentage of bank loans and loans through other institutions provided for in the Homes Act.

This Bill brings up to date one value stipulated in the Homes Act: it raises the limit of $7,000 to $8,000, and thereby helps meet some borrowers' difficulties currently being experienced regarding the gap between the price of a house and the sum that may be borrowed. But the Bill does not go the full way in meeting those difficulties. No doubt, the Treasurer had in mind the fact that his policies would reduce the absolute number of loans granted, as a result of Government action, and decided partly for that reason, rather than for the reason that concerns all this talk about the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, that section 7 (2) I of the principal Act would not be amended to permit a 95 per cent guarantee up to a limit of, say, $7,000. The Government is following a somewhat contradictory course in relation to the housing industry in general: it told the people of South Australia at the election that it would stimulate the building industry.

Of course, I suppose the Government may argue that it did not receive a mandate for anything at the election; we have certainly heard no mention of the word "mandate" from members opposite. No doubt they have a certain conscience about these matters. But I think that in view of the Treasurer's statements at the election, and in view of the policy presented by the Premier, it is rather unfortunate that in Government the Treasurer has seen fit to take actions that will only make the recovery in the building industry more difficult. We support the second reading of the Bill but we again request the Treasurer to consider further the need to provide more Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money in order to stimulate a recovery in the building industry. We believe that the action proposed in this Bill should have, in fact, been accompanied by an increase in Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement moneys to stimulate the building industry and should not have provided for any decrease, as has, in fact, taken place.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill, although I deplore the fact that it has been necessitated through creeping inflation, which has increased the cost of building houses. As a result of these increases it is more difficult to compete on world markets. Although we say that housing costs in South Australia are cheaper than those in any other

State, the average cost of a house built in this State is comparatively high (it could even be the highest in Australia). Undoubtedly this is because better types of house are built in this State. This is another reason why increased loans should be made available. It is interesting to see that the Returned Servicemen's League states that the increase in war service homes loans to $8,000 is inadequate and that it should have been to $10,000. The average cost of a war service home is over $10,000. Although Opposition members have said that, through this provision, fewer houses will be built, purchasers of houses would be in a much worse position if they were not able to secure these loans at reasonable interest rates.

The change of policy by the Reserve Bank in making more money available to savings banks means that more houses will be built. As a result of the provisions of this Bill, I do not think the housing industry in South Australia will be impeded by a lack of finance. The increase provided was absolutely essential. I deplore the fact that the cost of building houses is rapidly increasing. The basic problem we have throughout Australia is that costs are increasing as a result of various factors, without any corresponding increase in the living standards. Members on both sides of the House are interested in the general living standards of the people. Although we disagree on the means by which standards should be improved, we endeavour to improve them. Increasing costs in the building industry are to be deplored. However, as a result of these increases this Bill is necessary, and I support it.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the Bill. However, I am disappointed that the State Bank will be unable to lend money on established houses. I thought that the sum provided for loans under the Advances for Homes Act might have been increased from $500,000 to $700,000. The sale of established houses is important in the inner suburban districts. The member for Stirling referred to increasing costs in building houses. However, if the honourable member spoke to people in the building trade, he would find that they are receiving less than they deserve. Tradesmen are being told by people the price at which tradesmen can do a job. I do not know of any builders who are doing as well as was implied by the member for Stirling; more people have gone broke in the building trade than in any other business of which I know. I believe the honourable member is off the beam when he says that costs in the building industry have increased.

People in the Unley District and in other suburban districts need to be able to obtain extra money so that they can buy better houses, houses that were built, probably, 20 years or 30 years ago. I think the older houses were built to a better standard than the standard adopted today, when there is a tendency to build down to a price. I urge that consideration be given to providing assistance for the purchase of the better class of existing house. I also think that there will be a tendency to provide higher buildings as housing accommodation rather than to continue to sprawl as we have been doing. I hope that these matters will be considered and that under this legislation more help will be given young people.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): In supporting the Bill, I agree with what the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has said about the unfortunate inflationary tendencies in our society today which make necessary such legislation as this. In explaining this Bill, the Treasurer said:

> The Homes Act was originally enacted in 1941. It empowers the Treasurer to give guarantees to certain approved institutions to enable loans to be made to a higher percentage of valuation than would normally be available. Normal procedures of lenders restrict loans to 70 per cent of valuation but institutions operating under the aegis of the Homes Act may make loans up to 85 per cent and 95 per cent of valuation and the Treasurer guarantees that the lender will not make a loss on foreclosure and realization by so lending in excess of 70 per cent of valuation. . . . In line with its recently announced decision to increase the maximum loans to be made by the State Bank to $8,000, this Bill now increases the maximum loan on an 85 per cent valuation, which may be made subject to guarantee under the Homes Act, to $8,000.

As the member for Stirling has said, it is very much to be regretted that the inflationary tendencies in our economy, which are encouraged and perpetuated by the Socialist Party, make necessary such measures as this. It is fair enough for one to wonder, as you will, Mr. Speaker, where these inflationary tendencies will lead the State. Our export markets are decreasing, as you know, Sir, as a spokesman for the primary industries. Further, our export industries are drifting downwards, as are the incomes of primary producers. It seems that inflation is going on unabated in this country. Under this Bill the little people who want to buy houses will

have to borrow more money to make up for the increased price caused by inflation that has been forced on us by Socialism—by members opposite and by the Socialist base from which they operate.

I am always amused when I hear members of the Socialist Party talking about home ownership, because really in their hearts they do not believe in home ownership. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), who is interjecting, has been in this House only a very short while. A brand-new Socialist member of Parliament, he has had no experience, yet he gives voice every time he can. It is interesting to refer to what the Australian Labor Party policy is on home ownership. Being true Socialists, members opposite cannot possibly believe in home ownership, because that makes every individual family (as the member for Stirling has pointed out) a representative of the capitalist class. I take members opposite back to what Mr. Dedman, the Minister for Post-War Reconstruction and a very senior Minister in the Chifley Administration (very much senior to any members that we have in the Socialist Party in this Chamber), had to say about home ownership. He put the pot on the Socialist Party for ever, because he was foolish enough to have his words recorded in Commonwealth *Hansard,* indicating what the Socialist Party thought of home ownership. According to Commonwealth *Hansard* of September 13, 1945, he said:

The Commonwealth Government—

he was speaking about the Government led by Mr. Chifley, a most distinguished Parliamentarian—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see any clause in the Bill dealing with Socialism or the Socialist Party. The member for Light must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to legislation that we have before us providing for an increase to $8,000 of money that can be lent by the Treasurer to approved lending societies for the purpose of home ownership, and I am pointing out that members opposite do not really believe in home ownership. Mr. Dedman said:

The Commonwealth Government is concerned to provide adequate and good housing for workers; it is not concerned with making the workers into little capitalists.

This is what members opposite really think about home ownership. Mr. Dedman went on to say:

If there is any criticism which may be directed against the policies of past Governments, supported by the present Opposition, it is this: too much of their legislative programmes was deliberately designed to place the workers in a position in which they would have a vested interest in the continuation of capitalism.

All that has been said on this subject by the Socialist member for Glenelg and the Socialist member for Unley is just pure nonsense, for they do not really believe in home ownership.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill, to amend the Homes Act, contains three clauses dealing with conditions of guarantee and a general amendment of the principal Act relating to decimal currency. The member for Light must speak to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Mr. Speaker, unlike members opposite, I support this Bill with a true conscience.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I support this Bill, the purpose of which is to increase the maximum loan available to a potential house purchaser, under the Homes Act, from $7,000 to $8,000. This increase is desirable as the present maximum amount is not realistic because of the increasing cost of houses. The member for Light said that this increase was made necessary by the rise in costs that took place when the Labor Government was in office. However, if he likes to come to the Barossa District he will find that, before I took my seat in this House as the member for Barossa, people in that district were getting into difficulties with house ownership—and that was during the reign of the previous Liberal Government.

It is nothing new that people have been getting into difficulty with house purchasing because of the maximum loan available being insufficient. It is tragic when people put their life savings into a house and, unfortunately, have to take out a large second mortgage in respect of which they find they cannot maintain repayments. Often, they have to leave their homes, which are auctioned. Even when the homes have been auctioned, some owners have found that the money they get for the sale of their houses is less than the sum they still have outstanding as mortgage, and they are faced with no home and a debt. That has nothing to do with a Socialist Government, as the member for Light repeatedly calls us. It seems to me that he is more interested in what happens in the Labor Party than in what happens in the Liberal Party, and I suggest that he join the Labor Party.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise to reply to some of the remarks made by the member for Light. Listening to him this evening only shows this House and the people of South Australia what a rabble there is on the other side of the House. The Premier has told us he has a great legislative programme to deal with and he wants to get it through this House. So far, however, we have done nothing. It was only at 1.15 a.m. today that we finished the Loan Estimates.

Mr. Rodda: Whose fault was that?

Mr. LAWN: Members like the member for Light. That is what I am telling you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I am telling members opposite that they are just a rabble. The Premier wants legislation to go through—or does he? He would lead us to believe that he does. He wants to introduce the Budget tomorrow. We have several Bills on the Notice Paper. Only yesterday evening he told me that we would be sitting until Christmas.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I am speaking to the Bill. All the member for Light did was to speak about this Party and Socialism. I tell him now, as I told him last year, that I am always proud to say that I am a Socialist, and I am a believer in the greatest Socialist of all time—Christ. I am not the heathen from Light, dead from the neck up, paralysed from the waist down. One of these days, when his constituents know what he is like, they will make dead sure of it.

When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier, just behind him, not far from where the member for Light now sits, sat the present Premier, the member for Gouger. In those days he made sure that he was the rabbit behind the Premier. The member for Light has taken unto himself now to be the rabbit behind the Premier. The member for Light challenged my Party and said that it did not believe in house ownership. If he were not just a pup hardly out of his diapers I would have called him a liar; but this honourable member has only known one Labor Government in South Australia (he is that young) because of the gerrymander.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member should get back to the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that we did not believe in house ownership, and I am making the point that we do. Is not house ownership relevant to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? The Walsh and Dunstan Governments (the most recent Labor Governments) not only made more money available for house ownership in this State but did more, whereas the Playford Government refused to allow the State Bank to advance money to purchase older houses and required that money could be used only to build new houses. The Labor Party has always been interested in house ownership. Not only did it make money available to build new houses but it also did something that the Playford Government would not do, even when the member for Gouger was the rabbit behind Playford: it made it possible for people to buy older houses through the State Bank. I will tell the member for Light something that was done when he was only crawling around. The Gunn Labor Government from 1924 to 1926 organized the 1,000-homes scheme, which made it possible for a family to buy a house for a £25 deposit, and this was more than any Liberal Government had ever done.

The Labor Party has always encouraged house ownership. The Gunn Government started with the 1,000-homes scheme, and went further. When that Government was defeated the Premier's Plan Government was in control in 1933 when no-one had money, and the next Labor Government was led by the late Hon. Frank Walsh, who made it possible for additional money to be available to the State Bank so that people could buy older houses. When the member for Light makes the kind of statement he has made tonight he is either a liar or just does not know. I believe it is the latter: he just would not know.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you believe in capitalism or Socialism?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light is out of order.

Mr. LAWN: Why doesn't the honourable member grow up.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Light to obey the Chair.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I support the second reading. I rise only because we have been subjected to a barrage of the usual low standard from the member for Light.

Mr. Rodda: A submarine approach!

Mr. VIRGO: That may be so. I thought that when we entered the Chamber this evening we were to consider Bills that would benefit the people of this State but, unfortunately, we have one jester among the group who believes the legislation is a joke. This legislation is urgently needed by the people of this State. The fact that a Party of a political

complexion different from that of the Party to which I belong has introduced the measure surely should not be a reason to oppose it. It is obvious from the stand taken by members on this side that we are prepared to look at things in the interests of the people, and I think it is about time that someone in the Liberal Party caught hold of the member for Light and tried to ram some sense into his thick head.

I believe that the insults that are continually flung across this Chamber by the member for Light are a degradation of the Parliament of South Australia. I hope the Premier will take the honourable member in hand and ask him to co-operate with his colleagues to get some of the legislation through this House. To talk the way he did about the Labor Party's being opposed to home ownership is just so ridiculous that it is unbelievable. It is amazing that a person who claims to be a grown man can even come up with that sort of thing. The rules and policy of Parties are quoted in this House fairly often; I have the *Constitution, Principles and State Platform* of the Liberal Party, and it contains not one word about house ownership; it does not even refer to houses. That is what the Liberal Party thinks about houses! Do not let the member for Light give us this rubbish about the Labor Party's being opposed to house ownership.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you a Socialist or not?

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member knows that I am a Socialist; I am proud to be one, and so is every other member of my Party. I would rather be a Socialist than a capitalist, such as the member for Light obviously is.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He uses the word as a smear.

Mr. VIRGO: True. I ask the member for Light not to leave the Chamber but to listen to the policy of the Australian Labor Party concerning house ownership. If he does, he will realize that this Bill and our policy is one and the same.

Mr. Clark: He'll probably get up and apologize, too.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not think he is big enough to do that. We believe that housing is of such importance that we devote a complete section to it. Our policy is as follows:

1. The Minister of Housing to implement the functions outlined in this policy, co-ordinate the various aspects of housing policy, both private and public, and press for reforms where these are beyond the powers of the State.

2. The main function of the housing authority (the South Australian Housing Trust) to be to provide houses or flats to rent or purchase on low deposit, on terms within the capacity to pay of the ordinary worker. However, this should not prevent the trust from having a sale programme of houses to be sold on mortgage, so that workers shall not have to rely only on speculative builders for such houses.

Our Party's policy here is in complete conformity with the Bill, but the policy of the L.C.L. on housing is apparently so important that the subject does not even rate one line in that Party's constitution! We have observed much hypocrisy again on the part of the member for Light, and I only hope that his delaying Government legislation (and that is exactly what he has succeeded in doing) will induce the Premier and/or other members of his Party (if any of them can get at him) to tell him that he is here to legislate in the interests of the people who are paying him $7,700 a year.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 1. Page 435.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): This Bill provides the same general amendment to the Advances for Homes Act as those in the Bill to amend the Homes Act. Under the Advances for Homes Act, it has been the practice, as the Minister pointed out in his second reading explanation, to vote about $500,000 each year to meet requirements for loans that may not be made from Commonwealth-provided funds. Mainly, these loans are made available to purchasers of Housing Trust constructed houses. We should make clear in this debate that not everyone can obtain a maximum loan. I should like particularly to request the Minister to explain how, for very low-valued houses, the role of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation will be stimulated and encouraged by this Government. It is all very well to suggest, as he has done, that the activity by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation can be used to help cover the deposit gap on low-priced houses and that thus the necessity for providing for high ratio loans directly either under the Homes Act or under the Advances for Homes Act can be avoided. I know that in relation to this Bill this is less of a problem, because the Housing Trust generally has the most generous provisions available in this State for second mortgage. Therefore, those who contract to buy

through the Housing Trust or to buy Housing Trust houses generally have much less difficulty in meeting the deposit gap than other classes of buyer have.

Generally speaking, the trust, by investigating the financial position of prospective purchasers, ensures that they are able to meet the obligations they are undertaking. In the debate on the Homes Act Amendment Bill I asked the Treasurer to explain the Government's policy regarding the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation and to say what steps the Government was taking to ensure that the corporation's facilities were effectively used by house purchasers. He did not give that explanation and, therefore, I should be pleased if he would explain that during the debate on this Bill, stating what administrative procedures have been laid down and what contact has been made with organizations in this regard.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support this Bill for the same reason as I gave when speaking on the Homes Act Amendment Bill, which covered the same principle. In the last few years South Australia was lagging behind the other States regarding the number of houses insured with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. However, it is pleasing that the principle is extending to this State and that we have caught up with the Australian average regarding this type of insurance. Some young people, because of commitments, are unable to save deposits for houses, and legislation must be provided so that these people will be able either to rent a house or purchase one on low deposit. If we consider the wages earned by a young couple before marriage, assuming that males marry at about 23 years of age and females at about 20 years or 21 years, it seems that they should normally be able to save a reasonable deposit for a house if they have the will to do so, and the Commonwealth has provided for the granting of a subsidy in these instances. This enables more houses to be built and encourages young people to save. Those who are able to avail themselves of this scheme can, by making sacrifices in their youth, purchase a house without incurring unduly heavy capital and interest charges. The principle is that the Government should get behind those people who are prepared to help themselves. That is how we will get young people in houses of their own without their having too great a burden for the rest of their lives. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, am very pleased to support this Bill. To add to what I said in a previous debate on a similar Bill, I will say that I believe in the principle of house ownership. I consider that it is socially desirable for young people to be able to share some of our national wealth and our national capital so that they can start out in life with their own houses and their own titles. I believe this is a desirable move, and I support the Bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. Corcoran: But we don't, I suppose!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I do not think you do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I thank the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) for drawing my attention to what is a most important matter, namely, the use of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. Also, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) referred to the arrangement made through the Commonwealth Bank to supplement the savings of young people by providing a Commonwealth grant for those young people who have fulfilled the required conditions as customers of a savings bank.

I must admit that possibly not enough has been done by any of us, including me and perhaps the lending institutions, to make known to people what advantages are available to them under either the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation or the other avenues through the savings banks. I discussed this matter with the manager of an Adelaide bank some time ago, before I became Treasurer, and he urged that action be taken as far as possible to let these things be known.

I said in my second reading explanation that the State Bank would be making high ratio loans under the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, and I know from the many inquiries the bank gets of a nature that would justify consideration for high ratio loans that the borrower's attention will be drawn to this position. I am sure all members would agree that where a high ratio loan is not essential to the borrower it is better that he does not ask for it because, after all, borrowed money attracts interest and must be repaid. People should not be encouraged to apply for higher ratio loans than they actually need. I thank the honourable member for bringing the matter to my notice. I will examine in more detail than I have yet had time to do just what steps we can take to encourage people and to make

these things known to them, because the whole purpose of this legislation, and the legislation with which we have just dealt, is to facilitate people getting the necessary finance for building or buying houses. I will take whatever steps are possible to bring these matters to the notice of borrowers.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Sale of dwellinghouses."

Mr. HUDSON: I draw the Treasurer's attention to section 18 of the principal Act, which provides for a 90 per cent loan, while the Homes Act provides for a 95 per cent loan up to a limit of $6,000 and now, as a result of our amendment, an 85 per cent loan up to a limit of $8,000. Section 18 of the principal Act, as amended by this Bill, provides for a 90 per cent loan up to a limit of $8,000. There is inconsistency in these two Acts. It is not necessary for the Government now to try to reconcile them but I suggest that consideration be given to achieving uniformity. It may be possible to alleviate somewhat the conditions for the purchaser laid down in the Homes Act rather than make the provisions of the Advances for Homes Act any tougher. Whether one has to provide 10 per cent or 15 per cent by way of deposit, it can make a difference of a few hundred dollars in this range, and it is a matter of some significance.

I appreciate that the Advances for Homes Act is mainly used for Housing Trust purchases and that therefore in one sense there is less need for the 90 per cent provision than there is in respect of the Homes Act, because the Housing Trust has more generous second mortgage provisions than would be available to anyone having to go to some other source. Perhaps minor amendments could be introduced later to try to achieve some overall rationale for it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"General amendment of principal Act relating to decimal currency."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

Before "The principal" to insert "(1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section,"; and to add the following new subclause:

(2) The principal Act is amended by striking out each passage therein representing a percentage or other proportion expressed in terms of money in the currency provided for by the Coinage Act 1909-1947 of the Commonwealth, however that percentage or other proportion is expressed, and inserting in lieu thereof in each case a passage representing the equivalent percentage or proportion expressed in terms of money in the currency provided for by the Currency Act 1965 of the Commonwealth as amended.

These amendments are necessary because of an anomaly that has been noticed in relation to interest rates in this clause, which has not been correctly drafted. This clause is a general decimal currency amendment and is applicable where amounts expressed in old currency are to be converted to their equivalents in decimal currency. However, such an amendment is inappropriate where the amounts expressed in the old currency represent a proportion or percentage such as "four pounds ten shillings per centum per annum" as provided for in section 73 of the Act. If this amount was converted to decimal currency the result would be "nine dollars per centum" thus effectively doubling the rate of interest. Accordingly, this amendment will provide that where the reference in old currency in fact represents a proportion or percentage the result of the conversion will be the same proportion or percentage expressed in terms of decimal currency.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 1. Page 436.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): This is a further amendment in line with the change in the limit of the loan from $7,000 to $8,000, with an additional provision that where a settler is making improvements on his holding the increase in the limit of the loan is from $4,800 to $6,000. The Opposition supports both these amendments. I point out to the Treasurer that both section 7 and section 12*a* of the principal Act permit a loan of up to 90 per cent of the fair estimated value of the property, the amendment providing for a 90 per cent change in relation to section 12*a* having been made in 1944 and, in relation to section 7, in 1952.

Again, we have an inconsistency regarding the percentage of loan permitted. This, of course, is only really relevant on the smaller-value properties. However, the person concerned with such properties is just the kind

of person likely to get into difficulty through having to meet a margin of some hundreds of dollars by tapping another source of finance, which at present is often expensive. Some of the terms under which it is made available, and the use of a flat rate of interest in particular, have led to onerous lending arrangements being forced on to borrowers and have been the cause of a number of people getting into difficulty in meeting commitments entered into under various lending arrangements. It is not uncommon to find that a purchaser is borrowing temporary finance of $4,000 at 10 per cent, and on second mortgage he may be paying a flat rate of from 7 per cent to 8 per cent, or even a little more, over a five-year period, and that probably amounts to an effective rate of about 12 per cent.

I think everyone accepts the fact that the average individual in the community (in the middle income range) simply cannot afford to pay such interest rates on large commitments such as those involved in purchasing a house. The financial burden of this kind of interest rate in purchasing a television set, washing machine or other household goods, onerous though it may be, does not create the same problem as that created by high rates of interest in respect of larger-value houses and longer loans that are involved in purchasing a house. I am aware (and I know that other members on both sides of the House are aware) of constituents who have got into difficulties through their being induced to enter into onerous second mortgage conditions. I am aware, too, of the need to do all we can to ensure that the deposit gap is made as small as possible and that the conditions under which the deposit gap is bridged are made as reasonable as possible. Indeed, efforts to bring changes in this direction are essential. However, these are only quibbles about the general situation that exists in the community. They do not relate to the Bill, and the Opposition has pleasure in supporting the measure.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I, too, support the Bill, which relates to an increase in a sum advanced under certain conditions. It is interesting to see that last year the total advances under the existing Act amounted to $132,000, the repayments being $111,500. In view of the extraordinary number of settlers requiring finance for such things as the purchase of livestock, the discharge of existing mortgages, and so on, it is surprising that more use is not being made of advances under this legislation. Loans made under the Advances for Homes Act for the financial year ended June 30, 1967, totalled $761,000. Therefore, having regard to the proportion of settlers to the general community, it seems that insufficient use has been made of the provisions of Advances to Settlers Act.

The Commonwealth Development Bank of Australia is not involved in this matter, because a settler can secure such an advance from that bank only if he has already approached an ordinary bank. An advance under this legislation would be of extreme value to settlers at this stage in purchasing livestock, because purchasing livestock through stock mortgages means that the stock is tied up and the primary producers' liberty is disturbed. Therefore, it is a good thing that the sum that can be advanced has been increased, particularly in view of circumstances in which many settlers find themselves at present.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It reduces the age for enrolment of dental nurses from 18 years to 17 years. The training course for dental nurses is for a period of 12 months so that, in effect, training does not, under the Act as it now stands, commence in practice until a person is 17 years of age. The proposal is that commencement of the course may start at the age of 16 years, successful trainees being enrolled as qualified dental nurses at the age of seventeen.

The amendment has been recommended by the Nurses Board for the reasons that (*a*) by the time an interested potential dental nurse trainee has reached the age of 17 years, she might already be established in a position and feel reluctant to relinquish it to undertake a course not necessarily offering an opportunity for employment; and (*b*) trainee dental nurses are not required to accept the same degree of responsibility for patient care as trainee nurses generally. The board has pointed out that if a girl commenced her training at the age of 16 years and then decided that she was not suitable for nursing, she would still be young enough to train for another profession.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to protect fruit and plants from pests and disease. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It repeals the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959, and substitutes for it a new Act to be entitled the Fruit and Plant Protection Act, 1968. This legislation deals with matters of vital importance to the protection of trees and vegetation and their fruit and products from destruction or injury by pests or disease. The present Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act was enacted substantially in its present form in 1885. It has become increasingly outdated and ineffective in its application to modern methods of production and transportation. Many attempts have been made by regulation to improve the efficacy of the provisions necessary to ensure adequate restrictions upon the introduction and dissemination of pests and diseases, but it has become increasingly clear that a major revision of the Act is necessary.

The Bill cannot itself provide specifically for future contingencies, for it is, of course, impossible to anticipate and to provide remedies in advance for outbreaks of pests and disease. The purpose of the Bill is, therefore, to ensure that adequate power to deal with such outbreaks will exist when they occur. It thus attempts to achieve a maximum of flexibility, ensuring that power will exist where necessary, but that orchardists, viticulturists and others affected by its provisions are not subjected to unnecessary and gratuitous prohibitions and restraints. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959. It continues the inspectors appointed under the repealed Act in office and provides that the regulations and proclamations under that Act shall continue in force so far as they are applicable to the new Act. Clause 3 is the definition section. Perhaps the most significant definitions are those of disease, pest and plant. "Disease" is defined as including any infection or affection of a fruit or plant that the Governor declares to be a disease for the purposes of the Act, and any abnormality or disorder of, or injury to, a fruit or plant caused by a pest. "Pest" is defined as any organism or micro-organism that the Governor declares to be a pest for the purposes of the Act. A "plant" includes the species of vegetation specified in the definition, whether alive or dead, and materials from which they may be propagated. The definition includes sawn or dressed timber which has been causing some concern because of the possibility of disease being transmitted thereby.

Clause 4 empowers the Governor to prohibit either absolutely or conditionally the introduction or importation into the State of any pest, or any fruit or plant affected by disease, any fruit or plant of a species that is likely to introduce a pest or disease into the State, any host fruit or host plant of any species that has been grown in an area where host fruit or host plants of that species are subject to pests or disease, and any packaging or goods in or with which diseased fruit or plants have been packed. Clause 5 enables the Governor to specify certain ports and places as the only ports or places through which host fruit or host plants may be introduced into the State. Clause 6 enables the Governor to establish quarantine stations where diseased fruit and plants may be examined, disinfected or destroyed.

Clause 7 empowers the Governor to declare portions of the State to be quarantine areas. He may prohibit the removal of fruit or plants from the quarantine area; he may require the owners of land within the quarantine area to take prescribed measures for the control or eradication of a pest or disease; he may specify measures, in addition to those prescribed, to be taken by owners of land, discriminating, if necessary, between various portions of the quarantine area; and he may prohibit the planting and propagation of plants within the quarantine area during the period specified in the proclamation. Clause 8 enables the Governor to declare certain pests and diseases to be notifiable pests and diseases. If a person discovers any fruit or plant affected by a notifiable pest or disease he is required to notify the Chief Inspector forthwith. Subclause (3) places on the owner the onus of proving that the owner of an orchard did not know of the pest or disease. Clause 9 enables the Governor to proclaim such preventive measures directed against pests and diseases, to be taken by the owners of orchards, as he deems necessary.

Clause 10 provides for the appointment and remuneration of inspectors.. Clause 11 establishes the powers of inspectors. Under subclause (1) an inspector may enter upon any land, premises, vehicle, train, aircraft, vessel, carriage or conveyance on or in which there

is, or he suspects that there is, any fruit or plant affected by a pest or disease; subclause (2) empowers the inspector to disinfect or treat the fruit or plant and any packaging in which it has been packed. Subclause (3) empowers the inspector to remove and destroy any fruit or plant that he finds affected by any prescribed pest or disease and any packaging in which it has been packed. Clause 12 enables an inspector to direct the owner of property to take prescribed measures for the control or eradication of a pest or disease and to prevent the removal of fruit or plants from that property.

Clause 13 empowers the Minister, if he is of opinion that the owner of property is not taking proper measures to control or eradicate a pest or disease, to authorize an inspector to take such measures. Clause 14 provides that an inspector is not to be liable for any action taken *bona fide*, and without negligence, in the exercise of his powers under the Act. Clause 15 makes it an offence to obstruct or impede an inspector.

Clause 16 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 17 provides for the service of notices to be given under the Act. Clause 18 deals with the appropriation of moneys for the purposes of the Act. Clause 19 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act. This Bill re-enacts the old Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act with substantially the same powers but in a better and more workable form.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marine Act, 1936-1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments to the Marine Act, 1936-1966, some of which are designed to ensure the validity of certain existing provisions and others of which are to improve the operation and efficacy of the Act. Perhaps the most significant amendment consists of the insertion of a new Part in the Act establishing a committee to regulate the manning of the coast-trade and river ships. The question of the manning requirements that should be made and enforced by the Commonwealth and the various States of the Commonwealth has been studied for some time by the Australian Transport Advisory Council, a council of Commonwealth and State Government representatives convened by the Department of Shipping and Transport. The council has made recommendations that have been studied by officers of the Marine and Harbors Department, and it is now thought desirable that, in accordance with those recommendations, a State manning committee should be established having authority to determine the manner in which vessels are to be manned. Apart from the advantage of the Commonwealth and States adopting a uniform attitude towards the manning of ships, this amendment should accomplish an important economic advantage by the removal of outmoded and wasteful manning scales which are, in any case, inappropriate for the more specialized vessels now being built.

The Bill provides that the provisions of Part V of the Act, relating to investigations and inquiries into collisions, incompetence and misconduct, shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to fishing vessels. An attempt has already been made to extend these provisions to fishing vessels by regulation, but the validity of such a provision in the regulations is in question. There have been casualties involving fishing vessels since that regulation was promulgated and, in particular, the loss of the tuna vessel *San Michele* has underlined the necessity of legislation making possible inquiries into casualties involving vessels of this kind. The Marine Act provides that the Minister may cancel a certificate of survey in respect of a vessel if any structural alteration, or alteration to the machinery or equipment, is made without the approval of the Minister. However, the findings of the Court of Marine Inquiry in regard to the abandonment of the ketch *Nelcebee* highlighted the need to amend the Marine Act to provide that vessels in respect of which a certificate of survey had been issued must not be modified without the prior approval of the Minister.

The Bill, therefore, provides that structural alterations to a ship in respect of which a certificate of survey is in force, or modifications of its equipment or machinery, must not be made unless the Minister has approved them. In consequence of the introduction of compulsory surveys for fishing vessels, the Marine and Harbors Department has employed two additional surveyors who are shipwrights and who undertake the survey only of small wooden vessels. They have been appointed

with the title of Ship Surveyor, because section 70 provides only for the appointment of ship surveyors or engineer surveyors. The Bill amends the Act to provide for a title more appropriate to their distinctive calling and function.

In order that Australia may become a signatory to the Convention on the Safety of Life at Sea, it is necessary that certain amendments be made to the Marine Act to bring it into conformity with that convention. The Bill, therefore, makes an amendment to section 127 of the Act, providing for the application of certain provisions of the Commonwealth Navigation Act in this State, and enacts a new Part in the schedule to the Act, embodying relevant portions of the convention. In fact, an attempt has already been made, pursuant to section 59 of the Act, to insert these provisions in the schedule by means of regulations, but doubts have been expressed as to the validity of this attempt to put these provisions into effect.

Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 suspends the Bill for the signification of Her Majesty's consent thereon in accordance with section 736 of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act. Clause 3 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act. Clause 4 enacts new section 5a and re-enacts section 6 of the principal Act. New section 5a validates certain amending Acts, whose validity has been questioned because they did not conform with section 736 of the Imperial Merchant Shipping Act. This provision requires legislation affecting the coastal trade to have a suspending clause providing that it is not to come into effect until after the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon. Section 6 is re-enacted because of an error made in amending it in 1966.

Clause 5 strikes out provisions relating to manning scales, the operation of which is to be superseded by the Manning Committee. Clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 7 repeals sections 19 and 20, which are the present provisions in the Act relating to the manning of ships. Clause 8 re-enacts section 26 (2) simply for reasons of drafting. Clause 9 enacts new Part IIIA, comprising new sections 26a to 26e. This new Part establishes, and defines the functions of, the Manning Committee. New section 26a establishes, and provides for the composition of, the committee. It is to be comprised of three permanent members appointed by the Governor and two members who are nominated by the owner, or agent of the owner, of the ship in respect of which a determination is to be made. New section 26b provides for the nomination of these members. New section 26c provides for the quorum of the committee and the manner in which it is to decide questions arising for its consideration.

New section 26d provides for application to the committee, and defines its functions. It is to determine with what minimum complement of officers, engineers, and seamen a ship should be manned, and what should be their respective minimum qualifications and experience to ensure the safe navigation of the ship and the safe use of the ship in matters incidental to its navigation. New section 26e gives the committee certain powers necessary for the effective performance of its functions.

Clauses 10 to 13 make drafting amendments to the principal Act; clause 14 repeals an obsolete proviso; and clause 15 amends section 59 of the principal Act. The Second Schedule, to which that section refers, is now to contain the Rules for Preventing Collisions at Sea formulated by the Convention on Safety of Life at Sea. Consequently, references in that section to regulations are expanded to include rules. Provisions relating to a penalty for breach of the regulations or rules are also inserted. Clause 16 inserts corresponding provisions concerning penalties for breach of regulations relating to navigation on the Murray River, and clauses 17 to 19 make consequential amendments to sections 61, 62 and 64 of the principal Act.

Clause 20 re-enacts section 68 of the principal Act as new section 67aa. The amending Act of 1957 inadvertently inserted Division XA in the middle of Division X, thus displacing section 68 from its proper position in that Division. This amendment restores the section to its logical position. Clause 21 provides for the application of the provisions of the principal Act, dealing with inquiries and investigations into marine casualties, to fishing vessels. Clause 22 repeals section 68 of the principal Act. As has been mentioned, this section has been re-enacted as new section 67aa. Clauses 23 and 24 provide for a new category of surveyors to be entitled Shipwright Surveyors. As I have said, these surveyors are to undertake the specialized task of surveying small wooden vessels.

Clauses 25 and 26 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 27 enacts new section 78a. This new section prevents

any alteration to the equipment or machinery, or any structural alteration to the hull, of a ship in respect of which a certificate of survey is in force, unless the alteration is approved by the Minister. The value of a certificate of survey, which could otherwise be rendered nugatory by such alteration, is thus preserved. Clauses 28 to 31 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 32 re-enacts section 85 of the principal Act. This re-enactment is necessary because of defective amendments made in 1966. Clause 33 makes drafting amendments to section 86 of the principal Act. Clause 34 repeals section 108 (4) of the principal Act. The subsection is now obsolete. Clauses 35 to 37 make drafting amendments to the principal Act.

Clause 38 provides for the application of sections 215, 265 and 268 of the Commonwealth Navigation Act in South Australia. The application of these provisions in this State is necessary to bring our law into conformity with the Convention on Safety of Life at Sea. Clauses 39 and 40 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 41 repeals section 145 of the principal Act. This section inserts a provision in the Harbors Act, and it has been thought desirable to repeal this section in the Marine Act and to incorporate it in the Harbors Act by means of an amendment to that Act which is to be presented to Parliament during this session. Clause 42 enacts the first part of the Second Schedule. These provisions were promulgated by regulation in early 1966. But doubts have been raised as to their validity in that form, and consequently they are inserted by this Bill. They contain so much of the rules formulated by the Convention on Safety of Life at Sea as is relevant to South Australian conditions. Clause 43 makes decimal currency amendments to the principal Act.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 5, at 2 p.m.