

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 12, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

CANNERY CLOSURE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Many growers in the Renmark area have received from Moray Park Fruits Proprietary Limited a letter in the following terms:

Please find enclosed statement of final payment, which includes interest on 1967-68 fruit purchased from you under F.I.S.C.C. conditions. Where required cheque is enclosed; otherwise, payment has been remitted to your nominated payee. The directors of this company regret to inform you that, owing to financial losses sustained on the oversea market coupled with the uncertain future of the fruit canning industry, we consider it futile for a small proprietary cannery, such as ourselves, to continue to process fruit. We shall not, therefore, be in production in 1969. It is some years since this company showed a profit, and we have only been able to carry on for so long through the co-operation of the State Bank of South Australia. We thank you for your support in the past, and extend our good wishes for the future.

The company's wish about the future may be taken as a somewhat pious hope, in the circumstances. I am informed that many fruit-growers in the area have moneys owing to them by this company dating back to 1958. These growers, in order to get their fruit processed, will have to take shares in the Riverland cannery. With the closing of the Moray Park cannery, only two canneries (Jon Co-operative and Riverland cannery) will be operating in South Australia, and growers to whom money is owing will immediately be faced with a considerable payment in order to get their fruit processed. The company concerned, like all other companies in the canning industry, has been assisted considerably by the State Bank in the past. Can the Premier say what action the Government is taking to assist growers, particularly those in the Renmark area, faced with this extremely grim situation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government regrets the closing of this facility, which has served the industry for many years, as the Leader has said. I will take up the matter with Cabinet and bring down a reply.

GRAPE HARVESTING

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that in California a machine that makes possible the mechanical harvesting of grapes has been developed. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any information is available about this invention and about the economics of the mechanical harvesting of grapes? Will he also ask his colleague whether any attempt has been made in South Australia or in Australia to harvest grapes mechanically and, if it has not, whether an investigation can be made to find out whether this means of harvesting grapes has some value that may be beneficial, particularly to South Australia, in view of the large areas under grape vines in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Much information is available on mechanical harvesting, and I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to obtain a report for the honourable member.

RENMARK IRRIGATION

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Irrigation is aware that in rehabilitating the irrigation system at Renmark it has been decided to replace the open channel system by pipes, so that water would be reticulated in this manner throughout the whole settlement. Can he say whether the department has considered using pipes when the replacement of the open channel system becomes necessary in Government irrigated areas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Much discussion has taken place about replacing open channels in several areas, but this matter is extremely bound up with policy and, as the honourable member is aware, it is so heavily involved financially that it cannot be lightly decided, and I ask for time in order to give a considered reply. In amplifying the reference to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, I inform the honourable member that the party that went overseas recently and examined various matters concerning the trust has now returned, and these people have informed me that they have obtained much useful information of both a mechanical and an administrative nature.

DAIRYING

Mr. GILES: The Minister of Lands has informed me that he has received from the Minister of Agriculture a further reply to my recent question about aggregating dairying properties in the Adelaide Hills. Will he give that reply?

honourable member that the detailed recommendation of the Railways Commissioner is not yet available to the Minister and the Government. When that information is available, I will get it for the honourable member.

Mr. HUDSON: The recent increase in bus fares applies only for the first and second sections, so that any bus or tram traveller who travels some distance is not affected by the change; in particular, all of the constituents who have to come into the city by bus or tram from Glenelg or Somerton Park in my district pay the same fare as they paid previously. Many people in my district come into the city each day by train, joining the Brighton line at any of the stations between Oaklands Park and Marino Rocks. These people all have to pay a substantial sum each week in fares which, over the years, have risen as a percentage of their total pay, largely because of the distance they live from the city. In considering any recommendations made by the Railways Commissioner, will the Government especially consider those people who live a significant distance from the centre of the city of Adelaide and who are already paying a substantial proportion of their salary or wages in railway fares, so that any increase for them is either non-existent or only slight?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government will ensure that the honourable member's representations on behalf of this particular category of people are considered.

HEATHFIELD SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: It was recently announced that a Matriculation class would be available at Heathfield High School during the coming year. As it is now late in 1968 and as classrooms will be necessary at the commencement of the first term in 1969, can the Minister of Education say whether the department is presently calling tenders for constructing the necessary classroom buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the matter for the honourable member.

POSTAL DELIVERIES

Mr. VIRGO: About two or three weeks ago the Postmaster-General's Department reduced, in the suburbs, the number of letter deliveries from two to one and, in the city, from three to two, with a subsequent expected reduction to one. Since this scheme has been introduced and the effect experienced, I have received (and I am sure other members have also received) numerous complaints from all

sections of the community, including private citizens and people in business: the reduction in the number of deliveries is causing great concern. Although I realize this is primarily a Commonwealth matter, I direct the Premier's attention to it because of the effect it is having on citizens and business in the community. The Premier may or may not know that, under Public Service regulations, a restriction of 35 lb. is placed on the weight of a postal bag that a postman may carry on his bicycle. To overcome this, I am informed that two methods are currently being used. One is the overloading of bicycles, the net result of which is that bicycles are breaking down, thereby delaying deliveries by 24 hours and, in some cases, by 48 hours. The other method (and this is far worse) is that bags of mail are being carted by motor vehicle to predetermined places and left there and, as the postman goes on his rounds, he picks them up. This method is causing serious concern, as the security of mails is being jeopardized. Does the Premier regard this as a retrograde step? If he does regard it as a retrograde step, will he make an urgent request to the Postmaster-General on behalf of the South Australian people that the two suburban daily deliveries be restored forthwith?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I would have thought that the honourable member would have known that this was a matter for the Commonwealth authorities.

Mr. Virgo: I said that in my question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Therefore, I suggest that if he would like effective action on this matter he should take it up with his local member.

Mr. Virgo: What! A Liberal, and get nowhere!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member is too prejudiced in his political thoughts to take up this matter with his local member, that is his own affair.

Mr. Virgo: If that's all you think of the welfare of the people—

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Despite the honourable member's barbed comments and his political prejudice, I will obtain a report for him.

RENMARK HOUSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of November 7 about rental housing at Renmark?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust states that the trust has called tenders for the erection of 20 double-unit houses and 10 single-unit houses

at Renmark and that tenders will close on November 27, 1968. It is expected that contracts will be let shortly after that date. The single-unit houses will be for both rental and sale purposes and the double units will be for rental purposes.

PORT AUGUSTA BARYTES

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of November 7 regarding a company that has been formed to produce barytes at Port Augusta? Has he been able to contact the company?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: So far, inquiries have been directed to the Mines Department and to the Director of Industrial Promotion and I am awaiting a report from those two sources.

DECEASED ESTATES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General studied an advertisement that appears in the *Australian* of October 12, inviting members of the public to forward to an address in Brisbane, Queensland, the sum of \$9.95 for the purchase of a book that suggests methods of avoiding the need to administer a deceased estate by disposing of all assets prior to death? If he has studied the advertisement, can he comment on it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have studied the advertisement and I regard it as serious enough to have prepared some comments in case I was asked a question on this topic. I have been told that the author of the book is an American. Set out in the article are statements which may or may not be fair comment elsewhere. They are not helpful in South Australia. Indeed, they are quite misleading and worse. These statements include the following:

(1) That on the average it takes one to five years to complete the administration of a deceased estate;

(2) That under the existing probate system complete strangers may share in a deceased estate (apparently contrary to the testator's desire);

(3) That courts handling probate are "shot through with scandal";

(4) That by a declaration of trust a man may divest himself of his assets and later apparently change his mind and presumably re-vest the assets in himself; and

(5) That lawyers may not like it being suggested that the administration of a deceased estate can be avoided.

These assertions are quite untrue when applied to South Australia. A living person may so arrange his affairs that the administration of his deceased estate becomes unnecessary, but

this involves the giving away or transfer of his assets without the further ability to alter their ultimate destination. The procedure would not be as simple as that suggested by the advertisement. Bearing in mind the well-known saying that a person who acts as his own lawyer has a fool for a client, the best advice which can be given to a person desiring to arrange his financial affairs is directly contrary to that suggested by the advertisement. To avoid the pitfalls of preparing unusual legal documents at home a person should consult his solicitor.

SEATON CROSSING

Mr. HURST: I have received a letter from the parents of a young man who was killed on May 28 last in an accident at the level crossing at Morley Road and Lawton Crescent, Seaton, on the boundary of my district. I understand that letters have been written to the Commissioner of Police, the Minister of Roads and Transport, the South Australian Road Safety Council, the Woodville council and the Royal Automobile Association, and I also understand that about 177 residents of the area have signed a petition, requesting the installation of wig-wag signals at the crossing. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether these signals will be installed and whether any additional safety measures will be provided?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SILLO STORAGE

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to an urgent question I asked last week about storage of wheat in silos at the various centres?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No.

Mr. McKEE: I have tried to obtain a reply to my question about wheat storage in the silos and, as wheat was already being delivered to certain silos, I expected that the Minister would treat the matter as urgent. As the Minister is aware, all wheatgrowers contribute towards the cost of construction of these silos, and it therefore seems reasonable that each grower should be granted accommodation for his wheat in the silos. As I have pointed out previously, as a result of the record crop expected this year it will be impossible for many growers to store all their wheat on their properties, although they will be able to store part of it. As I consider this matter to be urgent, I will take it, if the reply is not forthcoming this week, that the Minister is not

private enterprise, which in the general sense we would be pleased to encourage. In relation to the question, biased though it may be in its presentation, I will get a report.

KESWICK SIDING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is not often that two great minds work alike but when, on the day that one is going to ask a question about a certain matter, one's favourite Labor member asks an identical question—

Mr. Hudson: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It relates to the question asked by the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) on October 8 about why the Railways Department was not able to gain a contract for transporting pipes in connection with work on the natural gas pipeline. As it is now November 12, and as I have an interest myself in this matter, will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport the result of any inquiries made into this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SAMCON SCHOOLS

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about the possibility of stepping up the production of Samcon schools?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The departmental Samcon report submitted earlier this year advocated increasing production progressively by about 40 per cent a year until the end of 1970. Action has been taken to put this recommendation into effect. At the time the report was submitted, five erection teams were constructing on an average two schools at any one time, and completing about six schools each year. There are now seven erection teams operating, and in June next year it is planned to have eight teams in the field. This will ensure full-scale activity on three major schools simultaneously, equivalent to a rate of about nine large primary schools each year. Samcon buildings are being used occasionally for other uses, such as dental clinics at various schools and a new temporary courthouse at Elizabeth. Research work is proceeding on the adaptation of the Samcon system of construction for high schools and area schools, and the first of these applications of the Samcon method of construction is likely to occur in mid-1969.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked some weeks ago about Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked about an area surrounding Bool Lagoon and said that he had received complaints about the fact that the water levels were too high. The reply from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board is as follows:

With the completion of the Mosquito Creek inlet channel from the Mount Gambier to Naracoorte railway line near Struan westerly to the eastern side of Bool Lagoon, the whole of the flow of the Mosquito Creek was diverted into the lagoon during the 1968 winter. The water has been held in the lagoon by the use of the regulator at the outlet drain on the western side of the lagoon. The regulator has been operated to control the level of the water consistent with drainage requirements, and at the same time to hold a level of water in the lagoon in order to provide the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department with sufficient information to proceed with its planning of a programme for the development of the reserve. At the present time the level of the water in the lagoon is at about R.L. 266.00. It was realized that the use of Bool Lagoon as a ponding basin and as a game and fauna reserve would probably have some adverse effect on the adjoining land but this could not be determined until after the first year of operation. So far, the board is aware that the properties of Messrs. Tucker, Harris and Allen have suffered inconvenience by the ponding of water in the lagoon and it is possible that the land held by Mr. B. Schinkel may also have been affected.

The position is being kept under close observation by the Assistant Resident Engineer, Penola, and the board has carried out inspections of the area. It is also the intention of the board to visit the area during the week November 11-15, 1968, with a view to meeting the landholders and investigating any complaints.

MOUNT GAMBIER CROSSINGS

Mr. BURDON: On June 26 last I asked a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport, through the Attorney-General, about the provision of automatic warning devices at Crouch Street and Commercial Street West railway crossings. The reply that I received on July 23 indicated that a departmental committee, charged with the responsibility of assessing priorities, had made recommendations concerning which protection should be afforded during the current financial year. Although those recommendations did not include provision for any crossings at Mount Gambier this financial year, the two crossings to which I have referred are apparently on

the list for future consideration. In view of the ever-apparent danger at these crossings, and before a fatal accident occurs, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to do his utmost to see that financial provision is made for these two crossings next year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

PACKAGED VEGETABLES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have received complaints about deception being practised in the sale of packaged goods, particularly unwashed potatoes and soup vegetables done up in plastic. The contention is that there is a habit of placing the rubbish at the bottom of the container in both instances and that this, of course, makes it difficult for the purchaser to examine the contents thoroughly, bearing in mind the way they are packaged. I am informed that the good potatoes are going to the potato chip merchants and that the rubbish is largely being packaged. As these types of vegetable are particularly purchased by people who are in the lower income bracket, will the Premier have the Prices Commissioner examine this matter to see what is going on in this direction?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to ask the Treasurer to refer this matter to the Prices Commissioner for his investigation.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the Mount Gambier Hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director-General of Medical Services reports:

The further inspection of the Mount Gambier Hospital was made by the Minister of Health and the Director-General of Medical Services on Saturday, August 17, 1968. It was noted that the daily average of occupied beds at the hospital during 1967-68 was 110.6. The present hospital has a total bed capacity of 210 beds. As the number of occupied beds in the present hospital falls far short of the total beds available, it is not considered desirable that the existing low occupancy level should be compounded further by the erection of a separate geriatric centre containing an additional 50 beds. A large number of elderly patients suffering from medical disabilities requiring nursing attention have been treated in the Mount Gambier Hospital in the past. In the main, these patients have received this attention in the medical wards on the first floor of the hospital. The nursing care given to elderly patients in this section has been of a high standard and that same standard is being maintained at the present time. As stated in the earlier reply on August 8, 1968, it is the

Government's intention, when funds become available, to re-structure the fourth floor of the hospital (at present unoccupied by patients) to provide a nursing area for acute medical cases. This alteration would free further beds on the first floor for elderly patients requiring more prolonged medical and nursing care. Considerable capital and maintenance savings would be possible under this proposal in contrast to any proposal to provide a large number of additional beds at a distance from the main inpatient area where there is already a high proportion of unoccupied beds.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: Last Tuesday I referred to a seminar which was conducted at the Adelaide University to discuss the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, and at which the following resolution was passed:

This seminar which met to consider the M.A.T.S. Report and the Adelaide development plan, and which was attended by some 230 people forming a cross-section of opinion in Adelaide, has resolved to ask the organizers to convey to the honourable Premier of South Australia to instruct his Ministers and departments that all action on the M.A.T.S. Report should be deferred until a comprehensive reappraisal or review of the development plan has been completed and approved. This review should include transportation considerations as well as other related facets and should be undertaken, it is considered, by an effective sub-committee of the State Planning Authority, including architects, urban designers, landscape architects, economists, sociologists and urban geographers. The study should range over a number of alternative land use patterns, including higher density inner area residential developments. They should include also public transport dominated systems and improvement of existing arterial road networks. It is furthermore resolved to ask that such a revaluation should be embodied in a suitable report available for public inspection and objection not later than January, 1971, before being submitted to Parliament for approval.

Last Thursday, when referring to the seminar in asking a question, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said that at the seminar opinions for and against the plan were discussed by some of the most learned people in Adelaide. Does the Premier agree with the honourable member's assessment that some of the most learned people in Adelaide were present and, if he does, will he assure the House that the Government will accede to the terms of the resolution?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the resolutions of the seminar are put to me officially, I shall be happy to look at them. The honourable member knows, as a result of questions he has asked me about the matter on behalf of individuals, organizations and councils that

white guide posts along the main highways within the settlement were set back 7ft. from the edge of the bitumen, slow-moving vehicles such as tractors would be able to travel off the edge of the bitumen, thus not restricting the flow of faster-moving traffic. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider this suggestion, also bearing in mind road safety?

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

SELECT COMMITTEES

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Attorney-General assure the public of South Australia that, if any person suggests to the Select Committee on Abortion, which the Attorney-General intends to appoint, that one or more members of the committee have pre-judged the abortion issue, that person will not be brought before the Bar of this House and censured for his statement?

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the Attorney-General wish to reply? This is a matter for the whole House.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I was merely going to say that, as the honourable member well knows, the practices and procedures of this House are laid down. The House is the master of its own business and it would be foolish of me or of anyone else (even more foolish than I think the honourable member on occasions believes me to be) to try to prognosticate what could happen.

Mr. RICHES: Mr. Speaker, can you tell the House what protection members of the public who may be invited to give evidence before a Select Committee of this House have against victimization or any other action in the future in regard to evidence they give or opinions they express?

The SPEAKER: Of course, the House is always in charge of its own business in a matter of that nature, and Standing Orders and previous practices lay down that a person giving evidence before a committee appointed by the House has certain privileges. Therefore if, in the opinion of the House, a witness has breached those privileges, the House is entitled to take what action it considers necessary in the matter. The House determines the matter because the question is whether, in the opinion of the House, any person has breached those privileges. The honourable member will also understand that it is the Speaker's duty to protect the privileges and rights of members at all times, and in my view that extends to

witnesses giving evidence before Select Committees appointed by this House. What happens in the other place is no concern of mine, because that Chamber is in charge of its business. I should like further time to consider the specific point referred to by the honourable member before giving a considered reply.

PENSIONERS' CONCESSION FARES

Mr. CASEY: Last Thursday, during the opening at Yunta of the new Adelaide to Broken Hill road, the Minister of Roads and Transport announced that the Government had granted concessions for rail travel to pensioners in Broken Hill. This was not exactly what the pensioners at Broken Hill had requested. At a deputation earlier this year that I arranged so that pensioners at Broken Hill could meet the Minister, it was explained that pensioners already received concessions for road travel from Broken Hill to Adelaide. Although the rail concessions will bring the position into line with road travel, the pensioners told the Minister that the people of Broken Hill did about 90 per cent of their business in Adelaide and that most of the elderly people who left Broken Hill on retirement usually came to Adelaide. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague again to consider granting pensioners from Broken Hill concessions for travel on Municipal Tramways Trust buses and the like in Adelaide?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is funny that the honourable member should make such a long explanation and say what he has said, because my information was that the Minister's announcement was particularly well received by those present including many people from Broken Hill.

Mr. Casey: I was there, too, and I ought to know.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member ought to know, but we know that frequently he does not know. However, I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with my colleague.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Premier a reply to my question about church properties acquired under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There are several methods by which compensation for acquiring a church property may be arrived at. Many factors must first be taken into account and agreement reached before any one method is

used. Investigations must be made on whether other suitable land or alternative suitable premises are available or whether the need for a church in the area still exists in the light of proposed works and other relevant factors. Section 12 (5) of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966, provides for one special method whereby buildings such as churches, schools, libraries, park lands, etc., may be acquired: this method is known as reinstatement. Section 12 (5) provides:

Where the land is, and but for the compulsory acquisition would continue to be, devoted to a purpose of such a nature that there is no general demand or market for land for that purpose, the compensation may, if the court or arbitrator is satisfied that reinstatement in some other place is bona fide intended, be assessed on the basis of the reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement.

C. M. Collins, B.A., LL.B., in his work *The Valuation of Property Compensation and Land Tax* refers to reinstatement as follows:

It certainly does not mean that the resuming authority must find new and suitable premises at whatever cost, and is only applicable when land that could be used for reinstatement is available or can be had on terms that are reasonable.

I consider that the provisions of the Act are such that specific compensation could be agreed only after a thorough investigation of all the circumstances of an individual case. It seems apparent that, when the time arrives, the acquisition of churches will be treated in a different manner from normal acquisitions where market values can be established. Each case will need to be treated on its merits in collaboration with the particular church authority. The basis of compensation will therefore be some form of replacement not necessarily in the exact architectural form as it exists.

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the purchase by one of my constituents of a block of land in the path of an expressway?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have been informed that the honourable member's constituent who purchased a block of land in the path of an expressway recommended in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report should contact the Administrative Officer, Planning and Design (Mr. E. W. Tylor) in the Highways and Local Government Department, and an appointment will be made for him to discuss the matter further.

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 1 concerning the property of Mr. and Mrs. H. B. St. George at Glandore?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The property of Mr. and Mrs. H. B. St. George at 532 Cross Road, Glandore, is affected by the proposed Noarlunga Freeway recommended in the M.A.T.S. Report. The recommendations of the transportation study are presently subject to a six-month public review period, due to terminate on February 12, 1969. During this period, interested parties are invited to make submissions on the proposals, and it is possible, as a result of these, that the proposals may be modified. No decision has yet been made by the Government regarding acceptance or otherwise of the M.A.T.S. proposals.

In these circumstances, the department would prefer to avoid acquiring properties which, at this stage, it is not certain will be required for road purposes. If, however, the owner is anxious to sell and is unable to do so at a reasonable price on the normal market on account of the road proposals affecting the property, and is being caused hardship on this account, then the department will consider immediate acquisition. In the case of Mr. and Mrs. H. B. St. George, in his letter of October 8, addressed to the Premier, the honourable member had stated that Mr. St. George had told him, "They hope they do not have to get rid of their home as they are both very happy in it". It is suggested, therefore, that Mr. and Mrs. St. George await at least the expiration of the current review period, and longer if they prefer, before making any move for acquisition of their property by the department. If, however, this is not acceptable to Mr. and Mrs. St. George, they should be informed to contact the department with a view to establishing hardship and arranging for acquisition.

SOLOMONTOWN OVER-PASS

Mr. McKEE: The Attorney-General will recall that over a period I have asked many questions about the Solomontown over-pass and, in my courteous way, I have sought information concerning its construction. As, in his reply to my last question, the Attorney-General said that tenders were being called, can he say who was the successful tenderer and when the work is expected to start?

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

MURRAY BRIDGE JUNCTION

Mr. WARDLE: Because of its nature, the junction of Swanport Road, Standen Street, and Adelaide Road at Murray Bridge has always been a traffic hazard, particularly for

I entirely support the companies provision in the Bill, believing this amendment to be desirable and necessary in the present circumstances. The other main amendment relates to the change in the age for drinking in a public place, licensed premises, a booth or cabaret from 21 years to 18 years. That provision is also included in a Bill that I introduced. As my support for it has been earlier expressed, I see no reason to reiterate it here other than to say that I support it.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The Leader of the Opposition said that the increased charge provided in the Bill would increase the cost of living and would be a burden on the community. The Opposition has often said that more money should be spent in various ways. Naturally this money must be raised in some way and this will always mean an increase in the cost of living. The Opposition advocates improved services, and obviously someone has to pay for them. Perhaps it is better that people who drink liquor are affected because, although some claim that liquor is a necessity, I think it can be said that, to a certain extent, it is a luxury. The Leader made heavy weather of his argument in this respect. He said that his Government had refrained from increasing the charge to the level applying in the other States because it could not do anything about arrangements made by lessees. However, there has been a period of adjustment since this Act was first introduced, and these charges can now reasonably be brought to the level applying in the other States, especially if we are to provide the services offered in other States, as the Opposition always advocates.

The Bill also provides for a reduction in the age for drinking from 21 years to 18 years. As I have said previously, I agree with this move, provided parents train their children in relation to the difficulties that the younger generation must now face. However, in moving around my district, I have found much opposition to this reduction, and it has come from most unexpected sources. Up to a point, members must analyse a situation bearing in mind what the people in the area they represent want. I have found in my district that, when the actual facts are explained, there is little opposition in regard to matters such as the adult franchise for the Upper House.

Mr. Corcoran: What are the actual facts of the case?

Mr. McANANEY: There are always true facts, but the position can be easily distorted. As I have said, I have found considerable opposition to this proposed reduction in the

drinking age. Mainly, people opposing the move have said that most 18-year-olds are students. However, if one works out the number of people of this age who attend the university or teachers college and the number who earn their living at various jobs, one finds that the bulk of these young adults are, in fact, out earning their living and mixing in the general community. I have gone further in regard to some of these social questions than I wished to go simply because there was insufficient policing of the law, and it seemed to me ridiculous for Parliament to make laws if they were not to be policed. If the age for drinking is reduced to 18, some safeguard must be incorporated in the Act to make sure that people under that age are not permitted to drink in hotels. During the last week or two, I have spent some time looking at the provisions in the present Act as it relates to persons under the age of 21 years to whom liquor is sold. Section 153 (2) (b) provides:

It shall be a defence in any proceedings . . . that the person to whom the liquor was sold or supplied was actually of or above the age of 18 years.

That seems an extraordinary provision. Another section provides that people under 21 years of age may not consume liquor on unlicensed premises. Often functions held in unlicensed premises are weddings or other family gatherings where people mix together in social activity, and in such cases I cannot see much against people under 21 years being permitted to consume liquor. At a cabaret one can see people under the age of 21 years drinking liquor and, at midnight, they will be enjoying themselves. However, if no liquor is provided at a function, at midnight no-one is there, and one does not need much imagination to work out where the young people are. In cases such as these, I believe people of 18 years and over should be permitted to consume liquor.

Another provision states that any person, who is on licensed premises or on any premises in respect of which a permit has been granted under the Act, shall, upon request made by any member of the Police Force, state whether he or she is under the age of 21 years. Previously, a form was provided at hotels on which people, in order to get a drink, would declare that they had travelled so many miles. I visualize that, similarly, a form could be supplied by the person serving the liquor to anyone who did not appear to him to have reached 18 years, and that that person could declare his age on the form.

If we reduce the drinking age to 18 years, we should see that it is made difficult for people under that age to drink in bars. Putting it another way, we should see that it is made easy to find out a person's age and to give that person the responsibility to make a declaration that he is of a certain age. At present the drinking age of 21 years is not accepted by the community. It is generally accepted that laws that are not enforced are bad laws. I have not declared for what drinking age I will vote, but if the age is made 18 years other sections of the Act must be amended to place an onus on anyone serving a drink and to impose a severe penalty on anyone who serves a drink to a person under 18 years of age. A person whose age is doubtful should have to make a declaration about his age. Possibly the age of 18 years is acceptable because, if a parent is a responsible person, he or she should see that by the age of 18 years the children have been trained to know the evils of drink and to have a drink under supervision so that they might go out and take their place in the world. I think 18 years is a suitable age if the legislation is properly policed and enforced. In my district (although I do not think this would be general throughout the State) there is considerable opposition to reducing the drinking age to 18 years.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the Bill. As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, naturally I am not happy about the 1 per cent increase in turnover tax that has been applied to publicans and to people who hold a wholesale storekeeper's licence, a wine licence, a brewer's licence or a distillers storekeeper's licence. I am not happy because, realizing this will mean another \$500,000 in a full year and about \$250,000 this year to the Government, this money will again come from the people who are possibly taxed to the limit now and who can least afford it. Those people who invariably go to a hotel after work to relax (which I believe is perfectly normal and reasonable) will find that after January 1, 1969, the price of the liquor they consume will be increased to cover the \$500,000 that will be raised in a full year by the Government. As has been said many times in this Chamber, I believe that other areas of taxation should be tapped before this area is tapped.

The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out the disadvantage that applies to publicans in this State, as in other States half of the burden of this legislation would be borne by

the lessor and half would be borne by the lessee, but this is not the case in this State. People who have current leases that do not expire for some time will be given no consideration on this score until the legislation has been reviewed. I think that the Government has looked at this legislation as an easy means of raising an additional \$500,000 because it has no difficulty in amending the legislation from 5 per cent to 6 per cent.

For those reasons I am not happy with the legislation. I realize that the member for Stirling might say that members of the Opposition are demanding that more money be spent on services in the State, and that therefore the Government has to raise it somehow, but no-one is more aware of this than the Opposition, because this was continually hammered into us when we were in Government. We were continually being told where we were not spending sufficient money and the things we should do, but instead of any agreement on any form of taxation we were invariably criticized for it. People throughout the State were circularized and statements were published saying that our taxes were too high. We recognize that the Government must raise additional money, but what we criticize the Government for is for tapping certain areas while neglecting other areas. We have said that consistently and will continue to say that.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Stirling have spoken on the amendment to reduce the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years. While the member for Stirling said that this was a matter that should rightly be discussed he did not say how he would vote on it, because he was not sure of the majority opinion in his district. I do not blame him for trying to assess this opinion. After all, this is a social question on which members can please themselves and use their own judgment. It behoves every honourable member to travel as widely as possible throughout his district to gauge the opinion of the district. From my own experience I have found in my district that little interest has been taken on this question. I have had some 18-year-olds ask me when the change in the drinking age will take place and some people have told me that this would be a retrograde step. For my own part I believe this is a step in the right direction. After all, look at the responsibility we place in the hands of 16-year-old girls and boys. In this State we say they are fit to take control of what might be

regarded as a lethal weapon, namely, a motor vehicle. If they have the sense of responsibility to guide a motor vehicle over the highways of this State or any other part of the country in a correct manner (as I hope most of them do), surely they should be capable of conducting themselves properly in a hotel bar or in any other licensed premises and of drinking in moderation.

Mr. Clark: The Government is not prepared to let them vote, though.

Mr. CORCORAN: That is a different matter and can be discussed later. The member for Stirling expressed a fear that some 16-year-olds might drink in hotels as a result of this legislation, the same as 18-year-olds drink in hotels now. I believe it is much easier for a person to be able to judge the age of a person between 16 years and 18 years than the age between 18 years and 21 years. This applies particularly in the case of a female. A girl matures a little earlier than does a boy, and it is more difficult to determine whether a girl is under 18 years. Many youths of 18 years, particularly in country areas, frequent hotels now, and the Attorney-General has related his experience about going to a hotel and enjoying a drink when he was 17 or 18 years old. I have had similar experience, and I am sure that the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has also done that. He is a man of the world, with broad views on many matters.

Mr. Rodda: Ask him about the Pink Pussy Cat.

Mr. CORCORAN: I did not think he frequented places such as that, although he may have gone along to inform himself. It is a step in the right direction to extend the right to drink to people of 18 years, because they have sufficient sense of responsibility to conduct themselves properly. They can be dealt with if they break the law, and the Act makes provision regarding the police powers and people serving liquor. A person serving liquor will have to establish that these people are of the prescribed age. If the police subsequently discover that they are not, the person who has served them has to prove that he had good reason for believing that the persons served were 18 years of age or over. One reason would be that he had questioned the young person.

By this measure we give young people in South Australia the opportunity to do what young people are doing in other States at the age of 18 years. Young people from Victoria

could be arrested if they went into a hotel at Mount Gambier, which is just across the border, at present. It is time we changed this, because young people have sufficient sense of responsibility to conduct themselves properly and they are entitled to this facility. We have no argument about protecting the company that the Attorney-General has mentioned. Doubtless this matter was overlooked when the principal Act was being considered and we do not intend to restrict this company's activities in the State. It is desirable that the anomaly be rectified. I support the Bill.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I oppose the Bill most strongly. I have not heard any argument that substantiates the need to reduce the minimum age from 21 years to 18 years. I consider the standard of South Australian youth to be as high as the standard anywhere else in the world, and we must maintain this standard. The reduction of the age is a step in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, a few undesirables in a group can affect the remainder of the group. I think every member has attended dinners at which young people have been present, and we know that when one person says, "Come on, what about having a drink?" the young person has a drink and other young people join him. This will happen more often if young people are given access to hotels.

Many invalid arguments have been used to try to support the reduction of the drinking age. One argument is that, because many 18-year-olds drink now, the law should be amended to suit them, but this is a ridiculous argument. We may as well say that, because most people who drive down the Anzac Highway travel at 45 miles an hour, we ought to make that the speed limit. If we did that, the next move would be to make the limit 50 m.p.h., and, if we made the minimum drinking age 18 years, people would say that it ought to be reduced to 16 years. Ultimately, it would be open to all to drink in hotels.

Mr. Corcoran: Have you ever had the moral courage to tell an 18-year-old person at a public function that it was against the law for him to drink?

Mr. GILES: Yes, I have. Another argument is that because the Army calls up people who are 18 years of age, persons of this age should be able to drink. The Army calls them up at 20 years, not 18 years, and by the time they go away they are 21 years of age.

Mr. Corcoran: A 17-year-old person can join the Army voluntarily, and he is allowed to drink in the canteen.

Mr. GILES: I said that the Army calls persons up when they are 20.

Mr. Corcoran: I said they can drink in the canteen at 17 years.

Mr. GILES: I do not dispute that. I do not think that many South Australians want this change.

Mr. Langley: You're out of touch.

Mr. GILES: If the honourable member reads the letters I have, he will find that I am in touch. Although I have received many letters opposing the move, I have not received one supporting it, and I think that applies to all members. Is this change being made to gain political advantage, or because 18-year-olds drink now? There is no good reason for the change. At present 18-year-olds can drink in their homes or under the supervision of their parents, and I do not consider that persons of this age should be allowed to go to hotels. They are not mature enough for that.

Mr. Langley: What about at a party in a private home?

Mr. GILES: I have said they are allowed to drink then. Mr. Sangster, the Royal Commissioner, decided not to recommend that 18-year-olds should be permitted to drink alcoholic liquor in hotels. The following is a portion of a letter I have received from the sergeant at the Woodside police station:

I am at a loss to understand the recent proposal of the Hon. Attorney-General to introduce legislation to lower the age for minors to drink on licensed premises, etc. I am sure that he has his reasons, but to date not one reason of any substance has been put forward by any party as to why this move is warranted.

Mr. Corcoran: He would have his reasons.

Mr. GILES: He would have plenty of reasons why it should not be changed.

Mr. Corcoran: They would be selfish reasons.

Mr. GILES: They would not. The letter continues:

On the other hand, there seems to exist ample reasons to the contrary. Some which immediately spring to my mind are as follows:

1. The proposed legislation is against the recommendation of the recent Liquor Royal Commission. From memory, Mr. Sangster advanced at least two reasons for this:

(a) evidence given by the police witnesses.

(b) the difficulty of telling the age of a young person, in that there is always a discrepancy. Whereas now some 19- and 20-year-olds get away with it, if the age is reduced to 18, then some 16- and 17-year-olds will be drinking quite freely in hotels.

Insurance companies charge higher premiums for comprehensive motor vehicle insurance in respect of drivers between the ages of 16 years and 25 years. I believe their reason is that they believe that people between these ages are not as mature as are people over the age of 25 years. The letter continues:

2. At 18 years, a youth is still seeking and learning his values. He is so easily led, particularly by the small minority of those of our youth who think of nothing but their own pleasures.

I think this is a most important part. The sergeant first stresses the small minority, and I think this is the case—that we have only a small minority of undesirables in our community. The letter continues:

3. The more avenues which are provided for the sale of liquor, the more we can expect will be sold, and in this case to a group of our community who cannot afford to and who have never been educated to drink, if they must, sanely.

4. That there is a connection between liquor and the accident rate is beyond argument.

Mr. Corcoran: What is wrong with their parents?

Mr. GILES: Many parents do not watch these undesirable people. I believe there are no delinquent children—only delinquent parents, who do not worry where their children are or what they do. The letter continues:

Already the 18 to 21-year-olds are in a very high accident rate category. This must be influenced detrimentally by a dropping of the age limit.

This is quite true. The letter continues:

5. That the excessive use of liquor is the cause of many of our social problems is an established fact. Any social worker, doctor, psychologist or policeman could give vivid testimony to this, and here with this legislation we are in effect encouraging our youth to join the ranks of the socially unacceptable.

I believe there is much valuable material in that letter. The following is a small portion of a letter I have received from a teenager:

The main question to be answered I feel is this: "Is the encouraging of drinking of alcohol, a substance which is the cause of many of our social ills, a good thing?" Surely No!

Mr. Broomhill: How old was the teenager?

Mr. GILES: The teenager was 17 years old. The following is a letter from another teenager:

At the age of 18 a person is certainly not responsible enough to publicly and freely indulge in any type of liquor.

I think this is quite a point.

Mr. Broomhill: How old is that teenager?

Mr. GILES: I do not know.

Mr. Langley: The "teenager" could have been 30.

Mr. GILES: The word "teenager" appears at the foot of the letter, which continues:

If the Government is trying to lower the standard of morality and boost the number of drinking fatalities, then it is certainly going about it the right way if it introduces such a law.

Mr. Hudson: I hope the Attorney-General is listening.

Mr. Langley: These people are all anonymous.

Mr. GILES: They are not. The honourable member can read the letters if he likes. A letter from another teenager says:

Being a teenager, I have associated with many persons between the ages of 17 and 19 and I can honestly say that many of these would not be capable of handling alcohol safely. I know of two cases this year where friends have obtained liquor by some means and have had car accidents the same night.

Mr. Langley: Was that teenager anonymous, too?

Mr. GILES: No.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Was the liquor obtained in a hotel?

Mr. GILES: It is not stated.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Then it does not affect this argument, does it?

Mr. GILES: If liquor is freely accessible to these people in a hotel, the accident rate will be increased. A letter from the Headmaster of the Charleston school says:

As a justice of the peace I view this situation and the possibilities that could arise with grave concern. I appeal to you to do all in your power to prevent the passing of this Bill.

The following is another important letter:

I wish to add my protest against the question of lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18. There is enough trouble in the world now and also enough evils without this one. I know you will do all in your power to try and stop it. I am only 23 years of age and can speak from bitter experience.

A letter from a person in the Lenswood area says:

I appreciate the fact that the "drinking age" question is, in the reported words of Mr. Millhouse, M.P.: "To eliminate the disabilities in the legal sense of people under 21." But I ask, "Can this 'age' question in regard to drinking be called a disability, when my previous next-door neighbour, an alcoholic, commits suicide, because his wife and children could not endure it any longer, and left him?"

These letters are some of the many I have received in protest against the lowering of the minimum age at which people may obtain liquor in hotels. If the age is lowered the

accident rate will increase considerably. I cannot imagine anything worse than learning to drink and learning to drive at the same age: this would be the worst possible combination. If we wanted to reduce the size of Australia's population this would be a good combination, but I am sure no-one would want to do this. I have here some statistics that enable a comparison to be made between the number of people killed and injured in South Australia and the number in Victoria, where for a long time people have been allowed to drink at the age of 18 years.

Mr. Broomhill: You will have to compare the populations, too.

Mr. Langley: How do you know the accidents were caused by drinking?

Mr. GILES: I do not have statistics of the number of accident cases in which alcohol was involved, but alcohol is certainly involved very often in accidents. I said that I believed we could take the statistics as an indication of what would happen.

Mr. Broomhill: What about the difference in population?

Mr. GILES: If the honourable member will listen I will illustrate the different age groups, which have nothing to do with the number of people in Victoria and South Australia. In Victoria in a 12-month period in 1964, 30 people between the ages of 17 years and 20 years and 26 between the ages of 21 and 29 were killed. In 1965, 48 people between the ages of 17 years and 20 years were killed, and 28 between the ages of 21 and 29 were killed. In 1966, in the first group 40 and in the second group 37 were killed. In 1967, in the first group 54 and 30 in the second group were killed. In 1966, 1,149 people in the first age group and 845 in the second age group were injured in accidents. In 1967, 1,181 in the first age group and 798 in the second group were injured.

Mr. Broomhill: Where was this?

Mr. GILES: In Victoria, and I am comparing the age groups.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't you think there are more in those age groups in Victoria than in South Australia?

Mr. GILES: Obviously, but I am comparing the different age groups in Victoria. However, let us consider South Australia. In the three months to December, 1967, 14 people in the age group 17 years to 20 years and 14 in the age group 21 years to 29 years were killed. It seems that in many cases more people are killed in the lower age group than are killed in

the upper age group, which indicates that when people are allowed to drink at a younger age there are more accidents, with more people killed and injured.

Mr. Hurst: You may have convinced yourself but you have not convinced us.

Mr. GILES: The honourable member would probably not be convinced if I talked here for six months, because he has had his instructions how to vote. When young people drink, their natural restraints are reduced and they are likely to behave in a manner that is unbecoming to well-behaved, well-brought-up children.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think apple cider would affect them?

Mr. GILES: If I discussed that subject I would be promoting an industry in which I am interested, and I am not sure whether this would be allowed. If the alcoholic content of apple cider was not high the drink would not do them any harm. It has been argued that it is easy to distinguish between a 16-year-old and an 18-year-old but that it is difficult to pick the difference between an 18-year-old and a 21-year-old. This argument does not hold water, because there is a difference of three years in one case and only two years in the other. It would be most difficult to pick the difference between young ladies aged 15 years and those aged 21 years.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Come, come!

Mr. Hudson: Have you made a study of this?

Mr. GILES: I have gained my knowledge from listening to the member for Glenelg. I solidly oppose this Bill, which is a backward step for the community, because I do not wish to lower the present excellent standard of our young people. If a poll were taken in the community it would be found that an extremely small percentage of people wished to reduce the age to 18 years. I oppose this particular provision. Because of the financial measures involved in the Bill, I support the second reading, but, on behalf of people of my district, I oppose legislation that lowers the age at which people are permitted to drink.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): Like my Leader, it is with some reluctance that I have decided not to oppose the Bill on the question of the increase in licence fees. I am not concerned with the case made out by the member for Gumeracha. He said earlier that he would completely oppose the Bill, and I think he caught the Attorney-General unawares,

because the Attorney looked around as much as to say, "What is going on here?" The member for Gumeracha got the message and realized that he should not oppose the Bill, because the Attorney-General had said that he would spilt the Bill so that good and faithful supporters of the Liberal Party could with a clear conscience impose this additional 1 per cent on the licence fees for publicans. I have no soft spot for publicans.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think they will bear the cost?

Mr. VIRGO: It is not a matter of their bearing the cost, because the price of liquor was increased two or three days after the Treasurer had announced that licence fees would be increased. The increases have been passed on, and if they are passed on again I hope the Government will inquire into the reasons for it.

Mr. Hurst: What about prohibition?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not agree with that because, unlike some Government members, I believe that a person who wishes to drink liquor should be able to do so and that a person who does not want to should be free to abstain. However, it is not the right of a person who abstains to be able to thrust his views down the throat of the person who, for reasons of his own, wants to drink liquor.

Mr. Allen: What member on this side said that?

Mr. VIRGO: Apparently the honourable member has not been in the House for some time, otherwise he would not ask such a stupid question. The main worry I have is that this is yet another of the seven imposts the Treasurer announced to this House on September 5. We have already had legislation to deal with some of those things, and this is yet another, which increases liquor fees from 5 per cent to 6 per cent.

I object to this type of impost because it is sectional taxation. As with the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill the Treasurer put through this House last Thursday, under which the motorist will suffer another \$2 levy on every third party insurance certificate, so we are now with this impost sectionalizing out those people who desire to consume liquor. To me this is completely wrong. We on this side agree that the Government must have finance. We were honest and announced to the people before the elections that added finance was needed and told them where it would come from. However, the Government was completely dishonest and would not say where the finance

would come from. The Attorney-General was one of those silent healers who had nothing to say on that point. It was just one of those big surprises.

Mr. Langley: It will revert back.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, it will boomerang.

Mr. McKee: The chickens will come home to roost.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. I do not think the other point associated with this Bill needs much discussion. I refer to the provision to enable Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited to obtain a licence, which is obviously desirable. However, the question that will be controversial is the one the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) has spoken on at some length. I readily concede him the right to the view he expressed: all I ask him to do is to treat others as he would have them treat himself by conceding the same right to people who have a different view from his own. Much of his argument leaves much to be desired. For instance, he said that insurance companies having a loading on policies of drivers between 16 years and 25 years of age proves this point about maturity. If the honourable member was honest in his argument he would be moving an amendment to alter the age in this matter from 21 years to 25 years. Regrettably, whilst there is this loading on insurance policies, insurance companies reserve the right even to decide whether they will insure a particular vehicle or person.

Mr. McKee: And in most cases they will not do so.

Mr. VIRGO: That is so. The question of the desirability of reducing the age from 21 to 18 will always bring about some degree of discussion and differing views. Most members, like I, probably have had representations made to them from members of the clerical fraternity on this question. When three ministers of religion were speaking to me two or three weeks ago, I found it most interesting and illuminating to hear them say that they did not oppose the age for drinking being reduced to a minimum of 18 years. However, they were afraid that, if the legal age were reduced to 18 years, youths of 16 years and 17 years would then be drinking in exactly the same way as are the youths of 18, 19, and 20 years today. They thought that, if the age was reduced to 18 years and this was effectively policed, there would be little quarrel.

I think these things are worthy of consideration by people such as the member for

Gumeracha, because I think there ought to be some policing. I do not believe that the responsibility for serving liquor to a person who is under age ought to rest on the barman: I believe that if a person of 18, 19 or 20 years of age at present obtains liquor from a hotel he is the one who should accept the responsibility.

Mr. Giles: Do you believe a situation could exist where 15-year-olds could be drinking in 10 years' time?

Mr. VIRGO: I suppose anything could happen in 10 years' time, but probably neither the member for Gumeracha nor I will be here then. I am just not sure to what extent we have to be our brother's keeper. I think there is a degree of responsibility on the people concerned. I also believe that there is a greater degree of maturity in youth today than there was years ago. I am certain there is far more maturity in my son, who is aged 21½ years, than there was in me when I was that age. I think this question of 18-year-olds drinking can be regarded on a logical plane and that it can also be regarded and decided on an emotional plane. It has to be looked at in the light of the standing of the youths of today, who I believe are far more advanced than were youths of the same age some years ago. It also has to be looked at from the point of view that youths aged between 18 years and 20 years are drinking today and are not doing the harm that the calamity howlers suggest they are, a fact that is evidenced by the position in Victoria. Although the member for Gumeracha attempted to quote some figures to prove a case, I am not sure whether he knew just what case he was trying to prove; we on this side certainly did not have the faintest idea what he was trying to prove.

The position clearly can be looked at sensibly. I do not believe that the fears many people have about the potential dangers associated with this will materialize. The clause referring to an additional impost on a section of the community is more important than that dealing with the age at which people are deemed capable of drinking. We must remember that youths of 18 years today are mature, and that if they are good enough to go away and fight and they are good enough to drink when they are conscripted into the army, they ought to be good enough to drink at any other time and to vote. I hope that when that other Bill comes up for discussion members opposite will recall some of the statements they made during the debate on this Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to give my general support to the second reading of the Bill. I was most interested to hear my colleague and friend the member for Gumeracha speaking, and I think I detected some criticism in his remarks about the Bill. He made out a case—

Mr. Nankivell: Perhaps for drinking apple cider.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. He made out what I thought was quite a valid case to the effect that lowering the age for drinking in hotels would increase the road toll. This, of course, is largely a matter of opinion. I do not believe that it will do so. I was disappointed to hear one member opposite calling out loudly and rudely that the thing to do was to raise the minimum age for holding a driver's licence. I think it was a typically ignorant remark made by a Labor member. Such a member, who spends all his time patrolling around metropolitan Adelaide in public transport, just does not understand that a large section of our youth in South Australia requires drivers' licences to earn their livings. On the surface, this particular member would like to raise the driving age in order to reduce the number of road accidents, but he completely forgets that all the young employees, in the rural sector anyway, must have drivers' licences to earn a living. It is all very well for these metropolitan Labor members to interject and say, "Raise the driving age to lower the accident rate." They are quite happy to use their Parliamentary passes on public transport to come to work each day, but they forget that a large number of South Australians—

Mr. Langley: Who uses public transport?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: All the Labor members for the metropolitan area use it. Of course they do. They get free passes for buses and the railways, so naturally they use—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Bill does not deal with public transport.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Quite so, but even though these Labor members have free public transport—

Mr. Langley: And so do Liberal members.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not wish to go on with this matter.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It greatly irritates me that metropolitan Labor members use the parking area that has been set aside at

Parliament House for country members. I have merely been replying to an interjection made while the member for Gumeracha was speaking. However, I believe the honourable member's case was largely unfounded and that lowering the age for consuming liquor in public houses will not have any real effect on the accident rate. I know that every member on the other side of the House will enthusiastically support the Bill. Only a few weeks ago, the Leader of the Opposition introduced his own Bill to lower the minimum age for drinking to 18 years and, of course, if this is the way that Labor members thought then, I am sure they will think this way when they vote on this Bill. I assume we will not see among members opposite any of the division that we see regarding so many other issues.

Mr. Langley: We believe in progress.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is interjecting too much.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was interesting to look back over some of the speeches made by members opposite when they were speaking to a similar Bill before the House a few weeks ago. I should like to refer briefly to one or two of those remarks but, before the Attorney-General goes out, I should like him to hear something that will delight him. One of my favourite Labor members in this House is the member for Gawler, a senior and respected member. When speaking to the Bill designed to lower the drinking age to 18 years, on page 1576 of *Hansard* he said, "The Attorney-General is a brilliant young man." I am pleased that the member for Gawler recognizes the ability of the Attorney-General.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to another debate of this session.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Quite so. I was merely reminding members opposite of some of the remarks they have made previously when addressing themselves to the subject of lowering the minimum drinking age to 18 years. It is salutary to have one's own remarks quoted for one a week or two after those remarks have been made. As I look back over the remarks made in this place, I find that every member opposite supports the lowering of the minimum drinking age to 18 years, and by the simple process of arithmetic it would seem that we need only one member on this side to vote in favour of the Bill and the provision regarding drinking at 18 years will go through.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you trying to steal our thunder?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It has been suggested that perhaps the Attorney-General is trying to steal the thunder from members opposite but, if he can, good luck to him. I do not wish to speak too long on this Bill.

Mr. McKee: When will you say something about the Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not think there is much point in my making a lengthy speech on this Bill, because members opposite will not do me the courtesy of listening. However, I deplore the attitude of members opposite that the driving age should be raised in order to lower the accident rate.

Mr. Langley: That's not in the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was brought up in this debate by a member who, I suggest, should know better. As members opposite have said, the Bill includes two or three other provisions: it alters the licence that would apply, in particular, to Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Not only Penfolds: a number of other companies are in the same boat.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, but it applies to Penfolds in particular, because it is the largest wine dealer in South Australia. The Bill also provides for an increase in the turnover charge. Everyone knows that this Government has to meet the deficit thrust upon it by the outgoing Government, but this will be an unpopular measure in the liquor trade. I remember how angry one hotelkeeper in my district was when the former Socialist Government so drastically raised the turnover tax during its term of office. I believe he has now become reconciled to the fact that, if we vote in a Labor Government, we have to pay for it. One or two amendments are on the file to which I will speak in Committee.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I favour the part of the Bill that increases the rate of turnover tax. I can see nothing wrong with increasing this tax, because liquor is really a non-essential in the community. I believe we could all survive if we drank less liquor, and I am not a teetotaler: possibly I could cut down a little, too. I oppose the part of the Bill that provides for reducing the age for drinking from 21 years to 18 years, and I intend to move an amendment in Committee to make the minimum age for drinking 20 years. I do not honestly believe that the

average teenager of today is any more mature than were teenagers 20 or 30 years ago. I have heard it said many times, and it has been pumped into us by those in the commercial field who are interested in selling to teenagers, that teenagers are more mature now. I agree that teenagers today have a longer and broader education academically, but in most cases their experience is less, and I do not believe they are any more mature. Those under the age of 20 years are still teenagers. Statistics, particularly in regard to marriage, prove this; they show that, in marriages between people who are both under 20 years, the divorce rate is three times as high as in marriages where both partners are over 20 years.

I strongly object to reducing the minimum age for drinking to 18 years. When the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) was speaking, one Opposition member said that, in view of what the member for Gumeracha was saying, perhaps the minimum age should be increased to 25 years. I disagree that the age should be so increased. Although insurance companies may choose that age as a safe age for a uniform rate of insurance, they are concerned with protecting their own interests, if I can put it that way. Young men of 20 years are conscripted and that is one reason I would select that age as the right age for drinking. Incidentally, even 40 years ago I think the age for drinking could have been set at 20 years, as it would have been equally applicable then as it is now. It has been suggested by members on both sides of the House that the present minimum age for drinking of 21 years is hard to police. I point out that it will be equally as hard to police the law if it is amended to provide for drinking at 18 years. If the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) honestly believes that the law can be policed if it relates to 18-year-olds, then I ask him to agree to have the law relate to 20-year-olds and then, if it can be proved to members and to the community as a whole that the law can be policed as it relates to 20-year-olds, there may be an excuse to lower the minimum age to 18 years.

I believe the general tendency in a community is for young men to take out young women who are about two years younger than they are. If 18-year-olds are allowed to consume liquor, young men will take younger girls into hotels. I realize that the girls could consume soft drinks and I have nothing against that. However, the young men may encourage the girls to have shandies which will become stronger and stronger until the

girls are consuming full strength liquor when under the age of 18 years. Some members have said that mothers and fathers are responsible for looking after their children. However, in this modern age motor cars are available to 16-year-olds. Parents have a difficult task in refusing their children cars, and therefore young people are able to travel 50 miles in an hour and can be outside the jurisdiction of their parents. In these circumstances, parents have a difficult job in controlling them. Some young people may deliberately drive 50 miles away to have a drink or to be in the company of a group that is drinking, and they may drive back at a faster rate than that at which they normally drive so that their parents will not find out where they have been. Therefore, how much can parents trust their children?

There is also the financial aspect of this matter. Average parents, if they are wise, struggle to put their children through school. What will be the position for these parents if children of the age of 18 years (and automatically some aged 16 years and 17 years) go into local hotels and drink willy-nilly? I have never yet heard that the law is effectively policed in regard to the present age for drinking, so how will it be policed if the minimum age is 18 years? We will have 15-year-olds drinking, as they are drinking in hotels today. During his speech, the member for Edwardstown inferred—

Mr. Jennings: He did not infer, he implied.

Mr. EVANS: I still say that he inferred that it was the parents' responsibility to look after teenagers and that once they reached 18 years we could forget about them. At that age he said they could marry, vote, sign a contract and so on. That is the inference we have about this age and, in this Bill, we will take the first step towards that position by reducing the age for drinking to 18 years.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The last Parliament reduced the age at which a will could be made from 21 years to 18 years.

Mr. EVANS: I can see nothing wrong with that, if people of that age have some material things which they wish to leave; that is a much different field. If we allow them to drink at 18, it may be necessary for them to make out a will so that they can pass on some of the things they have in this world (if they have anything), because they could possibly destroy themselves.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think they are old enough to join the Army at 18 years?

Mr. EVANS: If the parents and the child agree, I can see nothing wrong with a child joining the Army, Navy or Air Force: it is a family decision. As young people are conscripted at 20 years, I think this should be the minimum age at which they are allowed to drink.

Mr. Corcoran: It is their decision to drink: they are not forced to do so.

Mr. EVANS: I believe that not only young men but also young women should serve a term of national service.

Mr. Jennings: Did you do national service?

Mr. EVANS: I belonged to an unfortunate age group, and this did not apply to me. I believe they would find me a little bit expensive to keep now, and I would be a burden on the community.

Mr. Jennings: You are now.

Mr. EVANS: Reginald Barry Clowes, an Inspector of the Victorian Police Force (attached to No. 4 Division which covered licensing and gaming work) gave evidence to the licensing Royal Commission. Speaking about the liquor conditions prevailing in Victoria, and at that time Victoria had 10 o'clock closing, he said:

Bad behaviour resulting from drinking is apparent in young men.

He specifically stated that. He continued:

There are odd hotels where behaviour deteriorates in the evening.

That is another statement of his. He also said:

It particularly appears to be true where clientele of the hotel are largely young flat dwellers.

I emphasize that, that it is the younger group that is causing trouble to the police in Victoria. He continued:

Most behaviour problems that have been experienced since late closing in relation to drink have been confined almost entirely to the young—

that is, those under 21 years of age. He mentioned that some had been seen in public affected by liquor and made the point that since 10 o'clock closing there were still some affected by liquor in that State. They were not necessarily all young but, of those seen thus affected by drink, a large proportion would be young people. This is an inspector of the Victorian police giving evidence of experiences in Victoria, where it is mainly the young people who are giving trouble.

Mr. Langley: Of what age?

Mr. EVANS: I will read that statement again:

Most behaviour problems that have been experienced since late closing in relation to drink have been confined almost entirely to the young.

He is referring to those under 21 years of age.

Mr. Corcoran: I have had some experience of young people in my time.

Mr. EVANS: I am glad the member for Millicent has mentioned his experience of young people. I should imagine he had much experience of people about 20 years of age, because he served with our forces. I have had experience for the last seven to eight years of coaching schoolboy footballers aged 13 years to 17½ years. I say with regret that we have some young people in our community whose parents have little control over them, and who drink liquor at the age of 14½ years or 15 years.

Mr. Langley: Surely they can be reprimanded for that?

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Unley wishes to come along, he will find they are reprimanded, but this does not stop young people from drinking in our hotels today. The argument is used, "The law has been broken so let us alter the law by reducing the minimum age to 18." The member for Edwardstown said that if an individual wished to drink he should be allowed to, regardless of age. If people think like this, there should be no age limit at all: people five years old should be allowed to walk into a hotel and drink liquor.

Superintendent Brebner, after he had given much useful evidence to our Royal Commission on liquor, was asked the following question:

And, if you had to select which would be the legal limit on the assumption that some within, say, two years of that age would escape the prohibition by some means or other, which age would be selected as the legal age?

The Superintendent's reply was "Twenty years". We are given a job to represent the people here; we have some responsibilities and obligations to protect society as a whole. Can members opposite honestly tell me it is better for society that young people at the age of 18 are allowed to drink in licensed premises?

Mr. Corcoran: It is a Government measure.

Mr. EVANS: Opposition members are those who favour this proposal and have opposite views to mine, whether they sit on this side of the House or the other. My opinion is that, in the case of young people of 18 years who are either still attending school or working and not earning large salaries, it is the parents'

responsibility to find the money to enable them to succeed in this world. But here today we are giving them a wider opportunity to let the money that some of them are earning burn a hole in their pockets.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What proportion of the 18-year-olds are still attending school?

Mr. EVANS: I cannot answer that question but in England, of those attending school at the age of 17 years, there will be many aged 16 and 17 who drink. Of the 17-year-olds in England, 13.8 per cent attend full time; 3.6 per cent are on other full-time education; 16.5 per cent are on part-time education by day, and 16.3 per cent are part-time by night.

Mr. Broomhill: How do you get these figures and not the figures for the 18-year-olds in Australia?

Mr. EVANS: Because these figures give only the 17-year-olds, and that is the argument I am using now. If the member for West Torrens wishes to give the figures for the 18-year-olds, I will listen to him. The total attendance at school by 17-year-olds in England is 50.2 per cent; that is, those who are still attending school.

Mr. Hudson: What has that to do with South Australia?

Mr. EVANS: I was asked by the Attorney-General what proportion of the 17-year-olds was still attending school. If we reduce the age to 18 years, many 17-year-olds will be walking into hotels and drinking, and nobody here can deny that. Then let us take the ages of 15, 16 and 17 years—and 17 in particular. I do not go along with the member for Edwardstown who implies that we should cast aside all our obligations and responsibilities, leave it to the parents, and fix no minimum age at all at which a person has the right to go into a hotel. Let them walk in at the age of 12 months, if they can walk! If that is the attitude, if that is responsible action, to reduce the age to 18 years just to get a few extra votes, either on this side or on the other side of the House, to get some support from the younger ones, we are shirking our responsibilities merely for political gain. I definitely oppose this part of the Bill and shall seek your co-operation later, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment for a different minimum age: I think it will be 20 years.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I refer to clause 2 of the Bill which amends section 37 (1) of the principal Act by raising the licence fee from 5 per cent to 6 per cent, an increase of 1 per cent. I have received correspondence

from the Wine and Brandy Producers Co-operative Association of South Australia, which states that this matter that I am now intending to raise "is of prime importance to co-operative wineries". I understand that submissions have already been made to the Attorney-General on behalf of Co-operative Wines (Aust.) Ltd. in respect of the sale of wine overseas. I shall quote from this correspondence:

Co-operative Wines sells no wine in Australia but receives wines from member co-operative wineries, blends and matures these wines, and sells them either to the Emu Wine Company Proprietary Limited, which is a company registered in Victoria, or at some future date may sell directly to oversea buyers. Under any licence other than the five-gallon licence Co-operative Wines would, according to the provisions of the Licensing Act, have to pay licence fees at the rate of six per centum on the value of the sales. Under the present five-gallon licence provisions, the holder of a five-gallon licence can sell only to persons licensed under the Licensing Act, 1967.

The amendment sought by the Wine and Brandy Producers Co-operative Association of South Australia is designed to permit sales to persons who purchase or acquire the liquor for resale or disposal to a person or persons outside the State and sell or dispose of the same accordingly. The correspondence further states that there is so little margin in the prices obtained for wines exported that such sales could not bear the impost of a 6 per cent licence fee. The association, therefore, suggests that section 29 of the Act be further amended by deleting "on the premises therein specified" in the second and third lines. If the section were so amended and included the other suggested amendments, it would read:

Every five-gallon licence shall authorize the person thereby licensed to sell and dispose of liquor on any day (except Sunday, Good Friday and Christmas Day) between the hours of five o'clock in the morning and six o'clock in the evening in quantities of not less than five gallons—

- (a) to any person licensed to sell liquor of that kind under this Act;
- (b) to any person not licensed under this Act if that person purchases or acquires such liquor for resale or disposal to a person or persons outside the State and sells or disposes of same accordingly.

The association also suggests that a consequential amendment be made to section 41 (1) by inserting after the word "licence" first occurring in the second line thereof the words "five-gallon licence" and that a further con-

sequential amendment be made to regulation 17 (a) made under the Act on September 28, 1967, by amending the heading to add "five-gallon" after "vignerons" and "or a five-gallon licence" after "licence" in the first line. This correspondence gives nine reasons for the amendment suggested by the association, but I do not intend to quote them. Finally, the association states that it regards this matter as most important from the economic point of view of co-operative wineries. Therefore, I ask the Attorney-General whether, when he closes the debate, he will inform the House whether the Government intends to do anything about the situation that I have just stated.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I support the first part of the Bill but oppose the second part. I strongly oppose the reduction of the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) has spoken about 16-year-olds driving motor cars, and only last Thursday we discussed the increase of \$2 a year third party insurance. I am sure that, if the minimum drinking age is reduced to 18, these insurance costs will increase further. I have had more letters complaining about giving drinking rights to 18-year-olds than I have had about adding fluoride to the water supply.

Mr. Broomhill: How many have you had?

Mr. EDWARDS: Far more than the honourable member would care to answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. EDWARDS: In my district fluoridation has been a back number since the reduction of the drinking age to 18 years has been suggested. Only last week the manager of a hotel on the West Coast said that he had had two years' experience of 18-year-olds in Victoria having drinking rights, and he hoped that we would not make a similar provision in this State, thereby ruining our good record. He said that he came to South Australia because 18-year-olds in Victoria had drinking rights. Let us protect our young people until they are a little older and wiser. Why should we thrust drinking rights on them, when only a small minority want these rights? Why should we cast aside the rights of others and yet give this right to the minority?

I assume that, if the minimum drinking age is reduced, students at high schools and universities will be able to have a drink at lunch time. Students who do this will not bother

about having a proper lunch but will have a liquid lunch. I do not think they will be able to study very well on that. What sort of students will we have in a few weeks if this situation comes about? I assure the House that we will not have the best type. This is a part of one of the many letters that I have received from throughout the State on this subject:

We believe that 18-year-olds are not capable of exercising mature judgment, for lack of genuine experience, and we know of no evidence to substantiate the inference that this generation is more mature than 18-year-olds of the past. In fact evidence to the contrary is borne out in, for example, maximum car insurance premiums being paid by this group. Under-age drinking with present law suggests that offenders under the suggested new law could be in a group 15 years and over. This was suggested in the press, after bar attendants had been interviewed on the matter, and this must surely be an alarming thought to all sections of the community. We consider it not to be in the best interests of students to have legal access to alcohol, as this must surely present a further obstacle in the path of successful studies. We note in this regard the reports of the use of drugs by this group. Concern is felt for the survival of youth clubs and organizations which at present provide entertainment and a means of education for this age group. Evidence is already available of the effect of late closing on groups classified as adult education classes, and in smaller communities the lack of support for these groups ends in decline for the general well-being of the community and its affairs.

I support the first part of this Bill, but I certainly oppose the second portion.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): This Bill deals with three matters. The first is dealt with in clause 2, which, as has already been said, increases the licence fees from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the previous year's turnover, an increase of 1 per cent. This is not the first increase made in recent years in the licence fees payable by those engaged in the industry. It is only two or three years since there was an increase from 3 per cent to 5 per cent during the previous Government's term of office. This clause provides for a further increase of 1 per cent in those fees.

The second important matter in this Bill is dealt with in clause 5, which amends section 82 of the principal Act. I think it was said earlier this afternoon by the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) that this clause would affect only one company that is carrying on business in South Australia. However, I point out that several companies are affected and, consequently, this amendment is important.

I raised the matter with which this amendment deals on September 5, when I directed a question to the Attorney-General and pointed out to him that, in view of the law as it stands at present, it is impossible for a foreign company carrying on business in South Australia to obtain certain licences under the Licensing Act. For instance, a vigneron's licence would be impossible to obtain.

A foreign company is a company that is not incorporated in South Australia. Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited was mentioned, which is incorporated in New South Wales but registered in South Australia. It carries on very extensive operations here. There is another company, with which I am very conversant, which carries on business in the Barossa Valley and which is also incorporated in New South Wales and registered in South Australia, but under section 82 of the Licensing Act that company cannot obtain a vigneron's licence. Section 82 provides:

(1) A company incorporated under the laws of the State—

that is, this State—

... may hold any licence other than a full publican's licence.

The company has to be incorporated in this State to be able to hold this other licence. If it is not incorporated in South Australia it cannot obtain any of the other licences available under the 1967 legislation. The amendment will make it possible for a company which is "incorporated in the United Kingdom or in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth and registered in this State as a foreign company" to obtain a licence under the 1967 Act, provided it is one—

(a) that held a licence of any kind under the Licensing Act, 1932-1966;

or
(b) that was carrying on business pursuant to section 13 or the proviso to section 161 of the Licensing Act, 1932-1966, immediately before the commencement of the Licensing Act, 1967,

I hope this clause will be passed in Committee, because, if it is not, several important companies which are carrying on business in South Australia but which are not incorporated in South Australia will be unable to obtain certain licences under the 1967 Act and they will thereby be severely handicapped in their business operations in South Australia. Some of these companies have been in business in this State for many years. Indeed, some of them have been in business for more than a century, so I trust that in due course the Committee will pass this clause.

The other important amendment in the Bill is dealt with in clause 8, which reduces the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years. This provision goes too far. I would favour a reduction of the age to 20 years, but not to 18 years. I do not intend to go into any great detail in support of my contention because the arguments in favour of it have already been adequately dealt with by several other members who have spoken before me, particularly the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), who has foreshadowed an amendment in connection with this matter. On page 113 of his report the Royal Commissioner (Mr. Sangster) makes the following observations that can be a guide concerning how far we should go:

Two important aspects of this topic were dealt with in the submissions and in the evidence, namely:

- (1) whether the minimum age at which it should be lawful to be supplied with liquor in licensed premises should be reduced from the present 21 years, and
- (2) whether more responsibility should be placed on the person under the minimum age (whatever minimum age be fixed) not to obtain liquor in licensed premises.

Positive submissions were made for reduction of the minimum age:

- (a) to 20 years, by the South Australian Police very largely on the ground that at that age males become liable for active military service, and also on the ground of attainment of a "degree of discretion" by then,
- (b) to 18 years, by the Adelaide University Union, but, I suspect, having very much in mind its submission of a proposal for liquor at the Union where students aged from 18 years upwards may be found, and
- (c) to 18 years, by the Independent Hotel Freeholders' Association but without evidence or argument in support of that submission.

I will agree to reduce the minimum age to 20 years even though the Commissioner in his report, at page 114, said:

There appears to be no case made out for any alteration to the minimum "drinking age", but a case does appear to be made out for giving the present law more teeth by making it a direct offence for a minor to purchase or consume liquor on licensed premises, and for any person, not merely the licensee or his servant, to sell or supply liquor to a person, other than with reasonable grounds for belief of full age.

I consider that under the present legislation it is already a defence under section 153 to any person who supplies liquor to a person

who is under the age of 21 years, but who is apparently over the age of 18 years, if he had reasonable cause to believe that the person to whom the liquor was sold or supplied or by whom it was consumed was of or above the age of 21 years. Under the present legislation many persons under the age of 21 years but over 18 years are being supplied with liquor in hotels, but no action is taken because in many of these cases the barmen who supply the liquor have reasonable cause to believe that these people are over the age of 18 years and apparently are 21 years old. If the age is reduced to 18 years there will be many persons between the ages of 16 years and 18 years in hotels and it will be difficult for persons serving them to differentiate between persons who are 16 years, 17 years, 18 years, and 19 years old. Unless there is stringent policing of the licensing laws, persons under 18 years would be, with impunity, served liquor many times. Reference has been made at page 114 of the Commissioner's report to the report on the administration of the Social Welfare Act, 1926-1965, and to the work of the Social Welfare Department for the year ended June 30, 1966, and on page 12 of that report there appears the following:

Consumption of alcohol by juveniles appears to be increasing and it was at least a contributing factor in many acts of delinquency including sexual misbehaviour. Many children under the department claim that they are served freely with liquor in bars and bottle departments at various hotels. Children as young as 14 years who were committed for offences during the year were affected by alcohol at the time the offences took place.

I consider, as do other members, that we have a duty to protect certain juveniles in this State, and I think we would be going too far if we reduced the minimum drinking age to 18 years. If the age were reduced not only would people up to 18 years of age go into hotels but also there would be many between 16 years and 18 years who would be served as are the 18-year-old and the 19-year-old juveniles being served at present, although only persons over the age of 21 years should be served. In view of these circumstances I am not willing to consider reducing the minimum age below 20 years.

Finally, I refer briefly to a matter raised by the member for Barossa, namely, a request that has been made by the Wine and Brandy Producers Co-operative Association of South Australia. About 10 days ago I was contacted by a co-operative in my district and, as a result of a discussion I had, I arranged for a

representative from that co-operative to discuss a problem with the Parliamentary Draftsman following a contact I made with the Attorney-General. I thank the Attorney-General for making this possible. The matter for discussion involved an amendment to section 29, dealing with a five-gallon licence. I believe that, as a result of the matters raised by the co-operative's representative, there is likely to be an alteration in this law, and I, too, should be pleased to have a definite assurance on this matter from the Attorney-General. If it is not to be included in the present amendments, I hope that it will be included in the other Bill to amend the Licensing Act which, I understand, the Attorney-General intends to introduce before the House adjourns next month.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I agree with what the Leader said about the raising of licence fees being a burden on licensees but something not affecting the owners of hotels. I hope that the price of liquor in hotels will not increase again as a result of this increase in fees. The ordinary person in any walk of life usually likes to have a drink after finishing a day's work, but probably this is one reason why if this Bill is passed, further increases in the prices of liquor will result. I oppose that action, and I hope that this result does not materialize.

In this debate it is obvious that Government members want the Bill divided because some of them do not favour it as it was originally introduced: they want it divided so that they may voice their opinions on a particular section of the Bill, instead of discussing it as a whole. The Bill was introduced by the Government, but since then there seems to have been a rift in the Government Party, because its form has been altered. During the last Parliament the liquor laws of this State were re-written, and since then hardly a murmur has been heard about the new regulations and the way liquor has been consumed. In most cases people have acted as though these licensing laws had always been in force, and they have been able to abide by the present laws. Only recently, when in Victoria, I found that South Australian clubs and sporting bodies are far better off than their Victorian counterparts.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: They have more "courage" there.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and it is having an impact, too. I am sure that the Bill will be improved in Committee and that when it is

passed (as I hope it is) existing anomalies in the legislation will be removed. Members often say that if something is not done in another State it cannot be done here, yet has that argument been raised in this debate? It is a poor situation in which a person living close to another State crosses the border and takes advantage of the more relaxed laws applying in that State. However, I am sure that this measure will bring South Australia into line with other States, in addition to giving younger people from other States the opportunity to drink here. Young Victorians for example, often cannot understand why they are not allowed to drink in this State. I wonder whether Government members are sincere in their arguments that something should happen in another State before it happens here. They have talked about legislating for the minority, but I believe our young people are very sensible. When we were their age we did not have the same opportunities, salaries or motor cars, etc., and were doing our best perhaps even to own a bicycle, but the trend has changed as has also the way in which young people live nowadays. I am sure that many young people consume liquor in front of their parents at private parties, yet I have not heard of one such person being reprimanded by his parents for having done so. Whatever age is stipulated in the legislation, the law will exist to ensure that people toe the line, or otherwise be punished.

The member for Onkaparinga, as well as several others, said that a law such as this could not be policed. Indeed, it may be difficult to police: everyone who breaks the law is not always caught. However, many people are apprehended consuming liquor under age, and barmen have been prosecuted for serving such people. But a barman should have a defence if he serves liquor to a person under age, having asked that person if he or she is old enough to be served, and having received an affirmative reply. I believe that at each hotel there should be a book containing duplicate pages which should be signed by any person who, it was thought, was under age but who said he or she was old enough to drink. Putting people on their honour in this way may perhaps make all the difference. An added deterrent would be to increase fines for those who were detected drinking liquor under age. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) has decided that he is in favour of an 18-year-old drinking, although I do not know whether this will help the publican to whom he referred.

Mr. Lawn: He said it should be 16 years; he's an extremist.

Mr. LANGLEY: Sometimes, but I do not believe in 16-year-olds or 17-year-olds drinking, although I believe that an 18-year-old has sufficient common sense and responsibility to be permitted to drink. I think, too, that such a person should be given the opportunity to vote.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Having considered both parts of the Bill, I am against the measure in its present form, although perhaps later, if certain amendments are accepted, they will receive my support. I oppose the first part of the Bill, which relates to the increased turnover tax. It seems rather strange that, on the day after the Budget was introduced, the price of beer was increased by 1c and 2c a glass. I have great respect for the workers of this State. Although I voted against certain measures during the term of the Labor Government, I believe that, as a member of Parliament, it is not my duty to tell men who have attained the age of 21 years and who work hard through the day that it is not their privilege to have a drink on the way home from work. I maintain that that is their privilege. As I said then, I have no wish to influence men who have worked hard as to what they should drink. If I want to have a drink of lemonade, I do not want anyone to tell me that I should not have it; in the same way, I would not suggest that someone should not have a drink of ale. As the Bill stands at present, the working man, who can ill afford these little privileges, will be further penalized because, immediately the Bill becomes law, beer prices will be increased. Workers have had many levies placed on them by the Government recently, and I do not think it is fair that they should have to bear this additional one.

I want to make it plain from the outset that I oppose reducing from 21 years to 18 years the age at which liquor may be consumed. However, I am prepared to compromise and, if amendments are made to the Bill, they may receive my support. One member opposite said that all Opposition members would support the Bill. This honourable member hurls insults at people and says he knows the way they think and how they will vote, and then he immediately dismisses himself from the major part of the debate. I am sorry he is not here now, and I know he will be disappointed to learn that I will vote against this measure. That honourable member is not in

a position to say how people will speak or vote. Another member opposite has intimated that he intends to move an amendment that the age for drinking be reduced from 21 years to 20 years. I have carefully considered what he said and I believe, as young people (for whom I have the greatest respect) are called up for military service at 20 years of age, they should have the right to drink at that age, too.

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

Mr. HUGHES: Before the adjournment, I was telling the House of my stand on the Bill in its present form. I had already intimated that I was not prepared to support either the first or the second part of it unless it was amended in the Committee stage. However, I was referring to the first portion of the Bill which, in my opinion, will place a further levy upon the working-class people. I think I said that one day after the Budget was presented there was a press release to the effect that the price of beer would be increased. I want to correct that because, on checking, I found it was two days after the Budget was presented that the worker was told in the press that, if he wanted to have a schooner or butcher on the way home from work, he would have to pay an additional 1c, or 2c for a pint.

I have worked in industry for many years as well as being on the land, and I know the conditions under which men have worked and are working today. However, conditions are changing, and, in my opinion, changing for the better. However, I can remember the time when men really did work hard in unloading phosphate ships and in superphosphate works and sulphuric acid plants. Also, there were hard-working farmers then as there are today. (I do not say that all farmers are hard working; otherwise, they would not have time to lounge about on North Terrace, as some members opposite do.) If this Bill passes in its present form, it will place an extra charge upon these hard-working people. That is wrong, because anyone who has unloaded a phosphate rock ship will know the dusty conditions that prevail. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) and the present member for Wallaroo, who has worked on phosphate ships, appreciate the conditions under which men have to work during unloading. Men engaged in this work should not have this additional charge to bear when on the way

home from work they want to wash a little dust out of their throats with a drink.

Mr. Lawn: This Government was going to reduce taxes.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and many working people earning only moderate wages compared with the salaries of some honourable members opposite were thinking before the last election that things would be better for them after the election. They were told that this would be so, but it has not turned out that way. It is just as well for members opposite that there is not an election pending—

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

Mr. HUGHES: I am referring to the first part, which will place an additional impost upon the people of South Australia, particularly those men who work hard during the day and want to have a drink on the way home from work. The people of this State will soon protest about the additional imposts being placed upon them by this Government.

Before the dinner adjournment I referred to the part of the Bill dealing with the reduction of the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years and said that I was not in favour of that. I said, however, that I was a compromising person and would consider an amendment such as the one foreshadowed this afternoon by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) to reduce the minimum age to 20 years. That is because young men are called up for military service at the age of 20 years and we should have enough confidence in such a person's being able to take the role of a man in other spheres. I would favour such an amendment.

The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) has said that he has received many letters in connection with giving 18-year-olds the right to drink in hotels, and I understood him to say that no representations had been made to him supporting a reduction of the age. I have a fairly large file of representations from people in my district requesting me to vote against this reduction of the age, but not one representation has been made to me to support this provision. It seems that many South Australians are not pleased about the Bill in its present form and are making representations accordingly. Of course, some honourable members may have had representations supporting the lowering of the age.

Mr. McKee: Many.

Mr. HUGHES: I accept what the member for Port Pirie has said. However, I consider

that the number of representations made for the retention of the minimum age of 21 years far exceeds the number made to have the age reduced to 18 years. Some of the letters that I have received show the experience that the writers have had regarding the drinking question and the help that they have given to many families. I know that these people have considered the matter carefully: they are not ready to lash out at every measure that comes before the House dealing with liquor, but they are prepared to weigh up very carefully the measures presented to this House from time to time. I have received a letter from a person who has had much experience in assisting others in this connection. She sent me a copy of a letter that she had forwarded to the Attorney-General which took him to task for introducing this measure. She also sent a letter to the *Advertiser* that may have been printed, but I did not notice it. I thought that the letter she sent to the Attorney-General would take some answering: I was most impressed with it, because it showed that the writer really knew the subject she was dealing with. She reminded the Attorney-General that statistics showed that the 18-year to 20-year age group had the highest percentage of road accidents. Her letter continues:

Have you forgotten, Sir, the recent figures showing a 40 per cent increase in juvenile crime in one year—

She emphasized that it was, last year.

Mr. McKee: Do you think she was biased?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think this person was biased: she is a very fair person.

Mr. McKee: Some are biased.

Mr. HUGHES: I realize that. Some are biased in one way and some are biased in another way. Knowing this lady and her husband as I do and knowing the work that they have done over the years not only at Moonta but in other parts of the State, I would say she is not biased: she is looking at it with a fair mind and endeavouring to assess the position that would arise if the minimum age at which people could drink alcoholic liquor in hotels was lowered from 21 years to 18 years. I received a letter from a minister of religion, which says:

This matter of 18-year-olds having unrestricted access to licensed premises is one that should be examined carefully. Teenage drinking has assumed alarming proportions in the Eastern States and people far removed from the temperance bodies have expressed concern. A survey conducted in certain Melbourne secondary schools late last year showed that 65 per cent of young people classified themselves as drinkers, 10 per cent showed a lack

of responsibility in their attitude to drink, and 2 per cent had a drinking problem already.

I was most concerned when I read this letter (I have quoted only one paragraph of it) because I am the Chairman of the Kadina Memorial High School Council and I would hate to think that I was supporting a measure that would lead to students at this school being legally able to drink alcoholic liquor and perhaps being put into the category I have just mentioned. Referring to the letter, even if only two per cent had a drinking problem already, two per cent of such a group is far too many, and I sincerely hope that the House in its wisdom will not approve the proposal.

I have already said that I have great respect for the young people of today: I do not think anyone could hold them in higher respect than I do. I realize that young people mature much earlier today than they did in our time, but I put this down to the encouragement they are receiving today to take advantage of their education. As a result, they become more mature at an earlier age but, nevertheless, I do not believe we should encourage them to partake of something that would not be good for them or for the country. I know that members on both sides will suggest that I may be wrong, but I doubt that I am, because I mix with many youth organizations in my area and in other parts of the State, and it is strange that since the Attorney-General introduced this Bill not one young person has approached me and asked me to support it. Other members may have been approached, but it would be unusual for one or two members to be singled out.

Usually, when representations are made for certain people to have the privilege of doing something, all members are approached. A member on this side has said today that conditions in New South Wales and Victoria have been satisfactory with the legal minimum drinking age of 18 years, but in these places there are serious juvenile problems. I say that for the benefit of the Attorney-General, who would know that that statement was correct. About 40 per cent of road accidents have the consumption of alcoholic liquor as a contributing factor, and the most vulnerable group is of people between the ages of 17 years and 25 years. Insurance companies have been forced to consider this fact when arranging policies, and the Police Force requires more staff to deal with present conditions. It will be much more difficult should the legal minimum drinking age be reduced to 18 years,

because of the difficulty of ascertaining to within about two years the correct age of a person who is near the minimum drinking age. If we lowered the permitted minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years, the actual age group could prove to be of people aged 16 years.

Mr. McKee: It was not a general objection by the Police Force.

Mr. HUGHES: I have a great respect for the Police Force in every State, particularly in South Australia. When the Royal Commission was hearing evidence on the law relating to the sale, supply, and consumption of intoxicating liquor, the late Superintendent Brebner, who was a prominent police officer, brought matters before the Commission but, in fairness to the late superintendent, there was a particular reason for his doing that. I refer briefly to that evidence. Superintendent Brebner gave evidence about the difficulty in ascertaining within about two years the age of a person nearing the minimum drinking age, and the evidence is as follows:

Mr. King: Whatever change might be made in the law and whatever steps might be taken to enforce the law, do you see any substantial prospect of eliminating drinking by juveniles in motor cars and on beaches and remote places? . . . No.

Well, now, this raises the question, and I would like you to comment on this, as to whether the prohibition against juveniles between, say, 18 and 21 drinking in hotels serves a useful purpose. Have you any comment to make on this? . . . Assuming that the age was brought back to 18, of course, we would have the same problem between 16 and 18 as you have between 19 and 21. It is always hard to assess the age of a person.

I wish to be fair to the superintendent; indeed, he was being fair both to the juveniles concerned and to the service that he represented. The evidence continues:

Mr. King: Whatever age is selected, there will always be difficulties with those just approaching that age? . . . Yes.

The Commissioner: And if you have to select which age would be the legal limit on the assumption that some within, say, two years of that age would escape the prohibition by some means or other, which age would be selected as the legal age?

The answer was—

Mr. McKee: He was sitting on the fence.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think so. I think he was trying to be fair. The evidence continues:

Mr. King: Now, have you any reason for selecting age 20 rather than 19 or 21? . . . No, other than I feel that the year of 20 is getting pretty close to maturity, particularly today; and also the margin of where it is

difficult to detect the age is not so alarming when you come down lower; not alarming, but not so likely.

The Commissioner: Do you find it easier to detect the age between 19 and 20 than between two other proximate years? . . . No. I see less to be worried about with an 18-year-old drinking than I would with a 16-year-old.

If you come below 20, a two-year age, you would be getting too close to mid-teenagers? . . . Yes. This is my personal view.

Mr. King: I understand that. What is the point of reducing the present legal age from 21 to 20? . . . Nothing, except that I feel, well, for one thing 20-year-olds go into National Service, into army life; they are fairly well on the way to manhood; I still wouldn't object to 21, but I wouldn't like to see it go below 20.

I believe Superintendent Brebner was trying to look at this question fairly, as I am trying to do. As I have said, I am prepared to compromise on the matter.

Mr. Corcoran: It isn't a matter of compromise.

Mr. HUGHES: That may be so. However, perhaps the Deputy Leader was not here when I said that I would support a reduction in the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 20 years because young men were called up for military service at 20 years of age. If it is good enough for them to be called up to defend their country, they should be given the privilege to drink at that age.

Mr. Corcoran: They are allowed to join the services at 17 years so shouldn't they be allowed to drink in the canteen with others?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not in a position to answer that.

Mr. Corcoran: I am.

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt that is so.

Mr. Broomhill: What if there was a war on?

Mr. HUGHES: There is no war on at present. When we were outside the House I answered that point made by the member for West Torrens. He raised this question thinking he would catch me and that I would not know at what age men were called up for the services but, to his surprise, I was able to answer him.

Mr. Corcoran: They can join the Army at 17.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation. I think the honourable member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought I was right on it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is indulging in too much repetition, and Standing Order No. 155 does not allow that.

Mr. HUGHES: I should be glad if you, Sir, could point out the repetitious parts of my speech to me. I should also be glad if you would point out to honourable members who are interjecting and who are making me repetitious that they are not in order in interjecting.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is equally out of order in replying to interjections.

Mr. HUGHES: I wish you would make honourable members toe the line in regard to interjections, Sir. I know what is worrying you, Sir, as well as it is worrying many others: that I will get into a long debate on this matter.

Mr. Lawn: If you answer all the interjections, including the Speaker's, you will be here all night.

Mr. HUGHES: I know. Judging from the interjections coming from all quarters, members are looking for enlightenment and, apparently, they are getting it, otherwise they would not continue to interject. Many of the things I wish to say this evening have been made available by a minister of religion. However, I accept the points he has made as my own, otherwise I would not use them. There is an element of risk for all people who consume intoxicating liquor, and I do not think any honourable member can deny that. There are added risks to which the teenager is uniquely susceptible. The following reasons I give are set out in the alcohol education programme of the Queensland Education Department.

Mr. McKee: I will die of thirst.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the honourable member have his conversation with the member for Port Pirie after the House has adjourned.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know how many Speakers we have: I am getting rulings from various members but the longer they interject the longer they will have to put up with me because I am going to say what I want to say, with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

First, adolescents are affected by liquor more quickly than adults because teenagers weigh less than they will as adults. Because they are smaller, they have less body fluid in which alcohol can be diluted. Therefore, the alcohol from one drink will be in a higher concentration. Its dulling effect will be experienced

more rapidly and more strongly. Secondly, adolescents are more susceptible to psychological intoxication. As teenagers pass from childhood to adulthood, there is an awakening of new and exciting emotions. At this time, parental control gives way to increasing self-reliance, and home, school, church and community responsibilities are greater. Life careers are planned or started and, most powerful of all, the opposite sex becomes a source of intense interest. Teenage emotions are typically expressed in extremes—I do not think anybody will deny that. Certain friends are “with it” and others are “squares”; certain fashions are “in” and others are “out”. The excitement of first loves, dances and sporting triumphs triggers exhilaration and exuberant happiness. On the other hand, failure to make a team, a broken romance or being left out of a special group will set off moods of despondency.

Mr. Hudson: Are you talking from experience?

Mr. HUGHES: I am talking partly from experience, but the other part is from information made available to me by men competent in these matters. Adolescents are more likely than adults to become ill from drinking. Between the stomach and the small intestine is an arrangement of muscles which acts as a valve in regulating the flow of blood through this part of the digestive tract. This valve is extremely sensitive to certain drugs and on initial contact with alcohol it may protest by closing or by severe contractions. The result is a feeling of nausea or vomiting and this, together with the previous emotional mood, makes all drinking by an adolescent a double-barrelled threat to himself and may result in embarrassment or becoming ill.

I think I have outlined enough of these points to make honourable members think of the danger that can threaten young people of 18 years, or under 18 years. I realize there are many boys today who by their physique are real men. I experienced that only yesterday at a remembrance service when some military boys present of an average age of 18 years or 19 years looked like adults. The Royal Commissioner had much to say about retaining the age of 21 years as the minimum drinking age and evidence of adverse consequences of the consumption of liquor by minors was given by many witnesses, including Inspector Clowes, of Victoria, Mr. D. N. Wallis, of South Australia, Mr. L. C. Mills, of South Australia, and Superintendent Brebner, also of South Australia. The Commissioner said:

... these “warnings” were emphasized by the following extract from the Report on the Administration of the Social Welfare Act, 1926-1965, and the work of the Department of Social Welfare for the year ended 30th June 1966, page 12: “Consumption of alcohol by juveniles appears to be increasing and it was at least a contributing factor in many acts of delinquency including sexual misbehaviour. Many children under the department claim that they are served freely with liquor in bars and bottle departments at various hotels. Children as young as 14 years who were committed for offences during the year were affected by alcohol at the time the offences took place”. There appears to be no case made out for any alteration to the minimum “drinking age”, but a case does appear to be made out for giving the present law more teeth by making it a direct offence for a minor to purchase or consume liquor on licensed premises, and for any person, not merely the licensee or his servant, to sell or supply liquor to a person, other than with reasonable grounds for belief of full age.

I agree with that. Our present law is not being enforced.

Mr. Corcoran: Something was done about this at Millicent recently.

Mr. HUGHES: The Deputy Leader must know that the evidence I have referred to shows that it is difficult to determine a person's age within two years. If the present law were tightened, there would be no need for this reduction of age, because the 18-year-olds are not asking for it. I do not care who interjects to the contrary. I do not mind entering into the jocular part of a debate, but this is a serious matter. I challenge any member to say that he has been approached by youth groups or other young people in support of the reduction of the drinking age to 18 years.

Mr. Corcoran: I challenge you to tell a crowd of 18-year-olds, 19-year-olds or 20-year-olds that they are not responsible enough to have a drink.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think we had better have this fight after the House has adjourned.

Mr. HUGHES: The Deputy Leader interjected and surely you should let me answer, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why I am the big bad boy lately. Every time I answer an interjection or stray from the Bill being debated I seem to be jumped on. I am making a very serious point and I hope you will accept it as such, as the Speaker of this House. I again challenge members to prove that they have been approached by the 18-year-olds—not by one or two such people (there are always extremes). If members can prove this point, we will then be convinced that the

young people are asking for this legislation. I believe that they are not asking for it, and I defy any member to prove that young people are asking for the minimum age to be lowered to 18 years.

Mr. Hudson: Do you believe that, if young people ask for it, you should give it to them?

Mr. HUGHES: I would consider the number of young people asking for it and I would ascertain the parents' viewpoint. There are always two sides to the question. I would not like to think that, when my lad was 18 years old, if he and others had approached his member of Parliament, that member would have done anything asked of him. These young people are still under the care and control of their parents, and surely the parents should have a say regarding what they should do.

Mr. Corcoran: Whatever evidence was presented to you, you would not be convinced.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not accept the proposition that it would not matter what evidence was presented to me: I am always prepared to listen to both sides of the story. I want what is right for the young people of this State. The Deputy Leader has not convinced the House that he is right.

Mr. Rodda: There are reinforcements over here.

Mr. Corcoran interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: The Deputy Leader has had his say. This is one grand thing about the Australian Labor Party: members on this side of the House can disagree with one another, yet we can still be good friends afterwards. We are prepared to abide by the majority. I am at a loss to know why the Attorney-General introduced this measure. He will have to convince me in his closing remarks that he has been approached on this question and that he believes he is doing the right thing for the young people of South Australia. In my opinion, however, he is not doing the right thing, so I do not support the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN (Burra): I cannot let this opportunity pass without speaking on this Bill. I support clauses 1 and 2. I have no doubt that the increased licence fees will be passed on to the consumers. Hotel accommodation is a necessity but consumption of liquor is a luxury.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think it is a good thing?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Burra.

Mr. ALLEN: If anyone has luxuries he should be prepared to pay for them.

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, they do—and heavily!

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader has made his speech. Let the honourable member for Burra proceed.

Mr. ALLEN: I cannot support clauses 3 to 9 in their present form. However, I am prepared to support the amendment that has been foreshadowed. I have tried to get the opinion of the people in my electoral district, and it appears that the majority is not in favour of lowering the minimum age to 18 years. An alcoholic in my district begged me not to support this Bill. Also, the 18-year-olds that I approached were not happy with the Bill. Like the member for Wallaroo, I have not had one 18-year-old ask me to support it. Many members have used the word "mature" and claim that 18-year-olds are more mature than were their predecessors. My dictionary definition of "mature" is, "complete in natural development and growth" with the alternative, "having the powers of body and mind fully developed". No-one will convince me that 18-year-olds are more complete in natural development and growth than were their predecessors. Some young people are more mature at 18 years than others are at 24 years, but this has always applied.

The age of 21 years as an age of majority was probably chosen in order to strike a happy medium between these two age groups. Young people today are better educated than we were; they can handle a motor car more efficiently than we could, but that is because we did not own one. The member for Unley suggested that the member for Gumeracha was out of touch, but I believe that the member for Unley was referring to his game of bowls last Friday. Barmen should not be responsible for determining the age of drinkers. If young people are prepared to take the risk of entering a bar and consuming liquor, they should be prepared to suffer the consequences.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I am inclined to oppose this Bill lock, stock, and barrel. Increased fees have been provided for in the Bill, but the lowering of the minimum drinking age is a sop to young people. The Leader introduced a Bill earlier this session to give full voting rights to 18-year-olds as well as lowering the age of drinking, but that Bill was not accepted by the Government, which now introduces a Bill and is trying to force us

to accept it by linking them. This is the oldest trick in the book, and surely the Government does not think that we would be foolish enough to fall for such a thimble-and-pea trick. The members for Onkaparinga and Gumeracha claimed that they opposed lowering the minimum age, but they would not hear of this age group having a vote. They claimed that these people were completely irresponsible about drink, but they have no hesitation in allowing these people to be conscripted into the Army at the age of 17 years and being sent to Vietnam to protect honourable members opposite.

Mr. Evans: They are not conscripted at 17.

Mr. McKEE: They can go to the war at 17, but they are conscripted at 20 years of age. I am sure that if the member for Onkaparinga presented himself at the recruiting depot he would be accepted for service in Vietnam.

Mr. Corcoran: They'd knock him back.

Mr. McKEE: Mentally deficient, or something like that? If these people are sufficiently responsible to shoulder arms, pay taxes—

Mr. Casey: Drive motor cars.

Mr. McKEE: —and pay the extra charge for third party insurance that has just been levied, surely we are sufficiently reasonable to acknowledge that they are entitled to have a drink. When in Queensland recently, I heard that a contingent of young people was converging on Tweed Heads and causing much trouble, these people having crossed the border in order to enjoy more relaxed laws.

Mr. Hurst: It is like sending for a lottery ticket in another State.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, that took place here for 30 years until the Labor Government came into power. It is annoying to hear people say that young people should be conscripted, when the people who say this sort of thing could well be serving the country themselves. I previously agreed that I would support the lowering of the minimum drinking age, because I believe it is desirable. It has been accepted in other States, from which I have heard no adverse reports. However, I believe that the provision relating to a 1 per cent increase in licence fees is not related at all to the provision regarding the drinking age and should not have been included in this measure.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You know we are going to split it.

Mr. McKEE: I did not know.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: An indication to this effect has been on the Notice Paper.

Mr. McKEE: Anyhow, the two matters are being debated together and have been included on the file in the one Bill. I think the Government originally thought that, as the Opposition would wish to accept the provision to lower the drinking age, the Government would force use to accept also the increased licence fee in the one measure.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I am not as devious as that.

Mr. McKEE: Not much. Nevertheless, I believe that, had the Leader of the Opposition not introduced his Bill, this measure would not be before the House now. I believe the Attorney-General was rail-roped into introducing this measure, because he thought that here was an opportunity for him to gain a political advantage and that he might as well jump on the band waggon. However, that waggon is not going too well at the moment, and one wheel is dragging a little. I should like briefly to register my protest at the increased fee. As has been pointed out by other members on this side of the House, this increase is directed at a certain section of the public. As the member for Wallaroo was fair enough to say, when he was employed in heavy industry many of his workmates enjoyed a glass of beer on their way home from work. I do not think the Attorney-General would deny them this pleasure, but he is making it so expensive for them that they are practically prohibited from having it. I object to this proposed increase because it is directed at the people most easy to get at, and this seems to be the general trend of this anti-workingman Government. Its supporters can drink Scotch whisky. However, as the working people cannot afford to do that, they must drink beer, and it is the price of beer that will be affected. I strongly object to this because it is the action of a Government opposed to the working class.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the first part of the Bill because I realize that it has been necessary for the Treasurer to obtain additional revenue to finance the commitments that were made, to a degree, by the previous Government. In introducing the Budget, the Treasurer said that the people were demanding more services from the Government. Over the last three or four years Government services have been increased, and it has become (and will continue to be) more difficult for the Treasurer to meet the increasing demands. Therefore, it is necessary that turnover tax be increased to offset rising costs and Public Service expenditure.

With many other members, I do not agree that it is necessary to reduce the age at which people are permitted to drink liquor on licensed premises. I listened with much interest to the member for Wallaroo, who stood out like a lighthouse amongst members opposite. Although many members opposite endeavoured to blow out his light, he tried to keep it burning. I am pleased to see one member opposite thinking about the welfare of the young people of the State.

Mr. Virgo: Why don't you make the minimum age 25?

Mr. VENNING: As other members have said, this measure has not been introduced at the demand of young people but has been introduced for political gain, by the Leaders of our Parties. Another point made in support of this measure is that, as certain young people drink now on licensed premises, it is necessary that their misdemeanours be made legal. I do not think that is the right way to look at the situation. As the member for Onkaparinga said, where people exceed 35 miles an hour in the built-up area, it is not suggested that the speed limit should be increased from 35 miles an hour to 45 miles an hour (or higher) to make speeding legal. It is dangerous to think that because the law is infringed the infringement should be made legal. It is rather important to remember, in dealing with this question, that the licensing Royal Commission came out strongly against a reduction in the age at which people may drink on licensed premises.

Mr. Virgo: Your Party did nothing about the liquor laws.

Mr. VENNING: It was significant that this guide should have been the outcome of the findings of the Royal Commission, and it is the duty of this House to ensure that these recommendations be looked at with the idea of their being put into operation. It concerns me that, when we know that members are elected here by their constituents to attend to the welfare of the State, we should be worrying about such things as this Bill, particularly as these young people are not asking for it. This is a move by the leaders of the Parties for publicity which they think will gain them future support. Nobody in my electoral district has come to me with the idea of directing my thinking on this Bill. It is obvious to many of us that this is a move not by the young people but by our political leaders. It has been suggested that some amendments may be moved to the Bill.

If that is so, I am prepared to give them serious consideration, but I would want to see the details of those amendments before I could agree to them. For the moment, I am against the second part of the Bill but support the first part.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It is regrettable that the part of the Bill dealing with an increase in liquor licence fees has been deemed necessary to try to get the State's finances back on their feet, but it is one of the measures taken by the Government to try to spread evenly throughout the population the increases necessary to offset the big deficits we have incurred.

Mr. Corcoran: It is a sectional tax, not a tax spread over the whole community. It will affect the community hotels in your district.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: I have probably had as keen an interest in community hotels as anyone in this Chamber has had. It is to be regretted that the provisions dealing with licence fees are necessary because of the situation in which we find the State's finances.

Mr. Corcoran: Will \$500,000 make any difference?

Mr. ARNOLD: Every little bit helps. With regard to lowering the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years, this has been the case in New South Wales and Victoria for a long time. I spend much time in Victoria and have not noticed much difference there from South Australia in respect of the age. I do not think the problem is whether the age is 21 years or 18 years: it is a matter of education, which can be received only in the home. Even if we have 21 as the minimum drinking age, this has no effect on the problem of teenagers drinking at parties and dances. Whether the legal minimum drinking age is 18 years or 21 years has no bearing on that. The problem arises not regarding drinking on licensed premises but regarding drinking at parties and dances.

Mr. McKee: You must go to some wild ones!

Mr. ARNOLD: No, but I grew through this age and, as I come from a predominantly wine-producing area, I have probably seen as much of it as has any other member. The fundamental basis of the approach is the attitude in the household. In France and Italy the children are brought up in an environment in which they have a mug of dry wine in the same way as we have a cup of tea.

Mr. Corcoran: That happens in your own district and in the Barossa Valley.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes. The practice is increasing, especially because of the influence of the Greek and Italian people. Drinking is not a problem in countries where the children grow up with drinking and accept it as part of their life. However, here teenagers may not have anything to drink for a week or a fortnight, and then the problem arises when they go to a party. I am sure that, as a result of the influence of Europeans, especially in a community similar to the one that I represent, drinking will become part and parcel of everyday living and there will not be a problem. Although I am in favour of reducing the minimum drinking age to 18 years, I am not certain that the community or parents are ready for it. I am more inclined to favour the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Onkapingara.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 576.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Opposition supports this Bill, which is designed to clear up an anomaly. The anomaly in this instance is that stamp duty has been payable on both the sale of beasts and the sale of carcasses. When the principal Act was considered, Parliament did not intend that stamp duty would be payable on both transactions. This Bill clears up this anomaly. I am sure that it will be in the interests of these people who purchase beasts for slaughter to pay stamp duty on the purchase. When they sell the carcass they will not have to pay stamp duty, because it will already have been paid. I support the Bill.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2195.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. I wish I thought that the effect of supporting it was going to be greater than, in fact, it will be. I have already stated in this House the dismay I feel at the release of certain items of household expenditure from price control.

Although we retain price control legislation on the Statute Book there is not much price control left, and this is in items where there is an increase in cost to the consumer without, in many cases, a commensurate increase in cost to the producer justifying that increase in cost to the consumer. I speak with some knowledge about cool drinks, because the major cool drink manufacturers in this State are situated in my district. A price increase was granted last year for cool drinks. That was necessary because of the situation that faced the manufacturers, but a thorough investigation was made into the matter. Upon that price increase being agreed, the cool drink manufacturers were able to make an adequate return.

When cool drinks were removed from price control, it was published in company statements that they were making adequate returns. I cannot see why cool drinks should have been removed from price control, because the result is inevitably an increase, in due course, in the cost to the public of cool drinks. I do not see why it is necessary to alter the system which was operating previously, which our Government inherited from the Liberal Government and which we carried on in the same way as Sir Thomas Playford had carried on, or why it is now being altered so singularly by the removal of so many items from control. If this is to continue, there will be on the Statute Book a measure that is inoperative.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you see the Attorney-General's hand in this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know. As a private member, the Attorney-General always opposed price control and the passing of this type of measure. The removal of items from price control is weakening the system in such a way as to deprive South Australia of the cost benefits that arose from price control. It is essential for our industrial development that we maintain a competitive cost structure, and one of the means of doing that was to have price control, which meant that, while real wages were not less, money wages were. It is the comparison of the money wage that is the relevant question in setting off our costs against those in other States. If to maintain real wages in South Australia necessarily calls for an increase in money wages commensurate with those in the Eastern States, we will lose the cost advantage.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Leader will appreciate that he argued the cost factor in industry in another context when in Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I spoke about the cost factor in industry when we were in office, because many strange things were said. It was alleged that, by giving fringe benefits to workers (and this would only marginally affect costs in South Australia to a much less extent than the increase in costs of the average family that have occurred recently), we would affect industry. Obviously, the increase in costs of extra leave, better workmen's compensation, and other protection provisions did not mean a great increase in cost to industry. It contributed to our having a stable work force, which was of value to industry. Mr. Curtis, of the Chamber of Manufactures, was always saying that any increase in benefits, whether monetary or otherwise, to workers was loading costs on to industry. This was simply a piece of political propaganda. Small shopkeepers were told that their costs would increase because public servants were to get one week's extra leave or, in some cases, two and a half days' extra leave. That was nonsense.

Mr. Broomhill: Mr. Curtis has been quiet recently.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He has not talked about increases in this way just recently. But the creeping up of the costs to the average consumer in South Australia will inevitably affect the wage position much more signally than anything that was done to improve benefits or protections to workers during the Labor Government's term of office. This is what worries me. I entirely agree that this legislation should be continued; in fact, I believe it should be a permanent feature of our legislation and that it is an essential part of our administration to maintain the position that we have. My only dismay at the present situation is that the system on the Statute Book is not being administered as it was by the previous Government or as it was by the Liberal Government when it was previously in office.

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

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 578.)

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): This is not a controversial Bill; it is of a formal nature and brings the legislation up to date in respect of the Public Service Act and

also in respect of the repeal of the former Licensing Act. I support the Bill, but I draw attention to the fact that the Leader has several amendments on the file which relate to the removal of references to the Register of Aborigines and which also provide the Minister with powers now held by the board. These desirable amendments will be dealt with by the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. It is not proper for me at this stage to talk about the amendments I have on file. The Bill is purely a machinery measure making certain necessary alterations to the Act in consequence of later legislation. I think it is necessary that we should do this and, at the same time, clear up the unsatisfactory features of the Act that derive from the fact that the original Bill, upon which the Act is based, introduced to this House was different in form from the Bill as it finally passed the House. Originally, the measure proposed something different from the Act as we now know it. However, because it was amended so extensively in Committee, there were certain parts of it which had to be left but which now do not tie up with other later sections of the Act.

In order to bring the whole Act into line with what was obviously the final intention of the House, I believe we should make some alterations to the Act, and I welcome the opportunity to make those alterations. I notice that the Minister has on file a proposal to clear up something in the Act. I agree that that should be done, and I hope we can co-operate and get it done.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to amend my contingent notice of motion so that it will read as follows:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the respective powers of the board and the Minister, the definition of Aborigines, the Register of Aborigines, the declaration of trainees, and the abolition of special provisions relating to Aborigines giving false evidence.

The SPEAKER: The Leader gave notice today that he would move a contingent notice of motion, and he is now taking the short course of asking leave of the House to amend his original contingent notice of motion, which is on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): May I speak on this, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister may speak on whether the honourable Leader have leave.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not oppose the granting of leave, but I am not in favour of certain of the additional matter the Leader is bringing into the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The Minister would not be in order in discussing that at this stage.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not want to discuss it, but I want the Leader to know that, while I do not oppose the granting of leave to amend, I will oppose certain of the subject matter when we get to it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the contingent notice of motion as amended be carried.

Mr. JENNINGS seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New clause 1a—"Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. Section 4 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "other than a person whose name is removed from the Register of Aborigines in pursuance of section 17 of this Act,";

and

(b) by striking out from subsection (2) the passage "and every person whose name is removed from the Register of Aborigines in pursuance of section 17 of this Act and his direct descendants,".

The original purpose of the register of Aborigines was to have a register of full-blood Aborigines, who would still be subject to protection, and people of part-Aboriginal blood, who would not be subject to protection. The only way, then, that an Aboriginal could be absolved from protection was to get his name removed from the register of Aborigines. The provision concerning the protection of full-blood Aborigines was subsequently removed in the course of the passage of the Bill, so there was no protective legislation specifically covering full-blood Aborigines; yet we retained the register, which was a register, in effect, of people not subject to protection (although the protection no longer existed) and we retained the provision by which they could be removed (section 17 of the principal Act).

In fact, there is no point in retaining this provision any longer.

Mr. Jennings: It is an anachronism.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite. In consequence, this proposal will lead to further amendments later which I have prepared. It is undesirable that we should have in the definition section any longer a reference to the register of Aborigines.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): As I think I indicated a few minutes ago, I do not oppose this amendment. Indeed, I am prepared to accept all the amendments the Leader originally had on file. As he has said, they are designed really to remove those parts of the Act of 1962 that never operated. I am informed that a recommendation was made to him when he was the Minister to remove these things but, for some reason, he did not get around to it. I understand the same recommendation was made to the honourable gentleman's successor and he, too, did not get around to doing anything about it.

When this Bill was originally presented to me by my officers, it having been agreed to by the previous Government, I accepted it as it was. I was not prepared so soon after coming into office to initiate any other amendments to the Act until I had had a chance to settle down and get a grasp of the problems. Perhaps that is why the other honourable gentleman did not do anything either.

Mr. Jennings: You'll be out before you get around to it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, I feel that I am getting to that stage now, getting to the stage of having a grasp of the problems, and there seems to be no prospect of our leaving office. I feel that, perhaps, the member for Enfield is not on the ball at present. Had the matter come up a few months later, undoubtedly I would have included some such provisions as these in the Bill and, therefore, I am grateful to the honourable gentleman for adding them at this stage. It means that we are removing the provision relating to the non-existent register of Aborigines, the later provision regarding the declaration of trainees, and so on. I think that these are improvements, in that they tidy up the Act and bring it into conformity with what is the practice.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3a—"Register of Aborigines."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. Section 17 of the principal Act and the heading thereto are repealed.

This provision deals with the register of Aborigines.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3b—"Power to remove Aborigines to reserves or Aboriginal institutions."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3b. Section 20 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out subsection (2);

and

(b) by striking out from subsection (3) the passage "and any trainee declared under subsection (2) of this section who refuses to remain within an institution until he completes his training to the satisfaction of the Minister,".

In the original Bill there was provision for protection and orders for people to remain on reserves, an action which I considered quite unwarranted in relation to Aborigines and which I have always opposed in any legislation in Australia. However, because of representations from the Berri district, a compromise was reached by which a person who went to a reserve for training could, with his consent, be declared a trainee. I was not pleased about the provision at the time, but this was a compromise. Thank goodness, no Aboriginal has ever been declared a trainee, and the provision has been quite inoperative. It is contrary to the policy of our Government and of the present Minister, and I am pleased to see it go.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3c—"Power to provide such assistance."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3c. Section 22 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out the passage "board, may subject to the approval of the Minister," and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "Minister may";

and

(b) by striking out the word "it" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "he".

In the original Bill the board was to be an administering authority. In the course of the passage of the measure, the Minister became the administering authority and the board was to be advisory, but some administrative functions of the board were left in because of the peculiar way in which the Bill proceeded in Committee. The member for Ridley (Hon.

T. C. Stott) did not come in for some of the divisions but at other times we did not have the numbers, and so strange inconsistencies resulted from the amendments moved in Committee. The new clause brings the Act into line with the purpose clearly set forth—that the Minister shall be the administering authority and the board shall be advisory.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3d—"Unlawfully entering reserve or institution."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3d. Section 23 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subsection (1) the word "board" first occurring and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "Minister or Director of Aboriginal Affairs";

(b) by striking out from that subsection the following passage "(b) the Minister; or";

(c) by striking out from that subsection paragraph (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

(e) a person authorized in writing by an Aboriginal Reserve Council constituted by regulation for and in respect of that Aboriginal institution where by regulation that Council is given the power to grant permission for any person to enter, or be in, or to remain upon such an Aboriginal institution;

This transfers to the Minister or the Director the administrative work of the department.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3e—"Repeal of section 25."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had proposed to amend section 25 of the principal Act by moving the new clause 3e which is on members' files, but the Minister has foreshadowed an amendment to repeal this section. His amendment is eminently to be preferred. Therefore, I shall not move my amendment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new clause:

3e. Section 25 of the principal Act is repealed.

The purpose of section 25 was to make special provision with regard to the treatment of Aborigines for infectious diseases. I am advised that, in fact, it has not been operative at all since 1962. In 1967 there were amendments to regulations under the Health Act that made notifiable the diseases of syphilis and gonorrhoea. It is no longer necessary that

there should be any special provision for Aborigines, since they are covered by the regulations under the Health Act. I think the policy common to both sides of this Chamber is that there should be no discrimination or special treatment of any section of the community. Therefore, it is desirable to excise this section from the Act.

Mr. RICHES: I am sorry that the Leader has decided not to proceed with his proposed amendment. I should like the Minister to inquire fully into the effect of the action he is taking tonight. I agree with him that we should not treat Aborigines differently from the way we treat the white population in this matter, but I suggest that the law dealing with both Europeans and Aborigines is not nearly strong enough—in its application, anyway. There is a situation in my district which is not good, but the authorities seem powerless to take action in connection with these horrible diseases. We make it compulsory for the populace to submit to chest X-rays as a protection against tuberculosis yet not enough action is taken in respect of these diseases. Stories can be obtained from people in the Port Augusta Gaol that do not reflect credit on the way the Act is being administered. The information that has been given to me is that the Public Health Department does not possess the necessary powers. Having embarked on the course he has taken the Minister should have the matter thoroughly investigated to ensure that the power provided in this section is adequately provided for under the Public Health Act.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall certainly do that. The state of affairs mentioned by the honourable member illustrates the uselessness of the provision being deleted. It has not been used and, therefore, has not been effective in dealing with situations to which he has referred. My advice is that there is sufficient power in the regulations to the Health Act, but I shall speak to the Minister of Health, who is also the Chief Secretary, about this matter, and I shall also obtain a report from the Port Augusta Gaol. I discussed the Leader's amendments with the board and it was happy with them, and in this instance I have accepted the advice of my officers and moved the amendment.

New clause inserted.

New clause 3f—"Death in employment."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

3f. Section 27 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "board" twice occurring and inserting in lieu thereof in each case the passage "Director of Aboriginal Affairs".

This is purely a consequential amendment on the administrative power being in the hands of the department and not of the board.

New clause inserted.

New clause 4a—"Evidence."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

4a. Section 35 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by striking out subsection (1);
- (b) by striking out from subsection (2) the word "such" first occurring;
- (c) by inserting after the passage "legal proceedings or inquiry" first occurring in subsection (2) the passage " , whether under this Act or otherwise,";

and

- (d) by striking out from that subsection the passage " . Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "and".

This is a consequential amendment.

New clause inserted.

New clause 4b—"Additional power to make regulations."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

4b. Section 41 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by striking out from paragraph 1 the passage "Aboriginal Affairs Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Minister";
- (b) by striking out the proviso to that paragraph.

This is also a consequential amendment.

New clause inserted.

New clause 5—"Amendment of Evidence Act, 1929-1960."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new clause:

5 (1). Section 14 of the Evidence Act, 1929-1960 is amended by striking out the passage " , and further to be once, twice, or thrice publicly or privately whipped".

(2) The Evidence Act, 1929-1960 as amended by this Act, may be cited as the Evidence Act, 1929-1968.

Section 14 of the Evidence Act refers to penalties for what are considered to be uncivilized Aborigines who give testimony in a court without being sworn, and who wilfully give false testimony. In effect, the testimony is to be taken very much the same

way as is the testimony of a child of tender years. Personally, I thought it wise to cut out this penalty provision altogether: if we have Aborigines who do not understand the difference between right and wrong, as it is understood in our community, and who do not understand the meaning of giving evidence on oath, we generally get people who will say what they believe we want them to say, because this is their general attitude. In consequence, it seemed to me that it was unnecessary to have a penalty provision.

However, it has been suggested by some who have had experience in courts dealing with people in this situation that it is wise to retain some penalties. Quite clearly, if we are to have a penalty, it should not be one which provides for a public or private "once, twice or thrice" whipping of Aborigines. This is certainly something that would not be countenanced for anyone else in the community, not even by people who believe in corporal punishment, regarding an offence of this kind, and we should not subject Aborigines to it. In fact, I moved to amend this section when I introduced the Bill to amend the Evidence Act in 1965 but, unfortunately, that Bill for other reasons was not completed and, therefore, we did not at that time remove from this Statute a provision which plainly discriminates against Aborigines. I believe this was the opportunity (and the first opportunity I had since the matter had been drawn to my attention) to remove what is a clearly discriminatory provision. It has been protested about to me recently by workers with Aborigines who have studied this matter, and I believe we should get it off the Statute Book as quickly as we can. It may also be an idea to clear up the misspelling in the Statute, because at the moment the Aborigine is liable to be "imprisoned" and not "imprisoned".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope that the Leader will not press the amendment at this point of time. Having often seen this particular provision in the Evidence Act, I have marvelled that it had not been removed previously, particularly during the life of the last Government. I was surprised that no action was taken to repeal what is obviously, as the Leader has said, a provision which is now undesirable. I recall that the honourable gentleman brought into Parliament an amendment to the Evidence Act in which he could have included this provision quite properly, but he did not. I therefore do not oppose the

intent of this amendment or the contention that this particular provision in the Evidence Act should come out. However, the Leader has whipped in this amendment today right at the last moment, although the Bill has been on our files, I think, for a couple of months, and although he himself gave notice of intention of his other amendments many weeks ago, certainly in plenty of time for me to consider them. We are all taken by surprise at times and leave things to the last moment, but my real objection to this amendment is that he is purporting to amend the Evidence Act in an Aboriginal Affairs Act Amendment Bill.

I hope the Leader will not accuse me of pettifogging (which I think was the word he used of me last week when he tried to do something similar) when I say it is undesirable that we should amend the Evidence Act in the Aboriginal Affairs Act. I give him my assurance that, if he will let this new clause go, I will introduce an amendment to the Evidence Act to take out these provisions. The amending Bill will contain either this provision only or this provision coupled with others I have in mind at present. Certainly I will introduce that Bill this session. I think that, from a drafting point of view and for the convenience particularly of Mr. Ludovici, it would be undesirable to put this new clause in this Act. For those reasons, I ask the Leader not to go on with the new clause on my giving an assurance that the matter will be cleaned up this session in a proper way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will accept what the Minister has said. Frankly I do not think it is as undesirable as he suggests to amend two Acts in the one Bill. I know that sometimes those who have to compile indices get a little confused when we take that course of action, but I may say that I have the greatest precedents in this place for doing this, for members of the honourable member's Party and Ministers have supported the practice over many years and have done this, and we have heard not a single objection about it. I am faced with the position that, if I press this new clause now and it is defeated, it cannot be dealt with again this session. As the Minister has given an undertaking, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 579.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): The Attorney-General will be pleased to know that the Opposition will support the Bill. I point out that the amendments proposed are of a purely formal nature and do not alter the quality of the Act in any way. Although the Bill is brief, it contains amendments of which I approve. The existing Act refers to the Mental Defectives Act, the title of which has been changed to the Mental Health Act, and it refers also to the Inebriates Act, which has now been repealed by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act. This is desirable as both those terms "inebriates" and "defectives" are objectionable. As the modern terms have been included in this Bill, it deserves our support.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause dealing with the jurisdiction of the court and matters incidental thereto.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

New clause 1a—"Exercise of jurisdiction by court".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. Section 4 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsections:

(3) The court shall have, and may exercise, jurisdiction under Part II of this Act—

(a) if the person in respect of whom the protection order is sought, or has been made, is, or was at the time of the commencement of proceedings under that Part, domiciled or resident within the State;

or

(b) if the property in respect of which the protection order is sought, or has been made, is situate within the State.

(4) Subsection (3) of this section shall be construed as being in addition to, and not in derogation of, any prin-

ciple of law upon which the jurisdiction of the court under Part II of this Act might otherwise be founded.

The case of *Re G.* (1966) New Zealand Law Reports, page 1028, which is a decision based upon legislation substantially similar to this Act, leads to the inference that the court can exercise its authority under the Act only if the person in respect of whom the order is to be made is domiciled or resident within the territorial jurisdiction of the court. It is sometimes desirable to protect property within the State notwithstanding that its owner is not domiciled or resident in the State. This amendment is, therefore, designed to extend the jurisdiction of the court, enabling it to exercise its powers under the Act either where jurisdiction may be founded upon the domicile or residence of the person to be protected, or where the property to be protected is situated in the State. The court will thus have a rather wider authority under the Act to prevent the dissipation of property within its jurisdiction. This is a small amendment to take care of a point which has been raised in New Zealand and which could arise here. I do not think it is an amendment with any element of controversy in it, and I commend it to the Committee.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

OATHS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 579.)

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): This short Bill of minor significance results from the fact that the definition of bank in the original Act of 1936 had referred to the Banking Companies Act, 1935, which was repealed in 1946. It is agreed that the amendment is necessary, and I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 13, at 2 p.m.