

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 14, 1968

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

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

QUESTIONS

AIRCRAFT WORKS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was reported in today's *Advertiser* that the Commonwealth aircraft works in South Australia was to close. As many South Australian workmen who are employed at the works and who could be affected have already contacted me as a result of the announcement, will the Premier say what action the State Government has taken to try to retain this facility and this employment in South Australia? If the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to continue its investment, will the Premier say what consideration the State Government has given to taking over the works with a view to undertaking the production of aircraft, or work on aircraft, in the factory on the basis of a State investment?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The State Government is alarmed to learn that the works at Parafield may become redundant. Earlier this week I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister asking him, if this report be true, to use every endeavour to allocate additional work, of another nature if necessary, in this works to maintain the employment and organization existing there at present. Of course, I cannot presume to know what that reply will be. The report in the *Advertiser* also states that some additional air-frame work, I think in the wing section of aircraft, is being considered in Australia. Certainly, the State Government will follow up the representations it made this week along these lines. In addition to the actions I have taken and to which I have referred, I have briefly discussed the matter this week with the Director of Industrial Promotion, and I will put it before the Industrial Advisory Executive at its next meeting, I think next Monday. The matter is being actively considered, and the State Government will use every argument it can bring to bear on the Commonwealth Minister and, if necessary, on the Prime Minister, to see whether alternative work can be placed in this facility. In reply to the Leader's

suggestion that the State should purchase the factory and enter into aircraft work, I should think that this would be most unlikely because the basis of the present work is being phased out as a result, I understand, of the phasing out of two particular types of aircraft, one popularly known as the Dakota and the other as the Winjeel trainer, to a degree where repair work will not be required at this factory. I understand that, apart from the Royal Australian Air Force work, much work has been done at Parafield on aircraft from other countries and that this work has been recognized as being of a high standard. Therefore, I believe there will be no problem in pointing out to any alternative user of this factory that the standards are high. The State Government is making every endeavour it can to have work at Parafield continued. Unfortunate as this report is, it is not a reflection on the present economic position in South Australia: it is a matter of policy regarding the obsolescence of certain types of aircraft. The failure of the prospect of continuance of the work is not a result of any down-turn in the general economy of South Australia; I believe that is self-evident. We will do what we can to help in this matter.

SELECT COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER: I refer to the question directed to me on Tuesday by the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) concerning protection afforded a witness who appears before a Select Committee of this House. Section 38 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1965, provides that "the privileges, immunities and powers of the . . . House of Assembly . . . and of the committees and members thereof respectively shall be the same as but no greater than those which on October 24, 1856, were held, enjoyed, and exercised by the House of Commons and by the committees and members thereof, whether such privileges, immunities, or powers were so held, possessed, or enjoyed by custom, Statute, or otherwise." In general, witnesses are protected from molestation, threats or legal proceedings on account of what they may have said or done in the House or a committee thereof. The following extracts from Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* (17th edition), pages 129 and 130, will exemplify the specific nature of this protection afforded to witnesses before that House or any of its committees (by operation of section 38 of our own Constitution Act, comparable protection would be available to witnesses

before the House of Assembly or any of its committees):

It is a contempt to molest any persons attending a committee of the House as witnesses during their attendance in such House or committee.

Included in this category of contempt are decided House of Commons cases involving assaults upon witnesses in the precincts of the House, and the use of threatening, insulting or abusive language to witnesses within the precincts of the House. May also states:

To tamper with a witness in regard to the evidence to be given before any committee of the House or to endeavour directly or indirectly to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, is a breach of privilege.

Witnesses are protected from arrest, not only while going to or attending a committee, but while returning from such committee. May also states:

Any molestation of or threats against persons who have given evidence before a committee of the House will be treated by the House as a breach of privilege.

The House of Commons has decided in specific cases that the following misconduct constituted a breach of privilege—assaulting, threatening with personal violence, or insulting or abusing a witness on account of the evidence which he has given before a committee: and calling any person to account or passing a censure upon him for evidence given by such person before any committee of the House. It seems to me that adequate protection is available for a witness appearing before a Select Committee of the House of Assembly. As I indicated on Tuesday, questions of privilege are essentially matters for the decision of the House in each case.

Mr. LAWN: Can you, Mr. Speaker, say whether a witness, either subpoenaed to appear, or appearing voluntarily, before a Select Committee of the House of Assembly would be entitled to challenge the impartiality of a member of the Select Committee should the witness feel justified in doing so? If he is entitled to do this, how should the challenge be made?

The SPEAKER: At this stage I believe it is a little difficult to answer the question because, as I think the honourable member realizes, it is a little hypothetical. If the honourable member reads in *Hansard* a report of the statement I have just made on this matter, I think he will probably find it covers the point he has raised. However, if it does not I hope the honourable member will realize

that I cannot rule on a hypothetical case. However, I repeat that, after all, this evidence is given before a Select Committee and, if any action is to be taken, it must be taken with the consent of the House: it is not the Speaker's duty to decide these matters.

Mr. LAWN: This is not necessarily a hypothetical case, Mr. Speaker. I am seeking information for the community at large. In the event of someone desiring to make a complaint, how would the complaint be lodged? I believe the people of South Australia would like this information. It is not a hypothetical question to ask how people would go about lodging a complaint.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is really asking how a witness would go about making a complaint. I think I had better look into that.

STAMP DUTIES OFFICE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I frequently visit the Stamp and Succession Duties Department and I have noticed that for some time the employees of this department have been working in extremely overcrowded conditions. This must inevitably have a retarding effect on efficiency and, doubtless, with the implementation of revenue legislation recently passed by this Chamber, additional staff will be employed, putting added strain on the department. Therefore, can the Treasurer say whether the Government intends to provide, at an early date, more commodious and salubrious working conditions for the staff of this department?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member is correct when he says that the activities of the department are increasing, and they will inevitably increase further when certain legislation before the House is passed. I have had consultations with the Chairman of the Public Service Board, and Cabinet has approved recommendations I have made from time to time for necessary increases in staff consequent upon increased requirements of the department. The matter of accommodation must arise if further staff is appointed, and I have no doubt that the Chairman of the Public Service Board has plans in mind regarding that. However, as I do not know what these plans are, I will discuss the matter with him.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Education will recall that regulation No. 25 of Division IV of Part XXIII of the Education Department regulations will, after

January 1, 1969, enable the employment of a teacher with fewer than four classification units. Such a teacher will be known as an Assistant C and will receive a lower salary. The position of Assistant C will apply to secondary schools and will correspond to the position of unclassified teacher in primary schools. This change is strongly opposed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, on the grounds that it encourages and makes legal the undesirable practice of appointing persons with poor qualifications and paying them low salaries. Will the Minister reconsider this matter in view of her assurance on September 18 that the Education Department would cease to employ teachers with Assistant C status as soon as possible, and will she take steps to ensure that the regulation does not become operative?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I imagine that the honourable member is referring to a circular letter, which most honourable members have received, drawing attention to this matter. Incidentally, having received a copy I immediately referred the statistics given therein to the Director-General of Education and asked him to supply me with further information. In view of that and in view of this question, I will see whether I can obtain that information for the honourable member as early as possible, probably next week.

KINGSTON SOUTH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked this week about the extension of the water supply at Kingston to Kingston South?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The possibility of extending mains into this area has been examined on several occasions, the most recent being in April, 1967. A scheme to serve this area was estimated to cost \$28,000. This would serve 118 properties, 68 being vacant allotments and 50 house properties. The estimated revenue return from this scheme is \$1,136.80 which is only just over 4 per cent on the estimated cost of the scheme. For this reason the scheme has not been recommended. The demand for water in Kingston in the meantime has increased so that the existing three bores are barely adequate to meet the needs of existing consumers.

Therefore, approval was sought and given on December 19, 1967, for the expenditure of \$27,000 on the drilling of a new bore, the enlargement of the existing bore-hole pumps, the installation of new engines on all bore-hole pumps, and the provision of a rising

main from the new bore to the main distribution system. Drilling of the new bores was commenced by the Mines Department on June 3, 1968, but up to the present the success or otherwise of this bore has not yet been established by the Mines Department. For this additional reason, the shortage of water in Kingston itself, further consideration cannot be given to any extension of the water supply system to Kingston South at this stage. The honourable member will realize that we are awaiting the results of the exploratory work being done by the Mines Department.

GILES POINT

Mr. FERGUSON: Earlier this session, when I asked the Minister of Marine on what date the bulk handling facilities for grain at Giles Point would be completed, he said that it was expected to be August, 1970. With this year's expected record harvest some problems may be created, because the terminal silo at Giles Point is expected to be filled. With the erection of another 1,500,000-bushel storage next year, in a normal cereal year 3,000,000 bushels of grain would be awaiting shipment at the end of the 1969-70 harvest. In these circumstances will the Minister consider bringing forward the completion date at Giles Point so that the facility can operate for the 1969-70 harvest?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This matter having been considered, and the co-operative bulk handling project being now completed, it is intended to re-schedule the work so that the completion date of the facility will be brought forward three or four months at least, in order that advantage can be taken of the harvest earlier in the year.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about the opening and closing of the Goolwa barrages?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: In the Goolwa area there are six known professional fishermen. There are usually two periods in any year when it becomes necessary to allow river flows to pass through the barrage system to the sea. These are in early summer and mid-winter. The decision to open gates is made with due regard to river flows, evaporation, rainfall, tide level, wind strength and direction, and general weather conditions. Lake levels are quite sensitive to wind direction and discharges are varied by tidal levels on the seaward side. It is not practicable to

assess the required gate or log openings well in advance. The only effective method is to assess on a short-term basis, bearing in mind the effects mentioned above. The desired end result of these operations is to keep water levels at the barrage at designed pool level (R.L. 109.50) at all times. At present the secretary of the local fishermen's association is notified of intended openings 24 hours before action is taken, unless circumstances dictate shorter notice, as has happened on a few occasions.

Similar assessments and arrangements hold for closing of the barrages. The Australian Broadcasting Commission would broadcast information provided it was received 24 hours previously, but could not guarantee a fixed or regular time of issue, since the information is not regarded as a news item, it being relative to one broadcast region only. It is not practicable to anticipate gate openings to the extent that radio information could be provided 48 hours in advance of intended operations. The radio information should be available on the day previous to gate changes. It is therefore considered that the present arrangements are the most satisfactory and that effective radio information cannot be provided.

FORESHORE EROSION

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have received complaints within the last day or two about the fact that the embankment supporting the road on the Henley Beach seafront has eroded badly over the last few months, and I believe this situation is also being experienced in the districts of other members who represent seafront areas. I believe that an approach has been made through the local council to the Highways Department for assistance, but that this has been declined. I am also aware that the Highways Department has indicated that it is prepared to consider hiring special equipment to the council in order to restore the embankment to its original condition. However, as the type of erosion taking place on various sections of the seafront causes considerable financial embarrassment to the councils concerned, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have the matter further considered with a view not only to assisting financially the council in this instance but also to formulating a policy that will in the future provide assistance in cases such as this to all councils concerned?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. GILES: Much interest has been shown in containerization over the last few months, particularly by people engaged in the fresh fruit industry, because containerization is likely to result in a decrease of oversea freight rates. I have a series of questions to ask of the Premier, as follows: Will any container ships call at Port Adelaide and what facilities may be made available there for handling containers? When will the service start? Will the saving in freight be passed on to the consignor? If containerization is not to be implemented in South Australia, what arrangements have been made for containers to be taken to Victoria, and will we lose the freight advantage as a result? Has the necessary provision been made if we have to freight containers to Victoria? Finally, has the Premier any information about refrigerated containers?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will try to obtain a reply to all the honourable member's various questions.

VALLEY VIEW SEWERAGE

Mr. JENNINGS: I recently received a letter from the Corporation of the City of Enfield and, with my usual courtesy, I gave a copy of it to the Minister of Works, so that he would be able to answer my question (I hope in the way I want him to). The relevant section of the letter states:

Over recent months the council has been in touch with the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning the department's requirements for sewerage easements over recreation grounds vested in the council . . . The council had originally requested compensation of \$650 in respect of the major easements required, and also \$100 for the easement over the reserve at Darling Street, Valley View. The department has not been favourable to the council's claims and has asked that the requirement for \$650 be waived, and the claim for \$100 be reduced to \$50.

Unless the Minister can convince me otherwise, I think the department is being parsimonious in this respect. The letter continues:

In its advice to the department under date March 11, 1968, and again under date June 18, 1968, the council suggested that alternative means should be adopted as far as the proposed easements on the north-eastern extremity of the council's reserve adjacent to lots 140, 141, 183 and 332 are concerned. The department indicated that this would cause some problems as far as possible non-function of the sewer is concerned, but the council's advice in the matter is completely to the contrary in view of the steep grades available in this particular locality.

Although the Minister may say that his engineers are properly qualified, I point out that the Enfield City Engineer is a renowned engineer who was formerly an engineer in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and who has assured me that the alternative route sought by the council would be much more effective than that recommended by departmental engineers. Will the Minister ask his departmental officers to again examine the alternative suggested by the council and will he consider the financial position in respect of which I said earlier that I considered the department had adopted a parsimonious attitude?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: In his long explanation, the honourable member said he hoped that I had the answer he wanted. Although I do not know what sort of answer he desires, I point out that the honourable member is correct when he says that he did me the courtesy of giving me a copy of the letter on Tuesday. On Wednesday morning, I initiated action to ascertain what had happened. Today being Thursday, I am afraid I have not yet had time to consider this matter, but I will certainly try to have a full report available for the honourable member if he again asks the question next Tuesday.

LAMEROO ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the main road between Lameroo and Kulkami?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The sealing of the main road between Lameroo and Kulkami is considered to be justified. At present it is included in the current five-year works programme, but availability of funds will determine whether this work can be commenced in this period.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I consider the Minister's reply unsatisfactory. As this road has been constructed under the supervision of the District Engineer, will the Attorney ask his colleague what materials that engineer intends to recommend for the construction work so that the road will be safe and trafficable, and particularly so that it can be brought up to the sub-base standard suitable for the bitumen referred to, which may not be applied for five years?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I thought the honourable member looked awfully pleased when I gave him the first part of the reply,

although I saw his face fall when I read the second part. I shall be pleased to refer his present question to my colleague.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. VIRGO: As the Attorney-General will be aware, persons wishing to subdivide land must first submit their applications to the Highways Department. The subdivisions to which I am referring are small and completely distinct from those large subdivisions, those affected by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, the widening of roads, or anything of that nature. In other words, these subdivisions can be described as inconsequential. However, requests about them must still be made to the Highways Department. In the past, these requests have been dealt with expeditiously, usually a week, or a fortnight at the outside, being sufficient for approval to be given. However, over the last couple of months, since the M.A.T.S. plan has been released to the public, I am led to believe that the officers normally engaged on matters affecting small subdivisions are now spending much time trying to satisfy the many demands made by the public in respect of the M.A.T.S. plan. As a result delays occur and much goodwill is being lost by the department. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government whether some improvement in the position cannot be effected so that these small subdivisions can once more be dealt with expeditiously?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

DEVALUATION

Mr. ARNOLD: I have received from the secretary of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited, Berri, copies of letters sent to the Prime Minister and the Devaluations Committee pointing out the financial problem experienced in relation to the 1967 stocks of canned products as a result of the devaluation of the pound sterling. Will the Premier study these letters with a view to providing every possible assistance to these people affected by devaluation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course, the Government is most concerned at the effect of devaluation on industries that have a large part of their market in the United Kingdom. The Government will again examine the matter, and I will obtain a report that I hope will be of use to the honourable member.

HIGH COURT ACTION

Mr. EVANS: Today's *Advertiser* contains the following report:

The New South Wales Government is almost certain to intervene in a High Court action

against the Western Australian Government which vitally affects the future of State stamp duties. If the action succeeds all State Governments will have to abandon stamp duties except in a minor area.

The report concludes by stating that the Victorian Government may also intervene. Can the Attorney-General say whether this matter has been discussed by Cabinet and, if it has, whether the South Australian Government intends to intervene in this case?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, the matter has been discussed in Cabinet. It was discussed some weeks ago and I was instructed that South Australia should seek leave to intervene.

SALISBURY SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: The Salisbury Primary School committee is most concerned at the delay in completing the grounds of the new infants school. I understand that the buildings have been completed since last July but that paths, etc., in the grounds are still not completed. Although I do not know whether this information is correct, rumour has it that the contractor for the job has gone into bankruptcy. The committee is concerned mainly because the new school buildings are so obviously deserted that they could well be vulnerable to vandalism. Also, infants school teachers have packed their gear and equipment into packing cases, as they have expected the move for some time, and they are now faced with the difficulty of having to extricate things from these cases before they move. I know from my own experience that members of the school committee have been anxious for some years to obtain a new school and are indeed pleased at the prospect of having more room made available, but they are rather anxious to get into the new premises. Therefore, will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the matter and try to have the completion of this work expedited?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

MURRAY BRIDGE SEWERAGE

Mr. WARDLE: Over several months I have asked the Minister of Works questions about the installation of a sewerage scheme in the Murray Bridge township area, and I have received much information. Has the Minister more information on the matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As I informed the honourable member and other honourable members earlier, a sewerage scheme has been

planned for Murray Bridge. Estimated to cost about \$1,645,000, it was this morning referred by Executive Council to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report.

PORT ADELAIDE FACILITIES

Mr. RYAN: Many times recently I have had deputations, inspections and discussions with representatives of the Port Adelaide Fishermen's Association, and the Minister of Marine and I, with officials of the association, inspected the various sites and facilities at Port Adelaide. The Minister said then that he was having investigated certain matters affecting the facilities available at Port Adelaide for fishermen and for the sale of their products. Has the Minister a further report on these facilities?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: True, some plans for facilities for fishermen at Port Adelaide were prepared. As the honourable member knows, a fairly comprehensive scheme was prepared some time ago for the North Arm of the Port River, comprising not only wharf facilities but also fuelling and storage facilities and the like. Officers of the department and I discussed this scheme with the fishermen on the site and the fishermen did not then express complete acceptance of the plan. However, in the meantime, realizing the need for some improvement of the facilities adjacent to the Jervis bridge that have existed for many years, I personally examined the matter to see whether some improvement could be effected while the whole matter of future facilities was being determined. To this end, I have now approved a design for improvement that will be an interim facility while the long-term project is being considered. Sketch plans incorporating my suggestions have been prepared and forwarded to the Minister in charge of fisheries, who is also involved. When that Minister has concurred in my suggestions, I will submit them to the fishermen's association for its opinions on them.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION

Mr. RICHES: I understand that yesterday the Commonwealth Parliament passed a wheat stabilization measure but that, before this can be implemented, complementary legislation must be passed by the State Parliaments. Can the Premier say whether such complementary legislation is necessary and, if it is, whether the Government intends to introduce it this session?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The necessary complementary legislation (the Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill) was introduced in the Legislative Council yesterday, and the Minister of Agriculture also gave the second reading explanation then.

ROAD CONTRACTS

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Roads and Transport was reported in last Saturday's *Advertiser* as follows:

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Hill) had asked the Highways Department to increase the use of private contractors for road construction. He said yesterday that private contractors had the skill and equipment to contribute towards an expanding road programme in the State. Work done by contractors would preserve high quality construction and favourably compare with costs under present methods. It would also ensure that expensive plant was used to maximum advantage and eventually would reduce the department's own needs for expensive machinery.

I read that statement with interest and was somewhat disturbed when I was told of certain matters within the Highways Department that suggest that at present private contractors were used extensively, consequently leaving expensive roadmaking equipment within the department idle. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether roadmaking equipment (such as bulldozers) is lying idle at Northfield while private equipment is being hired at Sellick Hill at \$40 an hour; whether for about nine months a rock-crushing machine has been lying idle in the department awaiting repair while a similar machine has been hired from Coates and Company at \$100 an hour; and whether the firm of Brambles is carting bitumen for the department while the department's bitumen tankers are lying idle, their drivers being employed weeding the garden?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think a similar question was asked of the Premier on Tuesday: certainly, a question was asked arising from the same report. Naturally, I have not the information that the honourable member seeks. I should have thought, from the way in which he asked some of the questions, that he could have inquired of his colleague, the former Minister, because some of the situations to which he refers apparently go back to the time of the previous Government. However, as always with the honourable member, I shall be pleased to discuss his question with my colleague and give him a reply.

EGG BOARD PLANT

Mr. CORCORAN: The South Australian Egg Board's Annual Report states that negotiations are proceeding with the Government

for the erection of a processing plant at the board's premises at Keswick. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether these negotiations have been concluded and, if they have not, when they are likely to be concluded?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask my colleague for a report.

SEATON CROSSING

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question about the Seaton crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am advised that an approach will be made by the Railways Commissioner to the Woodville City Council to have the crossing closed.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent questions about additions at the Port Pirie Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I promised the honourable member that I would have a reply for him today. This morning stage 1 of this project was referred by Executive Council to the Public Works Committee for investigation and report. The inquiry will cover certain works to be undertaken at this hospital as part of a long-term plan that will run into many stages and over many years, and stage 1 includes the following works: children's ward, maternity ward and delivery unit, pharmacy, central linen store, central sterile supply department, ambulance unloading area, covered ways, enclosed links, some site works, temporary facilities for domestic staff in remainder of old kitchen and re-routing most of the reticulated services (that is, steam, sewer, electricity). The honourable member will realize that the matters about which he has questioned me have now been referred to the committee.

HEATHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of November 12 about an additional wooden classroom at Heathfield High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: An additional wooden classroom 24ft. x 24ft. has been recommended to make it possible to house a Matriculation class at this school from February 11, 1969. The room will be erected by the Public Buildings Department, consequently, tenders will not be called. Inquiry

of the Public Buildings Department indicates that some preparatory site work has been completed, and the room is expected to be available for occupation on February 11, 1969.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. BROOMHILL: As the Government intends to consider proposals from various bodies concerning the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, I am informed that the West Torrens council will be putting forward several proposals to be considered, one in respect of air transport at Adelaide Airport. The council, which considers that the present situation at the airport is inconvenient for many thousands of people living nearby, believes that, with increased air transport, the present closed hours between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. will be reduced, and that aircraft using the airport will be much noisier. Will the Premier consider the subject of air transport when suggestions concerning the M.A.T.S. Report are being dealt with?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I assure the honourable member that, before any proposal is finally accepted or rejected, the Government will consider it fully. Greater use is likely to be made of the Adelaide Airport, although I doubt that there will be more noise from aeroplanes, because the limited length of the present runway at the airport precludes (and in the future will probably preclude) the landing of inter-continental jet aircraft carrying anything like a reasonable payload. The answer to the question is, "Yes".

PREMIERS' MEETING

Mr. VIRGO: Several times, both in the House and in the press, the Premier has stated that a further meeting of Premiers would be held early in December in Adelaide to further discuss Commonwealth-State financial relationships and other matters. From information I have received it is now well known in other States that because of the attitude of the Prime Minister, as announced in the Commonwealth Parliament and in the press, this meeting will not now be held. If the Premier can do so, will he say whether this meeting will be held as previously announced and, if it is to be held, when?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Active negotiations are continuing between officials of the various Premiers' Departments who are trying to arrange a date before Christmas that will be mutually acceptable, and I confidently expect that this date will be fixed soon. At present there is no other intention. Every

effort is being made to fix a date suitable to all Premiers, and at present December 17 is favoured. If the House is to sit during that week I believe it will agree not to sit on that day so that it will be convenient for me to attend the Premiers' meeting. I will inform the honourable member when I know when the meeting is to be held.

BANK HOLIDAY

Mr. HUGHES: A few moments ago I received a telegram (and I understand that the member for Port Pirie also received one, and other members may have received one, also) addressed to me at Parliament House, Adelaide, which states:

The following resolution was passed unanimously at a special meeting arranged by this division and held at Kadina on November 13: "That this meeting of bank officers condemns the attitude of the State Government in their refusal to grant a bank holiday on December 31 this year and requests the President to approach the Premier with a view to Cabinet reconsidering the matter and that members of Parliament representing this area be advised of this resolution and the strong feelings of bank officers in this connection

H. T. Becker, President Australian Bank Officials Association, S.A. and N.T. Division.

Will the Premier ask Cabinet to reconsider its decision not to grant a bank holiday on December 31, with a view to meeting the request of the bank officers?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Several weeks ago, with the Chief Secretary, I had a pleasant lunch with Mr. Becker (President of the Australian Bank Officials Association) and we discussed this matter at some length. There may or may not be further representations from the bank officers, but I consider that further consideration must await an approach from the association. However, as I do not want to be negative in response to the honourable member's approach to me this afternoon, I will consult my colleagues again on this question, although I think it rests with the bank officials if they wish to have the case reopened.

AFFILIATION CASES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Social Welfare Act provides for blood tests to be taken in affiliation cases. In fact, this provision was written into the Maintenance Act as a result of an amendment which I moved in the House in, I think, 1962 and which was repeated in the Social Welfare Act in 1965.

Although it was suggested at that time that certain difficulties about administering the section needed to be cleared up, I am informed that blood tests take place voluntarily now at the Red Cross Blood Bank, and have been taking place for some time, so there should be no difficulty in proceeding with the section. I find to my amazement (although I must take some responsibility for this) that the section has never been proclaimed, although it was enacted in 1965 and was due to come into force when proclaimed by the Government. My attention, however, was not drawn to this omission by my officers and, although I should have chased it up, I did not do so. It was only when a case had been referred to me that I found that it had not been proclaimed. Will the Minister of Social Welfare take urgent action to have this section of the Act proclaimed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to hear the Leader's confession, which is no doubt good for his soul. I will look into this matter right away.

BREAK OF GAUGE

Mr. CASEY: I draw the Premier's attention to an article that appears in yesterday's *News* regarding an invention that has taken place in France and Spain. The article states:

A Spanish train will cross into France today for the first time—thanks to an invention which will enable it to switch from the broad Spanish gauge rails—

which are about the same gauge as ours, namely, 5ft. 6in.—

—to the narrower line across the border.

It is claimed that this invention holds the train up by only six minutes. I think this is interesting to South Australia, particularly as we are faced at present with a railway problem in respect of the various gauges. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Railways Commissioner to see whether a railways officer could not be sent overseas to investigate this claim? As the invention will apparently be of great benefit to France and Spain, it should be of infinite benefit to South Australia.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It has always been my endeavour to keep the honourable member on the rails. I will ask the Railways Commissioner if he knows anything about this matter and, if he does not, I will ask him to obtain the necessary information as soon as possible.

GERANIUM AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of November 7 about the cooling of the drinking water at the Geranium Area School?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: A scheme has been prepared and funds have been approved to effect improvements to the water supply at the Geranium Area School. In order to provide a supply of drinking water at a reasonable temperature it is proposed to pass water from the overhead tank through a copper coil in the underground tank to the drinking fountains. The piping to carry this water is to be buried to a depth of 18in. Documents are now being prepared to enable tenders to be called for this work. Every effort will be made to have the work carried out at the earliest possible date.

JUVENILE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McKEE: Over the weekend I was approached by a deputation of parents, some of whom claimed that their teenage daughters had been unemployed since leaving school last year. The Minister of Labour and Industry is aware that we will be faced with a contingent leaving school at the end of this year and that this will aggravate the employment situation. The deputation requested that I ask the Minister to ascertain how many married women whose husbands are in full employment are employed in Government departments and how many single girls are unemployed at Port Pirie. Will the Minister consider issuing instructions that single women be employed in Government departments in preference to married women whose husbands are in full employment? Admittedly, some of these teenage girls have limited qualifications, but it was pointed out that they could be placed suitably in Government departments, particularly in hospital laundries, domestic sections, and other sections presently employing married women.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I shall be pleased to consider the request. Although I am not sure whether I can easily obtain some of the information the honourable member has requested, I will do my best to get it as soon as possible. I know that the honourable member joins with me in appreciating the recent remarkable drop in the number of unemployed in this State and in hoping that this situation continues.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

Mr. LANGLEY: Over a period of years many head-on collisions have taken place on country roads even though visibility has been excellent. Many of these accidents have happened on long straight stretches of road. At certain times during this century colours have played a part in camouflaging vehicles, and certain colours have been used for better visibility. As a result of talking to frequent users of country roads, I have been informed that vehicles of a certain colour are more difficult to see than are others. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to ascertain whether any colour of a vehicle has been a predominant factor in these unfortunate fatal accidents?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If I properly understand the honourable member's question (and I am not absolutely confident that I do), it seems to have interesting implications, and I will ask the Minister to examine the position.

MURRAY BRIDGE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. WARDLE: My question concerns the installation about 60 years ago of a cast water main in Fourth Street, between Sixth and Seventh Streets, Murray Bridge. People in that area complain that during the winter, in particular, they have to allow all their taps to run in order to get water clean enough with which to shower. Will the Minister of Works say whether this section of main is on the list for renewal?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As members may realize, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has a regular schedule for replacing old mains, and each week I am authorizing this work to proceed in various districts. Although I am not sure at the moment whether the main to which the honourable member has referred is in the schedule, I will get the information and inform him as quickly as possible.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: On November 6 the Minister of Lands informed me that arrangements had been made for the Land Board to make a valuation of a section of land at Tea Tree Gully, bounded by the Main North-East Road on the north, Perseverance Road on the west, Range Road (Houghton) on the east, and Lower North-East Road (Anstey Hill) on the south, proposed as a reservation under open spaces. A quarry is operating on portion of this land, which is leased by the owners to Quarry Industries Limited. The lease expires in

1970, and the property owners expect to be approached to renew it. In order to help property owners in their negotiations with the quarry operators, will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether the Government cannot immediately make known its future intentions regarding this land?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will see that the matter is expedited.

SCHOOLGROUNDS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on October 8 about a possible limitation of school areas that can be grassed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In 1966, a committee consisting of representatives from the Education Department, Public Buildings Department, Agriculture Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department was formed to consider water consumption, the saving of water, appropriate areas to be put under grass, and other aspects of water conservation in schools. Recommendations made by the committee included the setting up of a sub-committee comprising senior officers of the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department to advise on the maximum area needed for schoolgrounds and playing facilities. Early this year it was decided that the grassing of grounds at each school should be considered separately, provided that in each case the plans were examined carefully to ensure that the grassed area was not excessive. In all new schools opened since February, 1967, ovals are being fully developed by the Public Buildings Department at Government expense.

TRANSPORT CHANGEOVER

Mr. RICHES: I have been given to understand that, since the closing of some of the rail services in the State and the transfer of business to road services, freight rates have increased by as much as 100 per cent in some cases, and also that other services, including passenger services, scheduled for the changeover have been delayed. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this is correct and, if it is, will he ascertain the reason for the delay in the changeover from additional rail passenger services to road services? Does this represent a change of policy on the part of the Government, or is another reason involved?

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

EQUAL PAY

Mr. HURST: I read in this morning's paper that an application had been made by the Australian Council of Trade Unions to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission regarding equal pay for females. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is not in the Chamber at present, to instruct the State representative to support this application before the commission with a view to eliminating the barrier that has existed for many years concerning the rates of pay for males and females?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will discuss this matter with the Minister and bring down a report for the honourable member.

TAILEM BEND SILOS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about silos being built in the Tailem Bend railway yards?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No silos are now being erected on railway land at Tailem Bend, those at the north-western end of the station having been constructed by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited some time ago. However, the department is building a loading ramp in the station yard on a site used for many years for the stacking of bagged grain. This ramp is primarily to permit the loading of lucerne pellets for export, a new industry that has been developed in the Meningie area. In the light of the question raised by the Leader and also of a direct approach from the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), expert advice, including that from medical sources, was sought, and no indication was given that the activity concerned would constitute either a nuisance or a health hazard. Both the road vehicle and the railway waggon will be covered by tarpaulins. The completion of the loading ramp has become a matter of urgency in order that the producers of the lucerne pellets may fulfil an export order.

Mr. WARDLE: I do not doubt for one moment the necessity for the ramp to which the Leader referred. I do not want to see the industry move away from Tailem Bend, and I know there is an export order to be filled. Therefore, I do not doubt any of the information given about this matter. However, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to give an assurance that all other sites have been investigated in an

effort to have this ramp located in some position other than in the centre of the town?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Naturally, the Government is most sympathetic to the wishes and convenience of the people of Tailem Bend, and everything that can be done will be done to meet them. I will have inquiries made.

HOSPITAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. EVANS: The following report appears in the Mount Barker *Courier*:

Stirling District Council was suddenly ordered by the South Australian Hospitals Department to pay \$3,941 as a compulsory contribution to the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Now, according to a newly founded paper, *Y.P. Country Times*, the District Council of Port Pirie was ordered by the same department to contribute only \$2,300 to the Port Pirie Hospital—" \$100 up on last year".

It would be interesting to ascertain why Stirling has to pay \$1,641 more than its counterpart at Pirie. Further, there's no need to remind Stirling ratepayers that through them, their council contributes \$1,200 a year in hard cash towards their own hospital. This makes Stirling council contributions to hospitals total \$5,141, or more than double that contributed by the lead smelting city's district counterpart.

Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether this report is true and, if it is, what formula is used to establish the compulsory contribution?

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

KESWICK SIDING

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I recently asked about the building of the Keswick railway siding?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Natural Gas Pipelines Authority's engineering managers, in the case of pipe transport, studied the various alternatives available and the costs and other relevant factors associated with such alternatives, and advised the authority that road transport of certain quantities of pipe was to be preferred to rail transport. It is not true that all pipe that will be used on the pipeline will be transported by road. The total pipe requirement is 83,000 tons, of which it is expected that at least 23,000 tons will be moved by the South Australian Railways; 34,000 tons will be covered by a combined New South Wales rail and road movement *via* Broken Hill (pipe originating at Port Kembla); and the remainder by road from Port Adelaide direct to the site. The siding at Keswick was

not removed on account of redundancy but was merely disconnected pending the construction of the new Keswick bridge. Upon completion of the latter, arrangements were made to reconnect the siding and at the same time to recondition it. The rebuilding of this siding would have been undertaken irrespective of the possibility of loading pipes there.

BUILDING STANDARDS

Mr. EVANS: I have received the following letter from one of my constituents:

I wish to draw your attention to some of the practices of the Housing Trust. I am aware that this body is outside the scope of the Building Act, but what grieves me is that when I was a building contractor I had to comply with the Building Act and also the minimum acceptable standards of construction required by the various lending institutions of this State. Yet the trust can build houses that do not satisfy these requirements and the banks are obliged to lend on these houses. The Building Act, Second Schedule, Part VI, section 61(1) was gazetted on December 10, 1964, yet the trust is still building houses without this particular section of the Act being implemented. Regarding timber frame or brick-veneer houses, Second Schedule, Part IX, section 158 (3) is not being implemented either. The Savings Bank also requires a damp-proof course under its ant cap, and they do not get it in a Housing Trust house. The framing of timber frame houses still permits 4in. x 1½in. at 2ft. centres yet the banks require of me 4in. x 1½in. at 18in. centres or 4in. x 2in. at 2ft. centres, yet they accept trust houses when they lend money.

Can the Minister of Housing say whether the Housing Trust is building houses that do not meet the standard required of the private building sector?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Some lending institutions lay down their own specifications for building, and in some cases they are rather more demanding than are the requirements of the Building Act. To that extent there may be some discrepancy between what one bank requires and what the Housing Trust specifies to contractors. However, I should be surprised to find that the trust did not comply, in any of its specifications, with the Building Act. As the letter to which the honourable member referred cited specific sections of the Act, I will therefore have the matter examined to see what is the actual position.

TRAIN CONTROL

Mr. NANKIVELL: As a result of the extension of the railway sidings and the incidence of much longer trains on the Adelaide-Melbourne railway line, at some of the stations

along the line stationmasters sometimes find difficulty in contacting the guard at one end of the train or the engine driver at the other end to have the train moved (in some cases only a few feet) so that a carriage doorway can be brought into line with the platform, or so that something of that nature can be done. The engine drawing some of these long trains is sometimes a quarter of a mile away from the station, and stationmasters must ride a bicycle along the track or wave some type of signal to attract the attention of the engine driver. Therefore, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to examine the possibility of providing a type of walkie-talkie equipment for stationmasters at stations such as Keith, so that whoever is controlling the train in the station yard may be in contact with the engine or the guard's van (whichever is the necessary part of the train to be contacted) in order that at all times the train can be quickly and easily manoeuvred into a required position?

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

BILLS

Mr. VIRGO: Will the Premier obtain for me details of the titles and purpose of the 64 Bills which, I understand, have been defeated by the Legislative Council since 1930?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe that that work could well be undertaken by the honourable member. I do my best to supply replies to various requests he raises, but I do not have time to peruse *Hansard* to get information which, I think, the honourable member already knows.

Mr. Lawn: Aren't you speaking to the Chief Secretary?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I suggest the honourable member might have time to do this himself; if he does not have time, perhaps he can ask the member for Adelaide to assist him. I am sure he will obtain assistance from members on his side. Therefore, I recommend that he look into this matter himself.

SMALL BOATS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about mooring sites for small craft at Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I recall the honourable member's asking a question about this matter some time ago, I think last month. I told him then that I would ask the Fishing Havens Advisory Committee

to investigate the matter. I did that immediately, but I have not yet received a report. I will look into the matter and bring down a report as soon as I can.

STOCK ROUTE

Mr. NANKIVELL: The stock route from Meningie to Taillem Bend has been closed progressively and I understand that the last section in the hundreds of Bonney and Malcolm has been surveyed and the blocks numbered, but that no allocations have been made. As constituents have asked when these blocks will be open for allotment, will the Minister of Lands obtain this information as soon as is convenient?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

CODLIN MOTH

Mr. GILES: Fruitgrowers throughout the Adelaide Hills greatly appreciate broadcasts warning them of possible black spot infection, because the growers are then able to spray to prevent the disease. They would also appreciate similar advice being given about codlin moth. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this information could be broadcast on three consecutive days after a flight of codlin moth, so that growers could protect their crops from this pest?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take the matter up with the Minister of Agriculture.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: DRINKING AGE

Mr. HUGHES (Walleraw): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUGHES: The report in today's *Advertiser* that refers to the proceedings in this House yesterday on the Age of Majority (Reduction) Bill has done me irreparable harm in the eyes of many people who had asked me to oppose that part of the Bill referring to the alteration of the Licensing Act, 1967. The report indicates to readers that all Opposition members who spoke in the debate claimed that young people were capable of assuming full adult responsibility at 18 years of age. That part of the report is definitely not correct and is most misleading. The article states:

Opposition members claimed that young people were capable of assuming full adult responsibility at 18.

Never at any time during the debate did I claim that young people were capable of assuming adult responsibility at 18 and, to confirm this, I quote from my speech, as follows:

Having studied the Bill carefully, I find that it contains some good points. While the Bill does not please me in its entirety I indicate to the House that, because of the points that please me, I am hoping the Bill will pass the second reading to enable me to move amendments to certain clauses.

I continued:

The Bill is too sweeping, and there is one section of the Bill that I dislike very much: the reduction in the age of drinking from 21 years to 18 years. In Committee I will move amendments to the clauses that deal with the reduction in the drinking age to 18 years.

I further continued:

It has been said that if the permitted drinking age was reduced to 18 years much difficulty would be experienced in determining the ages of some people who were drinking. It has been freely admitted by many members that people of 18 years of age are breaking the law today, and that, if the permitted drinking age were reduced to 18 years, children of 16 years and even 15 years would be involved. I view that result with much concern, as does the Minister of Education. I have had close contact with many young people in schools, and I should hate to think that a large percentage of that age group would be going into a hotel to drink.

I concluded:

I indicated earlier that, although there are some good points in the Bill, there is one particularly bad one, which I will take steps to rectify in the appropriate manner if I receive the opportunity.

Surely, the part of my speech from which I have quoted should have been sufficient proof to the *Advertiser* reporter that I was one Opposition member who did not claim that full adult responsibility should be given to young people at 18 years of age.

The SPEAKER: To assist the honourable member safeguard his rights and privileges, I hope that the *Advertiser* reporter in the gallery will note what has been said and will make the necessary correction. As Speaker, I also point out that the report in today's *Advertiser* regarding the unanimous resolution on the Chowilla dam does not mention the last paragraph of the resolution, namely, that we request all our members of the House of Representatives and our Senators to support the terms of the resolution. I hope that the *Advertiser* will also remedy that omission, too.

**POOR PERSONS LEGAL ASSISTANCE
ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, 1925, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act, 1925. Section 3 of that Act relates to the provisions of legal assistance for persons charged with a serious offence, when those persons have not sufficient means. Under the Act as it now stands, such application by a poor person must be made before the jury is empanelled, and the amendment in clause 2 will enable such an application to be made any time. Section 4 of the principal Act relates to civil actions *in forma pauperis*: that is, actions in relation to which no fees, or reduced fees, are payable. To qualify to undertake an action in this form a person must be worth less than "one hundred pounds, his wearing apparel and the subject matter of the cause or matter excepted". Clause 3 of this Bill provides that this limitation shall be raised five-fold, to \$1,000. Clause 4 of this Bill repeals sections of the principal Act relating to an obsolete State Act, the Matrimonial Causes Act, and an obsolete office, that of Public Solicitor.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

**FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION
BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 1080.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the Bill, which re-enacts the old Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, giving substantially the same powers but in a better and more workable form. The Minister said that that Act is in substantially the same form now as it was in 1885 and, because of necessary alterations, it has been considered desirable to repeal the Act and introduce this measure to replace it. Doubtless, this legislation is necessary, as it gives to people engaged in the production of fruit and plants of all kind the necessary protection in the event of outbreak of disease or pest, because the Minister is able to quarantine areas to control the entry of any fruit or plant into the State and to control the ports of entry, if necessary.

The Opposition considers all these provisions to be essential. The State has a good record and the Agriculture Department is to be commended for the action that has been taken on past outbreaks. One thinks of fruit fly in particular and, while another Act deals with that problem, it could be dealt with under the measure now before the House. It is to the credit of the department, and because of the lead it has given, that we have not had more serious repercussions from infestations of this pest.

The Act that this Bill repeals specifically provides that no compensation is payable for damage occasioned in carrying out that Act, and I notice that the Bill contains no reference to that provision. I have said before that it seems rather unwieldy that each time there is an outbreak, for instance of fruit fly, and an area is proclaimed and stripped of fruit, a period of up to 12 months elapses before compensation is paid, because a separate Bill must be introduced on each occasion. I think the first such measure was introduced in the late 1940's, and many have been introduced since. I consider it desirable to insert in this Bill a provision to empower the Government (not to oblige it) to pay compensation, if it considers such payment necessary.

As I understand that a private member is not permitted to move an amendment relating to collection or expenditure of money, I ask the Minister to consider my suggestion. Perhaps the Minister could explain why the provision to which I have referred has not been included, but in cases of certain outbreaks considerable losses could be incurred by people involved in this type of production. Instead of the Government going through the unwieldy process of introducing a Bill to provide for special compensation, facilities should be available whereby the payment of compensation could be expedited.

I, and other members of the Opposition, object to the provision of clause 8 (3), dealing with the onus of proof. If an inspector decides that an owner has not taken reasonable precautions and care, the owner, on being charged, must prove that he has been careful. This is justice in reverse. If the owner is to be charged for negligence the onus of proving that this is the case should rest on the authority and not on the owner. When this clause is discussed in Committee I will move to strike it out.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I, too, support the Bill. This legislation, first introduced in 1885, has served its purpose but, in order to keep

up with the agricultural outlook throughout Australia, we must keep our legislation on these matters up to date. This is a clean, straight-forward Bill, and I compliment the officers of the Agriculture Department on the way they are handling the provisions of this type of legislation in the field. The Mediterranean fruit fly has wrought havoc on fruit in this State. We have a complicated system of confiscating fruit, of spraying it with insecticides, and declaring quarantine areas. These problems entail much work for officers of the department. Since fruit fly was first detected in South Australia the aggregate net cost to the Government, paid from Consolidated Revenue, to June 30, 1967, was \$5,194,000, a sum that gives members some idea of how much the Mediterranean fruit fly and the Queensland fruit fly has cost the Governments of this State. The Bill will protect the fruit industry in this State, but I am surprised it does not include a provision to cover the outbreak of fruit fly. After an outbreak, once the fruit has been removed, a special Bill has to be introduced to enable moneys to be paid as compensation to people who have lost fruit. Such a provision could be included in this Bill, and I hope the Minister will explain why it has not been.

The most important part of the Bill is clause 14, which clears up a point that appeared in section 19 of the old Act, whereby inspectors were liable for negligence when they went on to a person's property. All inspectors of the Agriculture Department are competent men and they always act in the interest of the growers, no matter what their field of agriculture. The provision in the old Act was completely wrong, and I am pleased to see it amended by this Bill.

I should like to hear what Government members have to say concerning the provisions of clause 8 (3), which places the onus of proof on the owner. I shall be interested to hear how Government members, who are interested in the horticultural field, will view the situation, because, as owners of orchards who have taken proper care, they may find themselves in the unusual position of having a declared disease found on their property without their previously being aware of its presence. In most cases of this kind the owner would not be at fault, but clause 8 (3) puts the onus of proof on the owner.

Mr. Corcoran: It is justice in reverse.

Mr. CASEY: Of course it is. Because the owner takes proper care of his property, the disease may not be caused by his negligence,

but clause 8 (3) places the onus of proof on him. Otherwise, the Bill is a very good one and I support it.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I wholeheartedly support the Bill. For many years we have had many problems throughout the fruit-growing areas of the Adelaide Hills as a result of the many orchards which having been neglected, have become a breeding ground for various pests and diseases. The Act contains no provision to make orchardists spray or control diseases in any way and, provided that they make a token attempt at spraying their orchards, they comply with the requirements. This Bill provides that an orchardist must carry out a specific programme, and this is important. Unfortunately, there are many small orchards in the Adelaide Hills whose owners work elsewhere and, unless they have a specific programme to follow, they do not try to control pests and diseases. I consider that the Minister is making a move in the right direction by introducing this Bill. Clause 9 (1), the part of the Bill in which I am most interested, provides:

The Governor may, by proclamation, require the owner of every orchard to apply to all host trees therein such treatment and measures as he deems necessary to prevent the outbreak or spread of a pest or disease and specifies in the proclamation.

Clause 11 allows an inspector to go into a property to inspect it for notifiable diseases. Clause 19 (a) enables the Governor to make regulations prescribing the measures to be taken by the owners of orchards to prevent the outbreak or spread of pests and diseases. This is a most desirable provision. Mention has been made of clause 8 (3), which places an onus on the owner of a property with a disease to notify the authorities that a disease is present on his property. This just provision means that the owner will take more care regarding what is going on on his property. He should know whether a notifiable disease is present on his property. If the onus is not placed on him, he could avoid notifying the authorities that a disease was present until it grew to disastrous proportions.

Mr. Corcoran: The authorities should be able to prove a case against an owner without much bother if he did that sort of thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Millicent has made his speech. The honourable member for Gumeracha.

Mr. GILES: I agree that the onus should be on the property owner to notify and to prove that he has carried out preventive measures.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I, too, support the Bill, for the reasons given by previous speakers. It has been found necessary to bring the legislation up to date and into line with modern transport and modern growing methods. Modern transport is probably one of the things that has aggravated pest control as much as anything else has aggravated it. The new fumigation centre at Renmark will greatly help solve the problem of interstate transport of fruit and containers that come into this area. The Bill also gives the authorities adequate power to deal with outbreaks of disease. Such outbreaks must be controlled as quickly as possible and, at the same time, the fruitgrower must not be subjected to unnecessary prohibitions.

Clause 8 (3) provides:

The owner of an orchard in which there is any fruit or plant affected by a pest or disease, declared by proclamation to be a notifiable pest or disease, shall be deemed to have discovered that the fruit or plant was so affected unless the contrary is proved.

The member for Millicent has indicated that he will move to strike out this subclause. As a grower, I come within this category, so this legislation will affect me as much as it will affect anyone else and, if this subclause is struck out, it will tend to safeguard the inefficient grower (who, it must be stated, is in the minority). In my district there are properties which are not cared for properly and which are hosts for the diseases.

Mr. Corcoran: Don't you think the authorities could find sufficient evidence from the owners to prove the property was in that condition? It should not be for him to prove that he was careful.

Mr. ARNOLD: In Committee this provision could be amended but it should not be struck out, because its omission would safeguard the inefficient grower at the expense of the efficient grower. The costs involved in controlling these diseases and pests today are extremely high and reach the point at times where nothing is left for the producer as a return from his crops.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I appreciate the attention given the Bill and I should like to comment on one or two matters that have been raised. Fruit fly compensation has been established for many years and, as people are used to the practice now observed, I do not think there is any point in trying to alter the system at present. I point out that at no time has any Government ever committed itself to the possibility

of compensation should there be an outbreak of fruit fly in a horticultural area. It could be that the cost would be so enormous that the whole compensation system would collapse. Fruit fly legislation was designed to cope with the urgent matter of an outbreak, particularly in the metropolitan area. The fact that several outbreaks in the metropolitan area have been eradicated and that fruit fly has been kept down to a negligible degree is something which I think cannot be matched anywhere else in the world, and I think it is a tremendous credit to the people of South Australia, many of whom need not necessarily be interested in commercial fruit-growing but may simply keep one or two fruit trees in the backyard. Those people have co-operated with the Agriculture Department, which over the years under successive Governments has been active and successful in this regard.

I believe the department's success stems largely from its public relations, its patience and tolerance and, not by any means the least of these factors, the vigilance and efforts of its officers. There has been a complete absence of provocation on the part of the department: it has sought co-operation and has received it. To those who oppose the provision contained in clause 8 which places an onus on the fruitgrower to report a disease, I suggest that the department is the last body of any to be provocative towards people who may have a good excuse for not reporting a disease. Although no-one likes to see a provision relating to onus of proof, such a provision has of necessity been inserted in various measures time and again by the Labor Party as well as by our Party. Naturally, where ideal conditions exist, the provision is not warranted. However, the provision is required in certain measures in order that they may be effective, and this has proved to be the case in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia in respect of legislation of this kind.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition having informed me of his dissent in this matter, I have had a brief opportunity to talk with the Minister of Agriculture, and we decided to look for a reasonable compromise. However, when a provision relating to onus of proof is involved, there is no compromise. Officers of the Horticultural Branch have stressed the extreme importance of having this provision in the Bill, particularly in the case of spreading known pests and diseases. Almost every horticultural disease has been discovered

as a result of the vigilance of an inspector and not as the result of action taken by the orchardist himself. If the onus of proof provision is removed, it will be the inspector's sole responsibility to find the spreading of the pest, and this would greatly weaken the effectiveness of the measure.

I suggest that today we do not take our consideration beyond clause 7, and this will give me an opportunity over the weekend to discuss the matter again with the Minister and the department. If, as in the case at present, it is found that the provision is most important, I shall have to ask members to support the Bill as it stands. On the other hand, if the present view is changed, I shall be pleased to have reached agreement on the matter and, treating the matter with an open mind, will not oppose the relevant amendment. In any case, I give the assurance now (I know that it is not necessary for members of this House, but it may be necessary for people outside) that the Agriculture Department is most unlikely ever to use a power such as this in a provocative way. The provision will exist only to deal with people whose business it is to recognize a disease and with the sort of person who may be grossly negligent in keeping an orchard and who does not play the game. In those circumstances, I hope we can reach agreement. I thank honourable members for their support for the Bill in every other respect.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Progress reported: Committee to sit again.

DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1676.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Opposition is prepared to accept the Bill. This Act was first introduced in 1922 and, under the old provisions, any type of bull, whether beef or dairy, was required to be licensed. Over the years, there were always two birthdays for bulls, but that anomaly has now been rectified. Before 1960 any bull was required to be licensed but, in 1960, an amendment was passed confining the licensing of bulls to those on any dairy farm that was licensed or required to be licensed under the Dairy Industry Act, and also to those on any dairy farm specified in a milk-producing licence granted under the Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, the

holder of such a licence being entitled to produce milk or cream for sale. That amendment was desirable, and it did not affect the improvement of dairy cattle in the State. Under the Bill, bulls will be required to be registered only if they are over the age of six months on July 1 in any year. Previously, bulls also had to be registered if they were over the age of six months at the beginning of the year.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister pointed out that the licence fees collected under the old system did not justify the work required of the Police Force in enforcing these provisions. It is interesting to note that the licence fees collected from the registration of bulls will be used in the improvement of dairy cattle. I believe that that provision is proper and will benefit the dairying industry generally. For those reasons, I support the Bill.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 2393.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): The position on this Bill is most interesting. It provides for the lowering of the age at which a person may drink alcoholic beverages in a hotel, makes provision about the age at which bar-men and barmaids may be employed, and increases the turnover tax on liquor. On August 7 last the Leader introduced the Age of Majority Bill, which included, amongst other things, a provision, similar to the one in the measure now being considered, regarding the age at which a person may drink alcoholic beverages on licensed premises, and also a provision, similar to the one in the measure, regarding the employment of barmaids. On September 4 the Premier and the Attorney-General spoke on the Leader's Bill, and on October 17 the Attorney-General introduced the measure we are now considering. Having opposed the Leader's Bill, he introduced his own Bill to make a similar provision regarding the reduction of the drinking age.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I think that, in fairness, you should give the reasons why I opposed the Leader's Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I was about to do that. The Attorney wanted to claim the credit for introducing and having passed through this House

a Bill giving 18-year-olds the right to drink in a hotel.

Mr. Clark: I don't think that's the reason he gave.

Mr. LAWN: No, but he wanted to claim the credit. He has said publicly outside the House that he intended to introduce a Bill similar to this one.

Mr. Clark: He's going to do, bit by bit, what the Leader did, and get the credit each time.

Mr. LAWN: That is so. Regarding the other matters in the Leader's Bill the Attorney-General said, "Now is not the time for these things. They should be done in all States, or not at all." The Attorney-General is not consistent about the principle that we should do what other States do. In fact, I understand that some other States provide solicitors for the public free of charge.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: So do we.

Mr. LAWN: No, we do not. Our people have to go to the Law Society in Pirie Street and beg for financial assistance. The society, not the Government, decides whether they will get legal aid. The people have to go to the lawyers union and, in many cases, they are charged a fee, and the legal aid given is the most junior solicitor.

Mr. Broomhill: Does the Attorney-General practise there?

Mr. LAWN: He graduated from there. The Attorney knew that, while he was playing up to the 18-year-olds, the 19-year-olds and the 20-year-olds in the community, the Young Liberals and the Young Laborites—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No, mostly Young Liberals.

Mr. LAWN: The Attorney-General thinks that young people of 18, 19 and 20 years of age are mainly Liberal supporters, so he is giving them the right to drink, but he realizes that within his Party in this place there is much opposition to the proposal. He said, "I wanted to get this Bill through. It will go over well politically in the community, but I have to get it through the House of Assembly. I have much opposition to it from my own Party and, with the opposition here, even with the support of some of my colleagues I could not get it through." Therefore, he decided to link the increased turnover tax on licensees with the reduction of the drinking age. He said, "We can line our fellows up, and they will have to pass the Bill." The Premier has told us more than once that members of the Liberal Party are free to vote on any question.

Mr. Rodda: So they are.

Mr. LAWN: The Opposition Whip confirms my statement. Does he want to make a reservation regarding social questions, or are members opposite free to vote as they wish on any question?

Mr. Rodda: We're free at all times.

Mr. LAWN: I will test that by dividing the House on this Bill. In case I have not made my position clear, I oppose the Bill. The *Advertiser* reported this week that seven Government members opposed drinking by 18-year-olds and that one Opposition member, the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), also opposed it. I have not the *Hansard* reports of the speeches of the seven Government members, but I have the reported statements of four of them, and I will refer to what they have said. Then, when the vote is taken on this Bill, we will see how they vote. I will refer only to sufficient of their speeches to make their position clear. The Leader has said that the member for Gumeracha does not want any alcoholic codlin moth in his district. That honourable member said, "I oppose the Bill most strongly." He cannot say that and then vote for this measure. The member for Eyre ("Deadly Earnest") said:

I support the first part of the Bill but I oppose the second part. I strongly oppose the reduction of the minimum drinking age from 21 years to 18 years.

That is a definite statement. The member for Burra said:

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. 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.

The honourable member has made his position clear. The member for Onkaparinga also opposed the Bill and foreshadowed an amendment. He, in effect, said what I said earlier this afternoon: that the Attorney-General deliberately put these two parts of the Bill in one Bill so that he could get the support of Government members. The member for Onkaparinga said that these things should be separated; in other words, one part deals with a social issue (the minimum age at which a person should be allowed to drink on licensed premises), and the other part deals with an increase in tax, and these two should be separated.

Mr. Clark: In other words, you should split the Bill to avoid a split!

Mr. LAWN: I thank the honourable member. Having introduced the Bill, the Attorney-General promised his colleagues that, once the Bill had passed the second reading, if the members who opposed it would vote for it he would split the Bill into two parts, and each part would be dealt with separately.

Mr. Ryan: That's blackmail.

Mr. LAWN: No, it's the old thimble-and-pea trick. I tried to tell the member for Onkaparinga that, if he thought the test was on the third reading division, he was entirely wrong. The Attorney-General is far more experienced than he, and I think the Attorney-General will agree with me that when this Bill reaches the third reading it will pass, despite the objections of members to which I have referred.

I will not delay the House by discussing whether the policing of the legislation is possible or not; whether this is a good thing for 18-year-olds; or other matters that have already been debated. I think that the Bill will pass, because I am sure that some Government members will not do what they said they would do. I do not think they oppose the Bill. It is fine to make statements that they can take back to their districts and circulate, but then vote differently. They do not have to take back to their districts the details of divisions. The Government Party had a member here some years ago who did just that.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: He was in another place.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and I thank the Attorney-General for confirming my statement and the advice I am giving members opposite. They had a member in another place who spoke one way and voted another. When he travelled around his district he had a copy of his speeches and a copy of the division lists. When he spoke to someone who agreed with his Parliamentary speech he gave them a copy of it, but, when he met someone who disagreed with what he had said, he showed him a copy of the *Hansard* report of the divisions and of how he voted. He could not lose. Members opposite who have made it clear that they strongly oppose the Bill will face their test when the second reading motion is put. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Let me make it clear from the outset that I am not having 10c each way. When the appropriate time comes I will oppose the granting of drinking

rights to 18-year-olds, but I will support the first part of the Bill. As a backwoodsman, I am privileged to have a few shots with my bow and arrow out of the forest, before this debate or battle has ended. I suggest that a backwoodsman would have an axe, and that there would be more trees in the Labor Party representative forest at present if that axe had not been so sharp on social reform and had not been wielded so substantially to "de-forest" (if one may use that word) the countryside.

I thought it would have been fairer had the member for Wallaroo apologized to the working man for having increased licence fees from 3 per cent to 5 per cent when the Labor Party was in office, rather than complain about the present increase from 5 per cent to 6 per cent by this Government. I sympathize with him in having to say that this increase may raise the cost of a glass of beer to the average working man. He and I have most of our friends in this group but, no doubt, the increase imposed by the Labor Party Government also caused an increase in the cost of a glass of beer.

I have already expressed my opinion about my support for this Bill. I have heard it said in my district that it is believed by some people that the policy of extending to 18-year-olds the right to drink is one of political expediency. I should hate to think that this were true and that any political Party was prepared to take advantage of about 66,000 young people between the ages of 18 years and 21 years purely for the sake of political advantage. I should like to believe that members on both sides are more responsible in their attitude to their duties in this place than to treat this matter as one of political expediency. I believe that parents generally are not in favour of this measure. I have not had any parents ask me to vote for the reduction in drinking age from 21 years to 18 years because they desire their young people to attend at hotels and for them to be able to drink at 18 years, nor have I found that young people themselves have made this request, although some members may have had this request put to them.

Members of my family, three in number, are in various trades and professions and, like other members, I presume, in wanting to be with it and to see the picture as young people see it today, I have asked for their opinions and for the opinions of those with whom they work and study. It seems that few, if any,

young people are asking that they be given the privilege of being able to drink in hotel bars at the age of 18 years. The House of Lords *Hansard* of November 22, 1967, reporting the debate on the Latey committee, contains the following:

The national opinion poll, which was conducted at the request of the committee, showed broadly that two-thirds of those between 21 and 24 thought that 21, and not 19 or 18, was the right age for full adult rights, including getting married without needing to ask consent. Some of your Lordships may say that those were biased witnesses, because they were past the age of 21 already. But the interesting fact is that the survey disclosed that there was practically the same balance of opinion among those between 16 and 20 as there was among those between 21 and 24. Approximately two-thirds of those questioned in the sample survey between the ages of 16 and 20 thought that 21 should continue as the right age for entering into hire-purchase contracts, buying and selling houses, getting married without consent and so on. So the Majority Report is sure about something on which the people who are themselves concerned are not at all sure; and, indeed, by two to one take the opposite view.

Mr. Broomhill: Was that public opinion poll taken here in South Australia?

Mr. WARDLE: The honourable member knows where the public opinion poll was taken. I am also interested in the submissions made to me by people in my own district and, although I do not know how many letters I have received, there are 150 signatures on the letters, all requesting me to oppose this aspect of the Bill. I would have presumed (and not one person has requested me to vote for the Bill) that my people, knowing my square habits, would have made a special issue of reminding me that they preferred me to vote for this Bill, knowing full well that I would not normally vote for it.

Mr. Corcoran: They probably thought that was impossible.

Mr. WARDLE: There is no excuse for their not trying. I do not find that the Royal Commissioner was in favour of granting drinking rights to 18-year-olds. The member for Angas read from the Royal Commissioner's report, and members are familiar with it. I do not find any evidence from the police officers that they favour this move.

Mr. Corcoran: Why do you think there would be?

Mr. WARDLE: I think that police officers, who have the responsibility of dealing with these young people in our community, are aware of many of the things done which do not indicate a great sense of responsibility.

Therefore, their experience would prove to them that this would be an unwise move. All members are aware that most young people of 18 years are either at school or serving an apprenticeship, and many of them are still under the influence of home environment. Although most young people of today at 18 years are better educated than they were formerly, they have had little or no experience in life. I consider it is important that experience and education go hand in hand in respect to the use of alcohol. In days gone by, many 18-year-olds had been working for several years and, therefore, had gained a little experience of life through mixing with people, although they lacked the knowledge and information that young people have today. I am reminded of the story of the young man who at 16 thought his "old man", as he preferred to call him, did not know a thing; but when he became 26, after being married for several years, and becoming the father of two children, he was surprised by what his "father", as he then called him, had learnt in the last 10 years. I think that that story is indicative of the lack of experience of 18-year-olds. The *Medical Journal of Australia* of November 11, 1967, states:

There is convincing evidence that alcohol is responsible for over half the deaths on Australian roads. Many studies on this point, which have appeared in this Journal and overseas, were considered by Royal Commissioner P. D. Phillips, and summed up as follows (Royal Commission, 1964-1965):

On the basis of much research it seems a well-founded conclusion, and the conclusion applies to Australia, that a majority of the road accidents involving death or serious bodily injury occur because the driver or drivers involved is, or are, suffering impairments of necessary skills due to the consumption of alcoholic liquor.

In 1965, there were 3,083 motor vehicle traffic deaths in Australia. On the foregoing conclusion, which may be accepted as authoritative at least, 1,541 were caused by alcohol.

I think this is a broad statement of the whole of the Australian road statistics but, having had the responsibility for over seven years of running an ambulance service owned by local government in my district, and having had 1,047 patients in that vehicle in the seven years and four months that I was in charge of it, I have a background knowledge of the influence of alcohol on young people, especially in respect of road accidents and, indeed, fatalities. I am sure that statistics do not tell the whole story of the influence of alcohol generally on the vehicular accident rate in

Australia at present. Although many people may object on religious and moralistic grounds to allowing 18-year-olds to drink, there are many other good reasons for objecting. I think that as responsible citizens and legislators in this State it is our duty to decide this issue and that it would be better to err (indeed, if it is erring) on the side of conservatism than to allow the open and uninhibited consumption of alcohol by young people.

I believe there should be a programme of education in the use of alcohol before any such legislation as this is enacted. For some years Queensland has provided such instruction in its State secondary schools, using qualified teachers of the Education Department and covering every aspect of the influence of alcohol. The Victorian Government is at present investigating this type of instruction with a view to introducing it to its own Education Department. I believe it is necessary to prepare young people to live in a culture in which both abstinence and controlled drinking are acceptable customs. As a community we ought to acquaint young people with the facts about the use of alcohol in the hope that they will be more likely to make a wise decision in this regard. We should help young people form their own set of judgments, attitudes and behaviour concerning alcohol by combining two influences, namely, the values of their homes, church and their community, and the scientific, valid information that is available.

We should help equip young people to become adults with a balanced perspective on alcohol problems and with a competence to take constructive and remedial measures where necessary. Further, we should help them play their present and future roles as members of a community in which there is a climate of understanding and sympathetic acceptance of people disturbed by alcohol problems and in need of help and treatment. I reiterate that I am prepared at the appropriate time to support the first portion of the Bill but to oppose the second part.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): First, as the Bill contains essential provisions for tax measures which I foreshadowed in the Budget, I support the second reading. However, when the Bill is divided into two measures, as it will be if and when the second reading is carried, I will do whatever I can to defeat the proposals to reduce the age of drinking in public bars. I thought that position had been made clear, because there has been on the file for some time now amendments in

my name which seek to take out of that part of the Bill, dealing with the age of drinking, the provisions that give effect to a lowering of the drinking age. The fact that I may be counted among those who support the second reading does not mean that I support the Bill as a whole; indeed, quite the contrary.

Some thoughtful and well-expressed speeches have been made in this debate, and I commend the member who has just resumed his seat for the cool and logical way in which he approached the matter from his own standpoint. Indeed, I must agree with the views he has so ably expressed in this place today. Those who are opposed to a reduction in the age of drinking are accused, directly or indirectly, of a lack of consistency in their approach to the matter and to the way in which it applies to young people.

It has been held that, because young people are eligible (indeed, required) to do certain things at an age lower than 21 years, that is an argument that they should be allowed to drink in hotel bars. I reject that argument because, in my view, it is clearly irrelevant. The fact that a person may be given a licence to drive a motor car at 16 years does not necessarily qualify him, in my view, to be eligible to drink publicly in hotel bars at 18 years; nor, if the age were reversed, does the opposite necessarily apply. I think many of the arguments used to support the Bill are clearly irrelevant and should be discounted as such. To say that people in this generation are more sophisticated at an earlier age may be true, but to say that they are more mature is perhaps less certain and more arguable. Although there may be substance in this argument, I believe it is not a clear justification for taking the step this Bill seeks to take.

My second point is that I am not able to discover among the people most concerned by this proposed legislation any demand for it. The member for Murray said he had not received one request from any person to support this legislation but that he had had requests to oppose it. That is exactly my position. No approach has been made to me by any person or persons, either as individuals or representatives of any group, to ask me to support this legislation. I have close contact with many young people, both in political and social fields, and none of these, either as an individual or as a representative of a group, has asked me to support this legislation. However, parents of teenagers have come to me expressing the greatest concern at this proposal.

When parents, not as old as I but in their late 40's and early 50's, express the gravest concern about an enactment that will permit their children and their children's friends to frequent hotel bars legally, I must take some notice of their representations. Although I do not have a family so involved, I share their concern. I have not been asked to support this legislation but, on the contrary, I have been asked by a number of people to oppose it.

Thirdly, I see real danger in this legislation. I am particularly concerned for the welfare of the younger girls in our community in this regard. I believe there is no doubt that many indiscretions of youth are related to the use of alcohol. One could develop this argument at length and talk about the effects of environment and all the rest of it. However, as this aspect has already been discussed fully in earlier speeches, I do not intend to deal with it. I believe that many of the difficulties in which young people find themselves are undoubtedly caused by indiscretions committed under the excitement of alcohol. I know there is no law against young people drinking at a party or a private home and that all that this Bill does is to give them access to hotel bars. However, there is a substantial difference between the environments in the two cases. It is one thing for a youngster to have a drink at a party and another thing altogether for that person to go to the local bar and mix with the rest.

Mr. Riches: What's the difference?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a difference of control and influence. I think the honourable member would be the first to agree that he likes his young people at his home and likes his own family taking as much social pleasure as they can within his home and under his control. I think he would share my view and would not be nearly as happy if he knew his young people were at the local bar.

Mr. Riches: I have never worried about it: I can't see the difference.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not worried about it either, but I am concerned for other people's children.

Mr. Riches: There could be just as much trouble at some other parent's home.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The fact that the honourable member may have been fortunate in the influence he has been able to exercise over his young people and the fact that I have also been fortunate does not relieve me of my obligations to, and concern for, the children of other parents. I say again that I

believe that, particularly regarding young women, this is a matter of real concern. I believe further that the addictions to alcohol that occur in many people are prevalent particularly among those who start drinking at an early age.

Mr. Riches: At the social level.

Mr. Casey: Can you substantiate that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: One has only to study human nature for a short time to see that it is the habits established in youth and adolescence that largely determine the course of life. From that point of view, I say that many of the addictions suffered by people in their late 20's or early 30's which become worse as the years go by are addictions to which they have been introduced in the teenage years. Furthermore, I am concerned that, under the provisions of the Bill, older students from the high schools can leave their class and spend the rest of the afternoon in the pub. There is nothing to stop that. Does the honourable member say that this would be a good thing? Would it enhance their studies? Would it help them play sport? Would it help the discipline of the school or organization of recreation? Would it help them to go home at a reasonable hour, have their dinner, and settle down to a good night's homework, as they must do if they are to succeed?

The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) said that schoolteachers are concerned. Although I do not want to state his name (I do not think he would object if I did), one of the people who came to me was a prominent member of the education team on Eyre Peninsula. I do not think it is a good thing to have the lads and lasses from high schools going down the street after school and spending an hour or an hour and a half in the local hotel. This concerns me not only because it will interfere with the organization of their school activities but also because it is detrimental to them in so many other ways. I ask honourable members who are sponsoring this legislation whether this is or is not a good thing. I think that, in this place since I have been a member, we have been too often inclined to ask ourselves what harm legislation can do. My approach to legislation, I hope, in these social matters, is to ask what good it will do, and not what harm it will do.

Mr. Broomhill: What harm has social legislation created?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The implication is that it is bound to do some harm, but that the harm will be only minimal. I am

concerned about trying to do some good sometimes, not about trying to solace our consciences by saying that a Bill will not do much harm. I am not breaking new ground: my views are well known.

Mr. Broomhill: Too well known.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Well, I am not ashamed of that. If the honourable member thinks he is upsetting me, he is entirely wrong, because on social questions I have tried to speak and vote from the point of view of what is good for the community.

Mr. Broomhill: You have opposed any change on any social question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and history will prove me right. If the honourable member considers what is happening elsewhere, he will come back with a rather sober judgment.

Mr. Broomhill: I've been abroad.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I said at the outset that I would make my position clear. The press recently reported what some members had said and, as I had not spoken then, I wanted to make clear my attitude. That is one of my reasons for speaking, and another is to oppose the Bill, not because I have any particular interest to espouse but because I consider it the responsible attitude that I as a member of this House must take.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I thank members for expressing their views on the three matters contained in the Bill. The member for Barossa raised a specific point about five-gallon licences and sales in other States, and the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner), who is also concerned about this matter, had spoken to me about it before the Bill was introduced. I assure those members that I intend to include in the next licensing Bill a provision substantially to cover the case mentioned.

I have been accused by many members of engaging in sharp practices by including in one Bill the provision to increase the licence fee and also the provision to reduce the age for drinking in hotels from 21 years to 18 years. I think members opposite have flattered me or my political acumen, because I assure them that, when it was decided to include the two provisions in the one Bill, we did not realize that there would be the clash that has developed. I think the Treasurer first brought this matter to my attention. Of course, he is vitally concerned about the provision regarding licence fees, because that is part of his Budget proposals, but, as he has explained

(and as I think every member knew before he spoke), he is completely opposed to any lowering of the minimum drinking age. He made that clear to me, and, I think, to all his Cabinet colleagues before the Bill was introduced. He was in a most embarrassing position. Cabinet decided to split the Bill but, under our procedure it cannot be split until the Committee stage.

Mr. Ryan: Why didn't you introduce two Bills?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We could have done that but we decided, as one Bill was before the House, to split it after the second reading stage. We intend to do that, and that will give all members the opportunity to vote against either Bill.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you deny any charge of sharp practices?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes: first, because I do not indulge in them and, secondly, because I was not clever enough to work out any advantage from them. However, on the issues themselves I think every member has declared his position and the lines are fairly clearly drawn. I do not intend to canvass them further, but I thank members for their attention to the subject matter of the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (29)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Broomhill, Burdon, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, Hudson, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, Virgo, and Wardle.

Noes (8)—Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Hughes (teller), Hurst, Lawn, McKee, Riches, and Ryan.

Majority of 21 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

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 divide the Bill into two Bills, one Bill to contain the clauses dealing with fees and the power of a company to hold a licence, and the other Bill to contain all clauses relating to the reduction in the age of drinking, and to report the two Bills separately.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Bill be divided into two Bills, one to be referred to as the Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) and to include clauses 1,

2 and 5 dealing with fees and the power of a company to hold a licence; and the other to be referred to as the Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) to include clauses 3 and 4 and 6 to 9 relating to the reduction in the age of drinking.

Motion carried.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 postponed.

Clause 5—"Power of company to hold licence."

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Chairman, as members do not have their Bill files at present, we do not know what is before the Chair. I suggest that the Attorney-General ask that progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: The messengers are bringing in the files now.

Mr. HUGHES: Although it is not the fault of the messengers or of members, the Bill files have not been here, but we are now expected to open them and take up the position as the Attorney-General wishes us to do. He knows what is going on, but I am justified in asking that progress be reported. As the Minister is apparently unwilling to accede to my request, I move:

That progress be reported and that the Committee have leave to sit again.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I oppose the motion. All members know what is going on, because we are dealing with provisions that have been on members' files for some weeks. I am sorry that the member for Wallaroo did not have his file in front of him, but he has it now. Nothing new is contained in

anything on the file, as there is nothing on the file that has not been there since October 17, when the Bill was read a first time. We are dealing with clause 5 relating to the power of a company to hold a licence. This is not controversial, nor is there anything controversial about any clause with which we are now dealing.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not agree with the Attorney-General and cannot understand his attitude. It is the usual custom for the House of Assembly to rise on Thursdays at about this time. I cannot be expected to remember what is in all the clauses, and it seems that the Attorney-General is trying to have them rushed through.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes (teller), Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Stott, and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 19, at 2 p.m.