

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 24, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

#### HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had a question for the Premier but, in his absence, I shall address it to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health in this place and, with your permission and the concurrence of the House—

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question, which is in three parts, is this: why has the Government found it necessary to appoint a committee on health services; what are its full terms of reference; and when may we expect its report? We see announced in this morning's paper, under the heading "Bid for Best Health Services", the appointment of an eight-man committee and, although some terms of reference are set out there, from the tenor of the report I wonder whether all the terms are included. Further, except for the desire to have the best health services in Australia, which, in itself, is not unexceptionable, no reasons are set out for the appointment of the committee. I see that Mr. Justice Bright has been appointed Chairman of the committee: my recollection is that he is due to start the Moratorium Royal Commission sittings next Monday, November 30 (I think that was the date to which the Royal Commission was adjourned), and it seems, therefore, that he will have two jobs apart from his position as justice of the Supreme Court, of the duties of which he has been relieved by the appointment of Mr. Acting Justice Sangster: he will have these two jobs to do concurrently. I therefore ask the Attorney-General whether he can say when it is likely that Mr. Justice Bright will be able to complete at least this one?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to the Minister of Health and obtain a reply.

#### PORT ADELAIDE OFFICES

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister of Works say whether any progress has been made concerning the building of a new Government office block on the Black Diamond corner at Port Adelaide, on which corner the present police headquarters for the Port Adelaide Division now stand? Some time ago, the Public Works Committee

recommended that new police headquarters be built on this site, but it was later decided not to proceed with that building and to build the Marine and Harbors Board headquarters on this site. This work was deferred, and I understand that the Government's latest intention is to build a Government office block on the site.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give the honourable member specific details other than to say that, having inspected the offices in Victoria Square presently occupied by the Marine and Harbors Department, I can say only that the more quickly we can provide new accommodation for officers of this department the better it will be. In view of the honourable member's question, I will obtain a detailed report and bring it down for him as soon as possible.

#### METRICATION

Mr. CUMBE: In the absence of the Premier, I will direct my question to the Minister of Labor and Industry, whom I congratulate on his appointment. Can the Minister give some information about metrication? This subject has been considered by a Senate Select Committee, committees having been set up in the various States to consider the matter. I understand that in South Australia a committee comprising representatives of Government, industry, commerce and other interested parties has been set up. Can the Minister say what progress has been made and, if he cannot do so, will he obtain a report for me?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The committee has been set up, and I will obtain a report on details for the honourable member.

#### STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN: As my question concerns the Minister of Health as well as the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Education I ask the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, whether he can say when it is intended that student health services shall be provided in each teachers college. I understand that an inquiry has recently been made into providing student health services at Adelaide Teachers College and other teachers colleges. I think those on this inquiry have agreed that it is necessary not only to the welfare of students at teachers colleges but also to relieve continued pressure on the existing university health services that autonomous student health services be set up in teachers colleges.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

### PRIVACY RIGHTS

Mr. HOPGOOD: To obviate the necessity of explaining my question, I ask the Attorney-General the following question in four parts:

1. Was the person depicted in what purported to be a Liberal and Country League election advertisement on page 34 of the *Sunday Mail* of November 14 Professor Brian Medlin, of Flinders University?
2. If it was, was this photograph inserted with Professor Medlin's knowledge and consent?
3. If it was not, has Professor Medlin any legal redress against those who so misused his photograph?
4. If he has not, will the Attorney-General consider introducing legislation to protect the civil rights of persons in similar circumstances?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have no knowledge of the matters referred to by the honourable member, but I will certainly look into the matter and furnish him with a considered reply.

Mr. McRAE: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is correct that under the current law of South Australia it is permissible for acts that are in reality invasions of privacy to take place without any breach of the law occurring at the same time? If it is permissible, will the Attorney-General look into the situation? As I understand the law, it is no offence to take photographs or to make recordings by microphones without the permission of the person who is being heard or seen; in other words, it is permissible for any person, without the knowledge or consent of another person, to take photographs and then use them for various purposes that may include advertising. I recall one case, to illustrate this, when a photograph was taken of an employee, without his consent, by the employer and then used in a continual series of advertisements in a newspaper. Is this the case and, if it is, does the Attorney-General consider that this situation should be examined?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I believe that the law is defective regarding the protection, or perhaps lack of protection, it gives in respect of the privacy of citizens. Having publicly discussed this matter more than once since I assumed this office, I think the problem is intensified by the development of modern electronic devices, which make it so much easier to invade the privacy of another without infringing conventionally recognized legal rights. I think the law is due for an overhaul

in this area. It is a matter which I have been considering and which will be further considered during the Parliamentary recess, and I hope that later in the life of this Parliament it will be possible to introduce legislation that will give the citizen's privacy greater protection than exists under the present law.

### CONSERVATION PORTFOLIO

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Conservation say whether I am correct in assuming that matters relating to fauna and flora, which were previously dealt with by the Minister of Agriculture, will now be dealt with by him? If they will be under his control, I take it that national parks and game reserves will also be under his control. If they will be, will the Minister obtain a report on the policy of his new department and the Government in respect of game reserves and their further development, including their development in association with national parks? I am concerned particularly with the association of the national park and game reserve at Katarapko Island. The member for Chaffey is also concerned about this.

Mr. Curren: It's in my district.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister make a comment on policy in respect of this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member is correct in his assumptions about the two areas that he has spoken of, and I am aware of his views about Katarapko Island. The member for Chaffey has raised this matter with me, and this morning I spoke to the Mayor of the Loxton council about it. I assure the honourable member that I shall be investigating the matters he has referred to and discussing them with the Minister of Works. I will give the honourable member a report on future developments.

### BERRI POLICE STATION

Mr. CURREN: The Public Works Committee report on the Berri Division Headquarters and Police Station was tabled on September 3, the Committee recommending that work be undertaken at a cost of \$240,000. Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government has decided to proceed with that work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On November 16 Cabinet approved the expenditure of \$240,000 for the construction of the new divisional headquarters and police station at Berri. Present planning provides for tenders

to be called in June, 1971, and it is expected that construction will be completed by the end of 1972. Expenditure will be incurred during the financial years 1971-72 and 1972-73, and it is expected that funds will be made available, from the Loan works allocation provided for police and courthouse buildings, for this purpose. It is intended that a composite building to provide suitable accommodation for divisional headquarters and police station requirements will be erected. The building will be of two storeys and will be erected on land adjacent to the existing courthouse. In addition, it is intended that living quarters for single men, a cell block and vehicle accommodation will be built.

#### ELECTRICITY CONNECTIONS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Electricity Trust of South Australia to investigate the possibility of allowing two connecting points to farm properties to be connected with trust power? At present, when a property is connected with power (usually by the single wire earth return system) the connection is taken to only one point, which is at the owner's choice and, of course, is usually the house. Whilst I accept that there must be a limit to the number of points connected without charge, I do not think that to ask for two points (for example, the house and the woolshed or the house and a bore) is an unreasonable request, and I ask the Minister to investigate this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with the trust. I have had some experience of this matter and will be pleased to bring down a report. If the honourable member has any information about persons concerned or specific requests, I should be pleased to have that information so that I could pass it on to the trust.

#### DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. SLATER: In the temporary absence of the Premier, can the Deputy Premier say whether the introduction of daylight saving in South Australia is likely to be considered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member's question has probably been prompted by a programme which appeared on the national television station over the weekend, and which I saw myself. At present the Government has not considered the matter raised by the honourable member. However, as it has now been raised, the Government will examine the matter and I will inform the honourable member in due course of the result of its deliberations.

#### WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding reductions in wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee points out that reductions in the 1969-70 nominal quotas (which formed the basis for the 1970-71 quotas) were necessary because final allocations made by the committee for the 1969-70 season were considerably in excess of the total State allocation of 45,000,000 bushels. The committee was therefore faced with the task of reviewing all quotas that had been granted in excess of the five-year average deliveries, less 10 per cent, to reduce total allocations to the basis of the prescribed State quota. This involved adjustments to more than 3,000 quotas, and it was impracticable for the committee in the time available to provide individual explanations of reductions. The committee has done its utmost to eliminate mistakes that occurred earlier. The committee states that most of the errors that have been brought to its notice in regard to current quotas are the result of growers using incorrect quota reference numbers when signing up for their over-quota wheat.

#### LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on November 10 regarding the proposed widening of the Lower North-East Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The actual pavement width from kerb to kerb of the Lower North-East Road between Dernancourt and Anstey Hill will be 84ft. It is intended to acquire land where necessary to provide for a footway of at least 9ft. width on each side. However, construction of the footways is the responsibility of the local authority, in this case the city of Tea Tree Gully. Construction is scheduled to commence at the Torrens River end in the second half of 1972, and Grand Junction Road at the foot of Anstey Hill should be reached by early 1975. Negotiations for the acquisition of any land required will commence at least 12 months in advance of road construction, and it is expected that all affected owners will have been approached by mid-1973.

#### UNION BAN

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry intercede with the Trades and Labor Council in the dispute that has occurred concerning the declaring

black of the wool of a Kangaroo Island soldier settler? Although what I have been told about the matter is subject to my hearing the other side, I understand that the union delegate who appeared at the woolshed concerned asked to speak to the shearers working there. The owner of the property, a soldier settler, agreed to the request, as a result of which the delegate spoke to the men during a run of shearing. He later went into the woolroom of the woolshed and made notes about the bales of wool. The owner then asked him what he was doing there because he had given him permission not to go into the woolroom but only to speak to the shearers. The union delegate told him that he was making notes on the wool in case he had to declare it black. The owner then said that he had not given him permission to go into the woolroom. I do not have a verbatim note of the conversation but I understand that this is what happened. The owner told the delegate that he must leave. The delegate then told the owner that, if he wanted him to go, he would have to get the police, but the police were about 50 miles away. The words then started to get heated and the owner is said to have stated, among other things, "I will tar and feather you first." The owner's son then came and the union man left. This man's wool has now been declared black.

This dispute should be heard in a court where both sides of the story could be told. The Trades and Labor Council has apparently taken over this dispute and declared the settler's wool black. I do not know whether the council has asked him for his story, but it has made demands to which he declines to accede. I was on the island last weekend and I know there is great sympathy for Mr. Pratt (the soldier settler concerned). The people on the island asked me whether something could be done—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! When I call members to order that means interjections must cease. The member for Alexandra is on his feet and there are to be no more interjections.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The people on the island asked me whether I would request the Minister to do something about this dispute and I told them I would. The previous Minister of Labour and Industry was asked to intercede in this matter and declined to do so. Now that we have a new Minister of Labour and Industry, I ask him—

Mr. Gunn: Do you really think—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to be continually calling members to order,

and interjections are entirely out of order. That applies to the member for Eyre as well as any other member.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I told the people with whom I spoke that I would ask the new Minister of Labour and Industry whether he would use his undoubted influence with the Trades and Labor Council to have the black ban on this man's wool lifted and, if there was some grievance as a result of the insults and the exchange between the settler and the union delegate, whether this could be settled. If the black ban could be lifted it would be to the advantage of everyone.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As honourable members will recall, this matter was fully explained in the House last week and a reply given by the previous Minister. Having examined the situation, I consider that there is no room for intervening, and I have full confidence in the responsible officers of the Trades and Labor Council, in whose affairs it is not Government policy to interfere.

Mr. McANANEY: In investigating the rights of individuals, will the Attorney-General consider a man's right to carry out his normal trading relations, on which his livelihood depends, in his own woolshed?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think the correct attitude towards the matter raised by the honourable member has already been outlined to the House on other occasions by the previous Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) and again today by the present Minister. As I agree with what they have said, I have nothing to add.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry visit Kangaroo Island to examine the victimization of the soldier settler there? I ask your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked a question about that matter previously this afternoon.

Mr. Millhouse: But not this one.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked the Minister to investigate this matter and use his influence.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am now asking whether the Minister will visit Kangaroo Island to meet the persons concerned, because I understand that this Government takes pride in the fact that it wants to ensure that there is civil liberty in the State and that victimization does not occur. If the

Minister goes to Kangaroo Island, he will find that many people are concerned about this matter, and if these people had to wait for union labour, they could not get their sheep shorn on the island. I do not think these facts have been made clear to the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commencing to debate the issue.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am asking the Minister to find out the facts for himself by visiting Kangaroo Island and meeting interested persons: by so doing, he will overcome this victimization that is occurring.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have told the member for Alexandra that this matter is in the hands of the Trades and Labor Council. It is not the policy of the Government to intervene and I cannot see any benefit from, or point in, my visiting Kangaroo Island while the council is considering the matter.

#### RAILWAY TIME TABLES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about placing at railway sidings time tables relating to public holidays?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Railways Commissioner has arranged for the special time tables to be exhibited as soon as possible after delivery. Special attention will be given to the extent of vandalism to see whether this is a practical procedure.

#### NATURAL GAS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say whether negotiations have been completed by the South Australian Government with the New South Wales Government to supply natural gas to New South Wales and whether South Australia has sufficient reserves to supply both States? Newspaper reports have shown that more gas strikes have occurred since natural gas became a payable proposition than previously, and this must have heartened future users. Today's *Advertiser* reports the Victorian Premier as saying that South Australia does not have the reserves for its own use, let alone enough to supply New South Wales. He also states that he would not be interested in supplying gas from Bass Strait as the royalties would be only chicken feed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: With all due respect to him, that statement by Sir Henry is as ill-informed and poorly based as are many of his statements.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wouldn't be alone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may defend Sir Henry if he wishes, but I suggest that he listen to what I have to say. South Australia has proved gas reserves of 1½ billion cub. ft. and, on present indications (and they are very sound indications), will prove to have natural gas supplies in excess of 4 trillion cub. ft. That is not only enough to supply South Australia's foreseeable natural gas needs, plus enough to provide for a petro-chemicals complex in South Australia: it also provides us with sufficient reserves to supply other markets than our own. Negotiations for supply of natural gas to New South Wales have been proceeding for some time. I do not wish to trench on those negotiations; as they are between the suppliers and the Australian Gaslight Company in New South Wales, it would not be proper for me to comment on the course of those negotiations until they have concluded. All I can say is that South Australia can not only provide the total natural gas needed to supply Sydney, but provide it at a price competitive with what could be offered by any other supplier in Australia, and the South Australian Government has indicated to the New South Wales Government that such a project will have its full support.

#### PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Dr. EASTICK: In asking the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, to give me a reply that I understand he has to a question I asked last week about the Produce Department, I point out that my constituent was telephoned by the department on Thursday and told that the birds that he had been informed would not be moved from his property would now be moved in two groups.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The General Manager of the Produce Department points out that the weeks preceding Christmas are always extremely busy in a cold store and the department avoids processing poultry wherever possible. He has reported that during this month one employee had been allowed to take leave that had been previously arranged and, shortly afterwards, another one left and, in order to meet other commitments, the cold store foreman has advised a producer that he could not handle poultry on November 23.

However, he has now been instructed to honour his previous arrangement, even though this may involve the additional cost of overtime. In this era, when poultry has become more plentiful, the Produce Department handles a very small percentage of the total poultry slaughtered, and it was not expected that the producer concerned would have had any difficulty in having his poultry slaughtered elsewhere. However, his problem has now been satisfactorily solved.

#### SEAWEED

Mr. BROWN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about pollution of the water and loss of seaweed in the northern part of Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Dr. A. J. Gilmour, of the Victorian Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, who is studying marine pollution in Australia, visited Whyalla recently to ascertain the extent of the pollution problem there. Although he has not yet been able to forward to the Minister a report upon his investigations of pollution in South Australia, it is understood that he was of the opinion that the pollution problem at Whyalla was of a very low order of significance. The Minister would be unwilling to undertake another survey of the area before the report is to hand. If the report gives cause for concern for its effect on fish and aquatic plant stocks, the matter will be investigated by the department.

#### MAITLAND COURTHOUSE

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Works say whether tenders have been called for the erection of a new courthouse and police residence at Maitland?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot say offhand, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him know when it is to hand.

#### PORT PIRIE CHANNEL

Mr. VENNING: I apologize to the Minister of Labour and Industry, as my question concerns Port Pirie, which is in his district. Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Government has received any approach from interested parties about deepening the Port Pirie channel? Some time ago I read that an approach had been made by one organization (I think it was Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited) that this creek should be deepened a little to aid the passage of larger vessels into the port. I want any-

one who reads my question in *Hansard* to know that I am not advocating a super terminal, or anything like that, at this port.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member would be out of order in advocating anything.

Mr. VENNING: I just wanted to put the matter right.

The SPEAKER: I want to put the honourable member right.

Mr. VENNING: I want to make it clear that I am not advocating such a thing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know that the Minister of Labour and Industry appreciates the honourable member's interest in the Pirie District. I do not know of any approach being made by any authority to the Marine and Harbors Department about the matter referred to by the honourable member. However, I will inquire to see whether approaches have been made, and I will let the honourable member know.

#### PRISONERS

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the appointment to prison staffs of officers to help rehabilitate prisoners with special problems?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the total treatment plan for all prisons is prescribed by the Assistant Comptroller (Treatment) who is also the Senior Psychologist. On the staff of the department are a psychologist and probation and parole officers who perform part of their duties within prisons. Seconded from other departments are medical officers, education officers and a forensic psychiatrist. These people all combine in the compilation of reports to assist the administration in the placement of prisoners to various institutions with their different occupations and degrees of security, and also as individual professional officers use their particular skills in whatever treatment programmes are considered necessary. The principal problem is to ascertain which prisoners need professional treatment as against those who need to develop self-discipline and work skills in order to be able to cope successfully in the community. A further problem arises in that many prisoners are not imprisoned for a length of time suitable for treatment which may need to be protracted, and these people must be encouraged to voluntarily undertake this after discharge. Circumstances and individual attitudes often mean this is

impossible. So far as country institutions are concerned, and this includes Port Augusta, they only hold long-term prisoners sent to them by the administration, so that inmates for whom any special treatment is recommended, either by the courts or any other authority, are moved to the metropolitan area prisons where proper professional assessment is available. So far as aborigines are concerned, they are treated in exactly the same manner as anybody else. The policy of the department is therefore to move prisoners to institutions which cater for particular treatment requirements, as it is not possible to station professional officers in small prisons where their time and talents would not be fully used.

#### MILK AND CREAM

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider having a better system of dating fresh cream and milk on containers? The present method of dating milk containers leaves much to be desired. Each company that bottles milk or puts it in other containers has a different system of putting the date on the bottles. For instance, Amscol's system is to use a dot, and a dot in the centre of the cap represents the first day, the first day being Sunday in the case of all companies. On the second day the dot is in the 10 o'clock position (and I do not know how one is supposed to look at a bottle of milk, imagine it a clock, and decide that that represents the second day), on the third day it is in the 9 o'clock position, and on the fourth day it is in the 8 o'clock position. For the fifth day, one goes to the other side of the bottle and finds that the dot is in the 2 o'clock position. On Friday, the sixth day, the dot is in the 3 o'clock position, and on Saturday it is in the 4 o'clock position. Southern Farmers' Co-operative Limited has a still different system, the dot being in front of the "F" on the first day, after the "s" on the second day, in the 9 o'clock position on the third day (we go back to the clock system), in the 3 o'clock position on the fourth day, in the 8 o'clock position on the fifth day, in the 4 o'clock position on the sixth day, and in the centre of the top on the seventh day. Metro Milk Co-operative Limited has a different system again. That company uses dots, and a dot under "M" represents the first day, a dot under "e" represents the second day—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is making a copious explanation.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am merely explaining the systems of marking the milk bottles. If I may, I shall now explain the position regarding cream. At present, a campaign is being undertaken to encourage the use of fresh cream. The system is to use A for the first week, B for the second week, C for the third week, and D for the fourth week. I raise this matter because recently persons have been fined—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may merely explain the question, not give his reasons for asking it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Very well, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, a person was fined for selling cream that was 70 days old and another was fined for selling cream that was 54 days old.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a reply.

#### PETROL STATIONS

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Works, in the temporary absence of the Premier, a reply to my question about the renewal of petrol station leases?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is understood that oil companies, to varying degrees, do take into account profits made by petrol resellers on the sales of confectionery and cigarettes, etc., and on their workshop repairs and servicing activities, when determining rental adjustments on the renewal of leases. Oil companies usually require most lessees to submit regular detailed returns of all income and expenditure relating to their combined service station activities, through specified management consultant firms or, in some cases, direct to the company. Lessees would accept this requirement when first entering into a lease. Whilst the companies may consider this practice necessary for the efficient supervision of their lessees, particularly where company loan funds are involved, the extent to which the lessees are required to divulge details of income derived from other than the sale of petrol and lubricants has often been the cause of resentment by those concerned. Apart from being regarded as an unwarranted invasion of privacy, lessees consider it unfair that their personal efforts to increase their activities in workshop repairs, servicing and confectionery sales, etc., should result in increased rentals payable to oil companies. It is mentioned that there is an excessive number of service stations, and many of these rentals are low in relation to capital costs. It is understood that the matter referred to, together with various matters relating to security of tenure and hours of trading are currently under examination by

the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce and will, in due course, be the subject of a submission by the chamber to all oil companies, with a view to seeking uniform safeguards in all lease agreements.

#### TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, a reply to my question of November 3 regarding the new South Australian Government Tourist Bureau building?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Construction is planned to commence in March, 1971, and the estimated completion date is March, 1972. The new building is expected to be occupied in mid-April, 1972.

#### CALLINGTON HILL

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport discuss with the Commissioner of Highways the matter of providing a second traffic lane on the steep up-grade on Callington Hill? The Minister, on October 22, when replying to a question asked by the member for Victoria about the provision of a second traffic lane on a steep grade (page 2005 of *Hansard*), stated in part:

I assume that the honourable member is referring particularly to the Mount Barker Road and, as he nods assent, I can tell him that the Highway Department's plans are to extend the present South-Eastern Freeway through the Hills area, and ultimately we will have a dual highway to Murray Bridge, so the additional lane for the heavily laden vehicles will be unnecessary. I think the honourable member appreciates that with the work on the freeway as it is, it would not be a brilliant idea to start spending money widening the existing road when we are providing a completely new road.

I also refer to the reply the Minister gave me on November 17 about a new freeway on the Mount Barker Road, in which he stated that the freeway would be opened to Callington by 1977. He also said:

There are no current plans to construct a four-lane highway between Callington and Murray Bridge.

It is obvious that it will be many years before the Callington Hill is considered in any new road reconstruction. I think the Minister will remember that in February the Mayoress of our town and her 21-year-old daughter lost their lives on the Callington Hill section. It is a steep grade, almost a mile long, and there is the advantage that the cliff, on the left-hand side, as one goes uphill away from the metropolitan area, has been taken away to provide better vision and the area therefore would

not take a lot of excavation to provide a second left-hand lane. Having regard to the reply by the Minister that it will be many years before the Callington Hill road will be reconstructed, will he discuss with the Commissioner of Highways the possibility of providing a second lane up that steep Callington Hill grade?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### PAKISTAN DISASTER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier. With your permission and the concurrence of the House, Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain the question.

The Hon. L. J. King: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am about to state it. Does the Government propose to—

The Hon. L. J. KING: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mitcham has again sought your permission and the concurrence of the House to explain a question that he has not asked. I ask you, Sir, whether, in view of your ruling on this matter, the honourable member is in order in adopting that course.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in adopting that course and, if he does not adopt the course endorsed by this House and refrain from having continually to be asked to state his question, the honourable member will not get the opportunity of another call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question I desire to ask is this: does the Government intend to contribute, on behalf of the citizens of South Australia, to any of the appeals that have been opened to aid the victims of the Pakistan disaster? I now desire to seek that permission, which I sought before as a matter of habit (and as I have been doing for 15 years), to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order if he is going to comment.

The Hon. L. J. King: You are—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that the Attorney-General has not been here for too long: he is only a new member.

Mr. Langley: And a bit more intelligent, too!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And a different type of person, I might add.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now seek your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, as I did before, to explain my question. The tragic event in Pakistan has been described



as the greatest disaster in human history, and every story that one hears is most horrifying and heart-rending. The apparent toll seems to rise with each report received. I know that the Commonwealth Government has, on behalf of the people of Australia, already promised a contribution (alas, to my way of thinking, a small contribution) from this country. I have heard since the House last met that two of the other States (I think Victoria and New South Wales) have undertaken to provide support of one kind or another: I think New South Wales is making a cash contribution to an appeal, and Victoria has promised material aid and manpower. This means that South Australia cannot be the first State to provide assistance. However, I hope that the Premier will ignore that in the name of humanity and, because of the magnitude of the disaster, that his Government will on behalf of the people of South Australia make a contribution of one kind or another to the appeals that are reported in this morning's press—one by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund and the other by Austcare.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: U.N.I.C.E.F. has not an organization or an appeal in this State, but Austcare has. As the Government was approached by the latter over the weekend, it considered the matter yesterday morning (the earliest possible opportunity), as a result of which it has made a cash contribution proportionate to that of New South Wales. Victoria has not made a cash contribution, but is offering technical assistance.

Mr. Millhouse: How much are we giving?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: South Australia yesterday gave \$2,500 to the Austcare appeal.

#### MOSQUITOES

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on October 15 regarding the mosquito problem that is evident in the Port Adelaide and Torrens Island areas? This matter is even more important at present because of the move taken last week by conservationists to have some of the mangrove swamps retained as an everglade area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think there is anything wrong with the move made by these people to have these areas set aside as marine reserves. Indeed, I hope that in future something can be done to provide for this. The honourable member said that he

had put work in hand to eradicate the mosquito menace. However, having examined the matter, I cannot agree that he had certain work undertaken to eradicate the mosquito nuisance near Torrens Island, although he did agree that the Marine and Harbors Department should contribute to the cost of certain work proposed by the Public Health Department. Aerial spraying of mangrove and samphire swamplands on Torrens Island and adjacent mainland areas was first carried out early in December, 1963, under the supervision of officers of the Public Health Department. The results attained were generally satisfactory and the programme of aerial spraying was continued and extended in the area in the succeeding summers of 1964-65 and 1965-66. Most of the cost of these programmes was met by the Electricity Trust of South Australia because of nuisance to the construction workers on Torrens Island. The Commonwealth Health Department, the Marine and Harbors Department and local authorities met the balance of cost. The area was not treated in the next succeeding two summers as the organizations that had contributed to previous treatments were not prepared to continue to finance the operation.

During 1968-69, officers of the Public Health Department, with the assistance of officers of other departments and organizations, undertook a detailed survey of the area to locate the mosquito breeding sites and determine the best practicable means of control. As a result of the survey it was suggested that the problem be controlled by, first, long-range permanent projects to eliminate mosquito breeding areas by filling, draining or flooding the areas in which mosquitoes breed and, secondly, continuing temporary control measures during the summer months by spraying the breeding grounds with an insecticide. The report of the survey was submitted to the organizations that had contributed to the cost of previous treatments and it was agreed to resume immediate control by ground and aerial spraying. It was also suggested by these organizations that consideration be given to investigation of permanent control measures as these might prove to be the more economical and effective means of dealing with the problem. The report was considered in Cabinet on September 8, 1969, when approval was given for the Public Health Department to continue to negotiate with the various organizations with a view to resuming the treatment in the forthcoming summer. In the report to Cabinet, the Chief Secretary indicated that the possibility of more permanent

control measures would be discussed with the Minister of Works at a later date, but no further action in this regard appears to have been taken, although copies of the various reports referred to have been supplied to the Marine and Harbors Department.

The spraying programme was resumed in 1969-70 and will be again undertaken in the coming summer season. The costs of the present campaign are being met by the under-mentioned organizations:

	\$
Department of Marine and Harbors	1,666
Electricity Trust of South Australia . . . . .	1,250
Salisbury Local Board of Health	833
Port Adelaide Local Board of Health . . . . .	555
Enfield Local Board of Health ..	417
Commonwealth Health Department	279
	\$5,000

The Public Health Department in the present campaign, as in all previous programmes, has organized the programme and has met the costs of supervision and administration. Reports indicate that the treatment in 1969-70 was effective and few complaints of mosquito nuisance were received. In view of the general success of the treatments, the various organizations have continued to support the spraying control programme, but it has been continually pointed out that action should continue to be taken by the authorities directly concerned to divert stormwaters and eliminate possible areas that might be conducive to mosquito breeding. In addition, it has been continually pointed out that the annual spraying programme is a temporary expedient only and consideration should be given to the possibility of eliminating the breeding areas. It is possible that it is this aspect to which the honourable member refers in his question.

#### DERNANCOURT JUNCTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask officers of the appropriate department to investigate the placement of road traffic signs at the junction of the Lower North-East Road and Rayleigh Avenue, Dernancourt? Children from the Dernancourt-Highbury area who attend State schools in the Campbelltown and Payneham districts travel by Bowman's bus service to their schools. Yesterday (and on other occasions) an accident almost occurred involving a child where about 25 children alight from the bus at the junction of the Lower North-East Road and Rayleigh Avenue, which is near Lyons Road, Dernan-

court. Visibility is very poor at this spot. The parents of the children believe that a road traffic sign should be erected at this point in the interests of the children's safety.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure whether this matter has been referred to the Tea Tree Gully Council; if it has not, I will refer it to the council for subsequent submission to the Road Traffic Board.

#### HOUSE MICROPHONES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Speaker a reply to my recent question in relation to the microphones and amplifiers in the Chamber not being up to standard required by members as well as by the *Hansard* and press reporters?

The SPEAKER: I have had the amplification system used in this Chamber investigated by the Public Buildings Department, an officer of which reports:

The amplification system in the House of Assembly has been checked by the senior telephone and radio technician and he reports that the system is operating satisfactorily in the manner intended when designed and installed.

The existing sound amplification was installed in 1959. At that time it was understood that individual microphones would be switched on only when a member wished to speak and normally would be switched off. The microphones are quite sensitive and if left in the on position will pick up extraneous sounds and casual conversation and thus relay background noise through the amplifiers. It is proposed that the installation will be thoroughly examined during the coming Parliamentary recess with a view to providing improvements by the utilization of more modern equipment and/or techniques. In the meantime, the existing system will be checked early each week before each sitting of the House.

Members should note that the technicians advise that there is no necessity to move the microphones from the fully upright position as this is the position from which best results are obtained.

#### SHIPPING COMPANY

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I recently asked concerning an approach to the Commonwealth Government for assistance for the shipbuilding industry at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the Adelaide Ship Construction Company. The Director of Industrial Promotion (Mr. A. M. Ramsay) also gave evidence on behalf of the State Government at

the recent Tariff Board inquiry on shipbuilding in Australia. The future of shipbuilding yards in South Australia, as in the other States, depends on the attitude taken by the Commonwealth Government to Australia's long-term plans in this field. An indication of this attitude will be given when the Commonwealth Government receives the Tariff Board report soon. (I hope the board will do something about it before long because the inquiry has been going for an extraordinarily long time now.) The South Australian Government cannot at this stage influence the final decision which the Commonwealth Government will make on the industry.

#### RUTILE MINING

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier give the exact location of the rutile mining leases at Nepean Bay, on Kangaroo Island, and also indicate the distance away from the high-water mark the mining company is permitted to work? In announcing this work the Premier is quoted as saying:

Scrub areas affected by the operation will be transplanted with trees and other vegetation and will eventually be restored to better than natural conditions.

The phrase "better than natural conditions" is always treated by conservationists with reserve, and there is some concern about the effect of this sand mining. On the dunes immediately behind the high-water mark there are creeping plants which are heavily laden with moisture from which wallabies get their sustenance: they do not need to drink water because they can get liquid from the leaves of these plants. These dunes are supporting natural fauna at present and there is concern lest the mining operations eradicate some of these species of vegetation. It is well known that, although it is possible to replant most natural plants, it is not always possible to replant them all. I ask the Premier whether he will obtain a report for me on the exact location of the mining leases, the distance back from the high-water mark and the types of vegetation that will be affected, even if only temporarily, by the operation of the rutile mining company.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

Mr. McRAE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked recently concerning the Public Service Regulations and appeals made under those regulations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The following matters are covered by the Public Service Act and Regulations: (1) An appeal by an applicant against the nomination of an officer for appointment to a vacant office; (2) an appeal by an officer aggrieved by a decision of the Public Service Board in relation to a disciplinary matter; (3) an appeal to the Public Service Board by an officer having a grievance where no other remedy is provided; and (4) the rights of public servants to seek assistance from members of Parliament or lawyers.

The Public Service Board administers the respective legislative provisions under these headings, which are as follows:

(1) An appeal by an applicant against an officer nominated by the Public Service Board for appointment to a vacant office may be made pursuant to sections 48-53, Division V, of the Public Service Act. It will be noted that an appeal is heard by an Appointments Appeal Committee consisting of the Chairman, who shall be a special magistrate, and two officers, one of whom shall be selected by the appellant from a panel constituted of officers nominated by recognized organizations (staff associations). Provision is also made for an officer of a recognized organization to present evidence or argument on behalf of the nominated officer or the appellant, if they are members of such recognized organization. It should be stressed that the proceedings before the Appointments Appeal Committee are for the sole purpose of reviewing the nomination for promotion made by the Public Service Board and to enable an assessment to be made as to whether, in the opinion of the committee, the appellant is more entitled to the appointment.

(2) Division VI of the Public Service Act sets out the procedures for dealing with matters of discipline within the Public Service and sections 66-67 allow an appeal by an officer, aggrieved by a decision of the board, to a tribunal consisting of a judge or special magistrate who shall be Chairman and two officers, one of whom shall be selected by the appellant from a panel constituted of officers nominated by a recognized organization (staff association). Section 72 (1) allows the officer concerned in hearings before the board or tribunal under this Division of the Act, to be represented by counsel, solicitor or agent.

(3) Section 117 provides for an appeal to the Public Service Board by an officer having any grievance relating to his employment or

affected by any report or recommendation made by a permanent head, where no other remedy is provided in the Public Service or any other Act. It further provides that an officer of a recognized organization of which the appellant is a member, may present evidence or argument on behalf of the appellant.

(4) Regulation 18 (1) stipulates that no officer shall seek the influence or interests of any person in order to obtain promotion, transfer or any other advantage whatsoever directly or indirectly relating to or affecting the officer in any capacity in the service of the State.

#### CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the future of the Chemistry Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following a recent inspection of the Chemistry Department premises at Kintore Avenue, the Minister of Agriculture sought urgent action to provide alternative and suitable accommodation for the department. The Minister has informed me that a site has been approved for a new building to house the Chemistry Department and the Coroner's Department. Whilst it is true that the Chemistry Department undertakes much analytical work for the Agriculture Department, the work done for the Agriculture Department and Roseworthy Agricultural College combined is only about half the total analytical work. Much is done for the Coroner's, Police, Public Health, Hospitals and Woods and Forests Departments, with lesser amounts for various other departments, semi-government instrumentalities (including the Australian Wheat Board) and outside clients; furthermore, the samples received from the Agriculture Department and Roseworthy Agricultural College are usually in large batches requiring relatively few deliveries a year, while those from other sources are predominantly single specimens with occasional small batches, necessitating many deliveries. Moreover, the department carries out other work under the Explosives and Gas Acts. In these circumstances, it is considered that a central laboratory could work far more economically and efficiently in terms of both staff and equipment than would a series of smaller laboratories, and a city location is thought to be desirable. The Director is satisfied that the separation of the laboratories from the Agriculture Department's complex at Northfield will not impair in any way the service his department provides for the Agriculture Department.

#### LAKE HAWTHORN

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say what authority is responsible for controlling the outlet gates of the Lake Hawthorn evaporation basin, in the Mildura district, these gates, if opened, permitting highly saline drainage water to be discharged into the Murray River? Secondly, can he say whether any precautions are taken to ensure that the noxious fish European carp will not be discharged into the Murray River with the drainage effluent from this evaporation basin? Last week I heard on the Australian Broadcasting Commission's regional station 5MV a radio news item, during the country breakfast session, referring to a report that European carp were being speared in the drainage outlet channel, which I understand is the channel from Lake Hawthorn. That these fish have been liberated in the Murray River now involves the serious pollution of future and present water storages on the Murray River. Will the Minister have this matter investigated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that. The authority that controls the discharge from Lake Hawthorn would be the appropriate department of the Victorian Government; I am not sure of its name. However, I shall have the matter investigated and bring down a report for the honourable member.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on October 27 about justices of the peace?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have now considered the judgment of Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., in the case of *Borman v. Koufidis*. His Honour held that the complaint and summons were invalid, as the justice of the peace issuing the summons was an employee of the council on whose behalf the complaint was made. The special magistrate based his decision on the principle that the discretion of the justice issuing the summons was a judicial discretion and not a mere Ministerial act. In this case the justice was disqualified from exercising a judicial discretion in relation to the issue of this summons, by reason of his interest as an employee of the council. The principle on which the decision is based is by no means novel and is indeed an established principle of law. Nevertheless, the decision has raised the question whether it is expedient to issue some further information to justices to assist them in dealing with this type of situation. The Chief Stipendiary Magistrate agrees that it is desirable to do so. I propose, therefore,

to arrange for Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., to prepare a short exposition on the taking of complaints and issuing of summonses which will be of assistance to justices in performing these duties. I am grateful to Mr. O'Loughlin for generously agreeing to undertake this task.

#### WEEDS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the spread of weeds in the lower foothills?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that a Government-authorized officer for weed control has inspected the African daisy problems in the foothills within the Burnside council area and examined measures being carried out by the council to achieve control of this weed. From his report, the Minister is satisfied that reasonable action is being taken to contain this weed and to treat it in key areas from where it is most likely to spread. However, there is one exception, and the Minister has asked to be kept informed regarding this property. If no work is carried out to control the African daisy after the current legal notice that was issued several weeks ago expires, the Minister will consider what action can be taken to enforce the Act.

#### INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER: Before asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, I take the opportunity to congratulate him on his appointment to this important portfolio. After witnessing his ability as a referee in a certain snooker tournament, I hope that his duties here will be less demanding. Will the Minister consider appointing an additional Commissioner to the State Industrial Commission? At present, the President of the commission and the only two Commissioners are engaged on equal pay hearings, and I understand that this will create a backlog of hearings on other matters. It seems that one hearing has been deferred until February, 1971. I also understand that to create an extra Commissioner the Act, which limits the commission to having two Commissioners, will need to be altered and that it would be advisable to appoint one Commissioner a Senior Commissioner.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall have the honourable member's question examined and bring down a report.

#### WATER CHARGE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Engineering and Water Supply Department? I should like permission to explain the question. I have received a letter from a constituent regarding the supply of and charge for water.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. MATHWIN: The question is this: will the Minister take up this matter with the Engineering and Water Supply Department? I wish to explain the question.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not a bad question!

Mr. MATHWIN: It is in regard to the supply of and charge for water in respect of a property owned by Hamilton's Ewell Vineyards Proprietary Limited, which company has properties on both sides of Morphett Road. Part of a letter sent by the company to the department is as follows:

We incur annually several thousand dollars excess water charge on our winery and distillery operations, but we do not use (nor is there) a meter on the vineyard, which is across Morphett Road from our winery and distillery. These excess water charges are having a considerable effect on our overhead charges for we are paying water rates for an entitlement which we are not able to use.

The company asks that two matters be considered: first, that the water entitlements on the assessment that are not at present used be offset against the excess water charges; and secondly, if that is not permissible under certain regulations, that permission be given for a meter to be installed on the vineyard property. The company undertakes to lay at its expense a pipe across Morphett Road, subject to the permission of the Highways Department being obtained. Will the Minister look into the matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do so. Under the regulations, I do not think it is possible for water charges in one category to be carried over to another. However, I will have a look at the possibility of installing a meter. The honourable member said that payments were being made for excess water that was not being used. I cannot understand how that is possible, because excess water is not used until all the rebate water has been used.

#### ROAD SAFETY

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government will take action to require that blood alcohol estimates be obtained in relation to all drivers

involved in fatal and other serious motor vehicle accidents in South Australia? A report in this morning's newspaper states that in more than 60 per cent of all traffic fatalities in Victoria there was a blood alcohol level well above the recognized allowable level. I know that the Victorian police surgeon (Dr. Birrell) has for several years considered that estimates should be obtained. It may be difficult to ensure that victims in country areas undergo post-mortem examinations, but obtaining the blood sample is relatively simple. I emphasize that I regard this matter as urgent not because of the possibility of charging people with offences but basically for research purposes to find out whether or not the Government should take further action as a result of the findings of such an investigation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I understand the report in this morning's newspaper, although it showed that 60 per cent of accident victims had a blood alcohol content higher than is permitted under the law, it did not show that the higher blood alcohol content contributed in any way to the accident. That is an important aspect of the question. However, I believe the House should know that yesterday Cabinet devoted considerable time to discussing numerous aspects associated with road safety. Over the months we have been in office, I think we have done more in a genuine attempt to reduce the road toll than has been done in the past 10 years. I hope that as a result of our activities we will soon see a reduction in the road toll. I have had further discussions about the matter this morning. Soon I will have additional discussions because the desirability of several features, such as more patrols on the road, unmarked vehicles, seat belts and on-the-spot fines, is now being considered. You name it, and the committee is discussing it! If anything can be done to assist in reducing the number of road accidents, I shall be indebted to any member of the House or of the public who brings it to our attention.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Select Committee suggested by the member for Mitcham would be a good start.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Mitcham moved that there be a Minister of Road Safety: that is the most innocuous thing I have heard of in this connection.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the Minister may not, in replying to a question, refer to a matter that has already been debated in this House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are attempting to divorce politics completely from the question of road safety: politics has no part in it. I assure honourable members that, if any suggestion that has any merit in it is made, we shall be only too delighted to have the authorities look at it with a view to having it implemented.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport when we are likely to get action, as distinct from talk, to cut down the toll on the roads. In reply to a question asked by the member for Bragg, the Minister has said that the present Government has done more to cut down the road toll than has any other Government in the last 10 years, yet I note that the tragic toll on the road has increased this year to 307 deaths, compared with 219 to the same day last year. Several suggestions have been put forward and the Minister has canvassed some of them but, apparently, it has been left to the *Advertiser* to take the definite action that was reported on the front page of this morning's paper (that a dummy was used at Pasadena yesterday) and to do anything about this. Can the Minister say whether any of the matters which he has raised and which he says he is discussing with Cabinet and the Road Safety Council are likely to come to fruition in the present session of Parliament? Preferably, will anything be done during the remainder of the sittings of the House before Christmas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Only a person of the standing of the member for Mitcham could be so insulting to the Road Safety Council and to those who are suffering injury on the roads. I do not know whether the honourable member realizes this, but the figure quoted for this year is for the period from January 1, and I remind the honourable member that he and his lousy Government were in office until May 30.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I object to the undignified description of the previous Government by the Minister of Roads and Transport, and I suggest that he be asked to withdraw that description.

The SPEAKER: What do you ask be withdrawn?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister referred to the honourable member's "lousy Government".

The SPEAKER: Objection having been taken to the words "lousy Government", will the Minister withdraw that term?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thought members opposite were the Government then, and I do not know how I can withdraw the word "Government".

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member willing to withdraw the word "lousy"?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Alexandra objects to the term, in deference to him I withdraw it, and I will continue with the reply that the member for Mitcham has sought. I repeat my earlier statement that only a person of his nature could hurl such insults at a body of people that was starved of funds by the previous Government to such an extent that an officer who had been absent at the end of a financial year was told not to put in his account for expenses, because there was not enough money to pay the account. That is what the previous Government thought of road safety.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you do anything about it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member were to listen instead of being asleep half the time, he would know what we were doing. He will soon see the results of it.

PARLIAMENT AIR-CONDITIONING

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Works have investigated the air-conditioning in this Chamber, as it seems that the warmth in here is out of proportion to the moderation of question time this afternoon?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have noticed this afternoon that the air-conditioning does not seem to be functioning as well as it should. Air-conditioning comes within the scheme to upgrade the services of the House: it is part of the scheme that was criticized vehemently by the Leader of the Opposition as being a waste of public money. He suggested that the job could be done for \$1,000,000; no doubt members opposite agree. If only that sum is spent, I am afraid that air-conditioning will not be one of the facilities included in the renovations and re-arrangements of facilities within the existing four walls of this building. I guess we will have to do something about the air-conditioning eventually, because the present plant will be demolished in conjunction with the building of the festival theatre. Whether we want to or not, it will be necessary to replace the existing unit, and the sooner we do this the better it will be.

BARLEY

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the handling of barley?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that, following discussions last Friday between representatives of the Australian Barley Board and South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, it has been agreed to provide a bulk storage for barley at Thevenard for the 1971-72 season. The arrangement to provide storage for 500,000 bushels will be on a five-year trial basis, but it will become permanent if the production of barley in the area is sufficient and provided no serious difficulties arise concerning shipping. It is hoped that the improvements now being made to the port and due for completion in 1971 will overcome the reluctance that shipping firms have shown in the past to enter into contracts that may require loading at Thevenard. During the trial period, all deliveries on Eyre Peninsula will be based on a Port Lincoln differential, as it is expected that there will be insufficient barley in some classes to warrant loading at Thevenard. However, all savings that arise from shipment at Thevenard will be refunded proportionately to growers who have delivered barley within the proposed new Thevenard Division.

FISHING

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about fishing research?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that the provision for fisheries research on the current year's Estimates could be increased only if a corresponding reduction were made in some other line, and the whole thing became a matter of priorities. The Director, Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, has furnished the following information on the percentages that the funds provided this year in the departmental estimates for individual lines bear to the total provision:

	Per cent
Salaries . . . . .	62.5
Office expenses, travelling expenses, motor vehicle expenses, boat expenses, reimbursement to Police Department, minor equipment and sundries . . . . .	20.6
Fauna research . . . . .	7.2
Fisheries research . . . . .	2.6
Purchase of boats and engines . . . . .	2.4
Purchase of motor vehicles . . . . .	4.5
Purchase of office machines and equipment . . . . .	0.03

It is hoped that in future years the amount available for fisheries research can be increased. The Minister of Agriculture expects that, following the enactment of new fisheries legislation, this State will gain the benefit of a share of funds to be provided for the States by the Commonwealth Government for this purpose.

#### MEAT EXPORTS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about meat exports?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply is similar to that given in another place to a similar question. The Minister in the other place stated:

Questions that have been asked by honourable members in this Council and in another place regarding the withdrawal of licences from Australian abattoirs for the export of mutton to America indicate that some members, at least, are not clear on what has actually happened and, with the indulgence of this House, I wish to clarify the situation. The facts are that on or about May 18 of this year the United States Department of Agriculture advised that all registered meat export establishments in Australia would lose their right to export mutton (I emphasize the word "mutton") to America. Later, the Canadian authorities followed suit. I believe that the reason given for this action by the United States authorities was that the very high standards of hygiene demanded by them were not being met by Australian slaughtering establishments. Subsequently, some abattoirs (in the main, small through-put works constructed comparatively recently) applied and had their licences reissued. Applications by others were rejected. I want to make it perfectly clear that, for the Gepps Cross abattoirs, the embargo applies only to mutton, and the export of beef and lamb to the United States and Canada is not affected. The latest information I have is that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board intends to ask for an inspection of its establishment within the next week or so with a view to reinstatement of its licence to export mutton to the United States.

#### AIR POLLUTION

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding steps taken to estimate the degree of air pollution in various parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports:

Dustfall: In 1961 the Public Health Department began monitoring particulate fall-out, mainly in the western sector of metropolitan Adelaide. Fall-out gauges of the type used in New South Wales and Victoria were installed at 40 sites in late 1960 to monitor fall-out in general and particular areas. This number was later extended to 49 to cover

other areas of suspected high fall-out and two sets of five gauges were installed in two country areas where fall-out appeared to need checking. The results are calculated monthly.

Sulphur dioxide and smoke: In November, 1964, the Public Health Department began installing the United Kingdom pattern D.S.I.R. monitor for sulphur dioxide and smoke (expressed as coefficient of haze—COH units). The present total of 10 units in use were installed by 1966—eight in the western sector of metropolitan Adelaide and two at Port Pirie. They measure cumulative 24-hour values of sulphur dioxide and dark smoke.

Localized air pollution due to carbon monoxide from motor vehicles in city of Adelaide: Since July officers of the Public Health Department have taken measurements at a busy intersection in the city of Adelaide on three occasions to determine levels of carbon monoxide in the environment. It is intended to continue to take similar samples at intervals. The results of measurements of dustfall, sulphur dioxide and smoke have been published by the Public Health Department in its newsletter, "Report on Pollution of the Environment". Copies are distributed to all local boards of health, some Government departments and other interested persons. There is a mailing list of about 320. The results of carbon monoxide measurements will be published in subsequent issues. The title of this newsletter has recently been changed to "Community Health", and all members of Parliament are now on the distribution list. The department intends to continue to publish results of air pollution measurements from time to time.

#### BURBRIDGE ROAD

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Local Government reply to the letter forwarded to him on February 19, 1969, by the West Beach Ratepayers' Association, a copy of which was forwarded to the member for Henley Beach and to me on November 16, and in which the association suggests that the name of Burbridge, Rowlands and Cowandilla Roads be changed to West Beach Road, and that West Beach Road, which is divided by the Adelaide Airport, be named Hamra Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot reply at this stage, but I will do so as soon as possible.

#### CITRUS REPORT

Mr. NANKIVELL: I address my question, which concerns the Citrus Organization Committee's report, to the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture. As Cabinet has obviously had this report in its possession for some time, it must have been considering the report.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If Cabinet has had it for a considerable time, how long should it take?



Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister can answer my question without interrupting me while I am asking it. As Cabinet has had this report for some time, will the Minister say whether it has been considered and what action the Government intends to take in relation to it? The report contains certain criticisms of the operation of the committee, and suggests alternatives: first, improvement of the present marketing organization through its sales organization, in conjunction with other packing organizations; secondly, the re-constitution of the committee as a fully grower-elected committee with a series of newly defined powers; or thirdly, the repeal of the Citrus Industry Organization Act and the dissolution of the Citrus Organization Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What do you think we should do?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am asking the Minister a question; he should not ask one of me. As it has been recommended that a poll of growers be conducted on this matter, will the Minister say whether the Government has considered such action and whether it intends to conduct such a poll? Also, will he say whether the Government intends to inform growers of the full implications of the report, as has been suggested? If it does, what action does it intend to take in this regard?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member suggested that the Government has had the report for some time and that it therefore should have taken some action by now. If the honourable member cares to look at the Notice Paper of another place for tomorrow he will see that notice is being given today of the introduction of a Bill and, if he cares to examine that Bill, he will see what the Government has done about the situation. It does not involve a poll of growers to ascertain what they want.

#### IRON ORE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, any information to give the House about the iron ore find at Mount Cooper, which was reported in yesterday's *News*?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not at this stage, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### WHYALLA MAIN

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding water reticulation from the Morgan-Whyalla main?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Duplication of the pumping main and pumping stations which commenced in 1962-63 is now operationally complete. The designed capacity of the scheme is based on the programmed development of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company activities at Whyalla and adjacent areas, the growth of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Woomera, Port Pirie and the other towns and areas *en route*. Duplication of the gravity section of the pipeline was completed in 1967 and a terminal storage of 25,000,000gall. was built in 1969. Full economic utilization of the gravity system depends on the use of booster stations, the first of which is likely to be required near Georgetown in 1973. A second station is scheduled near Spalding in 1975 or thereabouts and this will enable the gravity flow from the Hanson Summit storage to match the capacity of the rising main. Further boosting will be progressively required to the year 1990, when the ultimate capacity of the system will be reached.

It is clear that capacity exists at present to meet additional demands that may be put upon the system. However, any such additions will necessarily bring forward the time when booster stations will be required and also the time when separate augmentation by other means will be necessary. Regarding rural reticulation, it is to be noted that in the past there have been cases where proposals have not proceeded because agreement of all settlers was not obtainable. Specific proposals for extensions are examined on their merits and scales of rating are determined to provide minimum return on capital expenditure. In some instances, the rates required to be levied on a property are too high to make the main extension a worthwhile proposition to the settlers.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether he will use his undoubted good offices and influence with the trade union movement in an attempt to bring about peace in the motor car industry. In the last few weeks other members and I have asked questions of the Minister's predecessor (Hon. G. R. Broomhill)—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Has Chrysler or General Motors-Holden's asked you to do this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know the Premier's interjection is out of order. It is quite unexpected, but I must have touched a tender spot. I can give him an unequivocal "No".

Several times in the last few weeks members on this side have asked the former Minister of Labour and Industry to take action regarding the industrial unrest which is rampant in the motor car industry, and on each occasion the Minister has refused to take action except, I understand, to have discussions with the employers (Chrysler Australia Limited and General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Limited), which discussions have brought on him the wrath of Mr. Abbott, the trade union secretary. After his election by Caucus last Thursday, the new Minister said his victory in a series of ballots was an undoubted indication of the strength of the trade union movement.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not an explanation. The honourable member is out of order; he is trying to provoke argument. The honourable member has asked his question, and he is now out of order.

Mr. Jennings: Question!

The SPEAKER: I rule the honourable member out of order. He must resume his seat.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If that is the best the honourable member for Mitcham can bowl up to try and put me out of step, he is wide of the mark. His question was answered last week by the previous Minister of Labour and Industry, and the situation is being handled by the Trades and Labour Council.

#### MINING LEASES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light wishes to ask a question, and interjections are out of order.

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding mining leases at Kapunda?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The old Kapunda mine proper is on private land with mineral rights privately owned. The owner of these rights has entered into an arrangement with another party giving him rights over the area for an indeterminate period. This other party has, in turn, attempted to interest mining companies in developing the mine. At this stage a company is at present investigating the proposition, but no decision has been made. Previous exploration of the area was undertaken by the Mines Department and subsequently by Mines Exploration Proprietary Limited. The latter company was not encouraged to proceed further.

#### DETERGENTS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the effect of detergents on the sewerage system?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A typical all-purpose household detergent consists of: (1) a surface active detergent material; (2) a complex tripolyphosphate builder; (3) miscellaneous ingredients such as brighteners, perfumes and inhibitors and may also include (4) bacterial enzymes. Until recently the commonly used detergent materials were branched chain alkyl benzene sulphonates, noted for their foaming ability. These so-called "hard" or non-biodegradable detergents are not amenable to biological decomposition and consequently can survive and cause foaming problems in sewage treatment processes, in the resultant effluent and, in many cases, in subsequent receiving waters.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### ROAD ACCIDENTS

Mr. HOPGOOD (on notice):

1. How many road accidents have occurred on the Reynella by-pass in the past 12 months?
2. How many non-fatal injuries and fatalities, respectively, have resulted from these accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For the period of 12 months from October 1, 1969, to September 30, 1970, only, as under:

1. There have been 30 accidents on the Reynella by-pass.
2. Eight non-fatal injuries and one fatality have resulted.

#### ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Were all locally-based advertising agencies invited to submit applications for the Savings Bank of South Australia's advertising account before this account was transferred recently to an American-owned company?
2. What was the nature and extent of the successful submission, and how many submissions were considered?
3. On what basis was the successful agency selected?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is not a matter under Ministerial control—pursuant to the Savings Bank of South Australia Act.

**AGED COTTAGE HOMES**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What result has been achieved so far by the Government in its negotiations with Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated over charges to its tenants?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have nothing further to add to my reply of November 17, 1970, to the question asked by the Hon. D. N. Brookman, M.P.

**MURRAY STORAGEES**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What does the Government intend to do next in its attempt to renegotiate the agreement between members of the River Murray Commission to build the Dartmouth dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Proceed, as the Hall Government announced it would do, with a political solution, but no doubt with better success.

**UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Ascot Park Primary School (Replacement),

Norwood High School Additions,

Tea Tree Gully Primary School (Replacement).

Ordered that reports be printed.

**MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marine Act, 1936-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is designed to solve a number of problems that have arisen in the administration of the Marine Act. The Bill extends the definition of "vessel" to include hovercraft and other air-cushion vehicles that traverse any navigable water within or adjacent to the State. It seems highly desirable that these craft while engaged in navigation should be subject to the rules of navigation and the other provisions of the Marine Act relative to safety at sea and investigation into casualties, incompetency and misconduct. The department has experienced some difficulty in connection with the survey of fishing vessels. Occasionally a new vessel is

built and upon application being made for a certificate of survey, the design is found to be deficient in certain respects. It is felt that needless trouble and expense could be saved if the plans of the proposed vessel were first submitted to the department for approval. Accordingly the Bill empowers the Governor to require, by regulation, that plans of a proposed fishing vessel be submitted to the Director for approval before construction is commenced.

The Bill also tightens the provisions of the principal Act relating to survey. It has been found that in some instances unsuitable craft are being employed to carry excessive numbers of passengers with inadequate safety precautions. Sometimes the ship falls outside the provisions of section 69 of the principal Act because there is no direct consideration in respect of the carriage of an individual passenger. It may be included in a "package deal" covering a complete holiday. The Bill therefore provides that a ship is liable to survey if it is used for the conveyance of passengers for hire or reward or any other direct or indirect consideration.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 suspends the operation of the Bill until the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon. This suspension is required under the Merchant Shipping Act of the United Kingdom. Clause 3 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act. Clause 4 amends the definition of "vessel" by including hovercraft and other air-cushion vehicles that are used in navigation. Clauses 5, 6 and 7 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 8 enables regulations to be made requiring that plans of proposed fishing vessels be submitted for approval. It also increases the maximum fine that may be prescribed for breach of the provisions relating to fishing vessels to \$1,000. Clause 9 amends section 69 of the principal Act. The amendment provides that any ship used for the conveyance of passengers for hire or reward or any other direct or indirect consideration shall be subject to annual survey. Clause 10 increases to three months the period for which the Minister may extend a certificate of survey.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

**INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL**

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 13 (clause 2)—Leave out "January" and insert "July".

No. 2. Page 3, line 18 (clause 5)—After "Salisbury," insert "Tea Tree Gully,".

No. 3. Page 3, line 21 (clause 5)—Leave out "Tea Tree Gully".

No. 4. Page 17, line 14 (clause 46)—After "Minister" insert—"or a shop, approved by the Minister, situated within the premises of a golf club".

No. 5. Page 19, line 2 (clause 46)—After "metropolitan area" insert "at any time".

No. 6. Page 19 (clause 46)—After line 10 insert new subclause as follows:—

"(3) It shall be lawful for a shopkeeper at any time to sell or deliver spare parts for agricultural machinery and to keep his shop open for so long as is necessary to effect the sale and delivery."

No. 7. Page 20, lines 21 to 36 (clause 46)—Leave out subclauses (4) to (7) and insert new subclauses as follows:—

"(4) An application under this section may only be made in pursuance of a resolution of the council supported by not fewer than two-thirds of the total number of members of the council.

(5) The council must advise the Minister of the views it has ascertained of persons (including shopkeepers and shop assistants) resident in the area and affected by the application, upon the subject of the application.

(6) The Minister may require the Returning Officer for the State to conduct a poll of all electors on the roll of electors for the House of Assembly at the date of the application, and resident within the area of the council, in order to ascertain their views on the subject of the application.

(7) Voting at any such poll shall not be compulsory.

(8) If a majority of votes cast at a poll favour the application of the council, a shopping district or a part of a shopping district shall be created or abolished by proclamation in accordance with the application of the council.

(9) If the Minister is satisfied without a poll being conducted that the application is supported by a majority of the persons (including shopkeepers and shop assistants) resident in the area and affected by the application, a shopping district or part of a shopping district may be created or abolished by proclamation in accordance with the application of the council.

(10) If an unsuccessful application is made to the Minister under this section a period of three years must elapse before the same, or a substantially similar, application is made to the Minister.

(11) The Governor may by regulation make such provisions as he deems necessary or expedient in connection with a poll to be conducted under this section.

(12) Subject to the regulations a poll shall be conducted in such manner as the Returning Officer for the State determines."

No. 8. Page 21, The Third Schedule (clause 47)—After "Confectionery shops" insert "Cooked food shops".

No. 9. Page 21, The Third Schedule (clause 47)—After "Non-alcoholic drink shops" insert "Plant nurseries".

No. 10. Page 22, The Fourth Schedule (clause 47)—After "Fish food" insert "Fishing bait, Fishing gear".

No. 11. Page 22, The Fourth Schedule (clause 47)—After "Pasta" insert "(including lasagna, macaroni, noodles, ravioli, spaghetti and vermicelli)".

No. 12. Page 22, The Fourth Schedule (clause 47)—After "Pastes," insert "(" and after "fish" insert ")".

No. 13. Page 23, The Fourth Schedule (clause 47)—Leave out "Spaghetti".

#### *Amendment No. 1.*

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Conservation): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

Members will recall that the Bill was originally designed so that the trading hours provision would operate from the date of assent. However, as a result of representations made to the Government after the Bill was introduced, it was decided to defer the date of operation until January 1, 1971. I believe it has been suggested that, if the legislation comes into force on January 1, storekeepers would not have sufficient time to adjust to the change and that they would suffer hardship. However, as far back as August 13, when we introduced the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) Bill, storekeepers throughout the State were warned of the likely outcome of the actions in this matter being taken by the Government: we made it clear that, if the result of the referendum favoured the general closing of stores throughout the State at 5.30 p.m., the Government would act accordingly. If this was not sufficient warning, I point out that the present Bill containing this provision relating to shop trading hours was introduced on October 14, and this indicated the Government's intention that stores would be closed at 5.30 p.m. on Friday.

Therefore, I do not think it can be fairly argued that sufficient warning has not been given. I think it is fair for us to assume that storekeepers have had sufficient time to adjust to a change, to commence as from January 1 next. Retail trading organizations in this State have made it clear that they believe that January 1 is the proper date on which the provision should commence to operate. Comment is made on this matter in this morning's newspaper, if members dispute that this is not the attitude of the Retail Traders' Association. No doubt, the arguments advanced in this respect by the retail trading organizations are quite proper, because deferring the date will not only permit Friday night trading to continue in the

fringe areas but will also provide an opportunity for storekeepers in those areas to extend their operations: they may adopt the attitude that, as they have this period of grace, they may just as well make hay while the sun shines and open their stores for extended hours. The opportunity would exist for storekeepers to open on any night of the week or on Saturdays or Sundays, whereas this may not be their present practice.

This would increase the problem we are now trying to solve, and it would mean that the unfair competition, which is being suffered at present and which this Bill is seeking to remove, would exist for an additional period, so that the position during the six-month period could be considerably aggravated. That no member of this Chamber during the Committee stages suggested anything along the lines of the amendment is, I believe, significant. Obviously no such approaches have been made to members in this Chamber, and I think this supports my view that all of the retail trading organizations support the Government's intention to have this provision operate as from January 1. A further complication that would exist if this amendment were accepted is that the extended list of exempted goods would not be available outside normal trading hours until July 1. Therefore, I submit that the amendment does not serve any useful purpose; in fact, it would create difficulties of the kind that the Bill seeks to remove.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The former junior Minister has made a totally inadequate explanation of why the Government refuses to accept this most reasonable amendment. I should have hoped that the Legislative Council would throw this legislation right out the window. That was apparently too much to hope for.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'd have liked that.

Mr. HALL: If I can make myself heard over the President of the South Australian Labor Party, who exerts an overwhelming influence on the Front Bench, may I say that although the Council has not decided to throw out this most oppressive legislation at least it has given a period in which people affected can get used to the idea that they will be dictatorially told that they will no longer be able to carry on business after 5.30 p.m. on Fridays, which is the restriction desired to be enforced by the Government. Even the businessmen so ardent in their advocacy of restricting the people concerned

in this matter will be the first to admit that these people will have made financial arrangements which will involve them for much longer than the period the Government has given them to work in. Is it unfair to give these people six months to wind up their affairs in respect of the late trading that will be removed from them? Would any member opposite say that it is fair to insist that trading on Friday nights and weekends shall cease from January 1?

Mr. Slater: Yes.

Mr. HALL: One member says that it is fair to see people who have leased plant, equipment and so on have their ability to make repayments on that equipment diminished as a result of a reduction in trading hours. This trading opportunity will be removed from them on January 1, and some members opposite say that that is fair. That demonstrates their attitude towards people in this community: let those members be known by that attitude. In moving around the districts affected by the change in trading hours, I have found Labor voters absolutely astounded that the Government should do this to them.

*Members interjecting:*

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order!

Mr. HALL: Many of those voters are not yet ready to vote for the Liberal and Country League, but they are astounded that their champions, who through public relations over the years have sold themselves as the people's representatives and the friends of the workers, have suddenly turned on them with a poisonous and venomous sting and, by their iron-fisted and dictatorial attitude, have removed from these people the right to continue to enjoy activities that they have enjoyed until now. Having put forward concern for people who want to retain the facilities they have, I am pleased to see the Council exert its influence by giving the people involved six months to get used to this idea. No member opposite who represents one of the districts concerned would deny (and I challenge these members to deny it) that it is fair that these people should have six months in which to wind up their businesses in respect of the direction of the Government about trading hours.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why not six years?

Mr. HALL: We know that no member opposite who represents these areas will say that what I have said is unfair. No doubt there is good reason why the former Minister

of Labour and Industry has been removed from that position. I have read in the newspaper that "please explain" notices will be sent to 23,000 people in the community.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader is not dealing with the motion that the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to; I must ask him to speak to that motion.

Mr. HALL: I accept your ruling, Sir, that I may not discuss the ineptitude of the Minister in this regard. The amendment gives some little extension of time to those who will suffer. Apparently it does not matter to the Government that people will suffer. The interjections of members opposite indicate that the Government is heartless on this question and simply does not care. I am sure all members on this side cannot agree to the attitude expressed by the Government. I express sincere regret that the public will be pushed around by the Government once again in this way. The Government has the numbers in this place to steamroll the Opposition and so to steamroll the public. Members opposite representing the districts concerned have fully explained that they have made a pledge which causes them to vote, in this case, against the people in their districts by supporting the Minister's motion. At least I am free to express my own view on this matter and I will vote against the motion, knowing that those members who represent these districts and who, because of the discipline of their Party, vote with the Minister, are with me in principle.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In this case, the immature Leader has given us an example of the way in which he has tackled the question of shopping hours right from the time the Government first introduced its proposals. After I had concluded my remarks, he leapt to his feet and attacked the Government, saying that we had put forward no reason why we were taking the steps we were taking in this matter. He said that despite the fact that he had walked into the Chamber only two minutes before I completed my remarks and had not heard my remarks.

Mr. Millhouse: I told him what you had said.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the honourable member could pass on to anyone an accurate account of anything that went on in this place, I would be surprised.

Mr. Millhouse: You said so little.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: What the honourable member told the Leader must have

been completely inaccurate or the Leader would not have made such a fool of himself. He suggested that there was no logical reason why six months' notice should not be given in this case. For his benefit, I point out that I told honourable members earlier that the referendum legislation, which spelt out clearly what the Government intended to do, was introduced on August 13.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't go over that again.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Obviously the member for Mitcham did not tell the Leader this, or the Leader would not have made the remarks he made. On October 14, the Bill to reduce the trading hours to 5.30 p.m. on Friday nights throughout the greater metropolitan area was introduced. Therefore, sufficient warning has been given. The retail trading organizations believe this measure is justified and completely support the Government in this matter. The Leader should have learnt after last Saturday, when the Liberal Party—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister cannot refer to matters that do not come within the scope of the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before getting to my feet I deliberately hesitated to see whether any of the members whose districts were concerned in this matter would get up to defend the attitude put forward by the Minister. I notice that all of them are studiously otherwise engaged and apparently none of them intends to speak. In his second round, the Minister of Conservation has said that the Government's attitude in insisting that this Bill operate from January 1 has the backing of the retail trade organizations. That does not surprise me, but what surprises me is that the Minister ignores the views of those who will also be affected, namely, the people living in the areas where this type of late-night trading now exists. Apparently, their views mean nothing to the Minister, as they mean nothing to their own Parliamentary representatives.

I consider that the view put by the Leader of the Opposition is correct. It is now about five weeks from January 1, from which date this legislation will apply if the Government gets its way. The Minister has said that he introduced the Bill for the referendum on shopping hours in August and that, therefore, people have had an opportunity since then to put their affairs in order and be ready for this legislation to operate. That begs the question, because neither he nor anyone else on the Government

benches expected the result of the referendum to be as it was, and to say that people, by the mere introduction of a Bill for a referendum, were given notice that they would be robbed of their right to both buy and sell during the later hours of the day is absurd, as the Minister knows.

After the referendum campaign we had three weeks of uncertainty, when no-one knew whether the Government would go ahead with its undertaking, given before the referendum, to "honour" the result or whether it would wobble sufficiently to go back on that, and no Minister would tell us during that time what the Government would do. Until the Bill came into this House (and this is making the most generous assumption to the Minister) people in South Australia did not know what would happen. It was kept a closely guarded secret then, because it was not until the Saturday morning preceding, when the secret meeting was held, at which the trade union leaders told the Government what to do, that a decision was made.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now, that is—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I have pointed out to honourable members that we are dealing with the motion that the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to, and honourable members must speak to the motion under consideration.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In my submission, I was speaking to it, because I was canvassing the events that led up to it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not allowed to canvass them. We are dealing with the motion that has been moved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well: I think I have made the point sufficiently, in any case. All that the Legislative Council's amendment asks is that this legislation be delayed for six months to allow persons to put their affairs in order. The Minister has referred to the remarks in this morning's newspaper. I remind him that the Mayors of Elizabeth and Salisbury, who were at one time called dingoes, I think, by one of the members for those areas (there was a retraction, and I say that in fairness to him; I think that to retract that statement was the right thing to do) have commented about this matter of trading. Why the Minister considers that they should not be regarded, being the chief citizens of cities that are concerned in this matter—

Mr. Groth: They're voicing their own opinion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Salisbury says that they are voicing their own opinion and I see by the expression on the face of the member for Elizabeth that he also said something, but I did not hear it. The referendum result shows that those mayors are voicing not only their own opinion but the opinion of an overwhelming number of persons living in their cities. This amendment is a small concession to make to compensate for the upheaval in business activity that will be caused to people in areas where late-night shopping is now extant, and I consider that we should support it. I was indeed surprised that the Minister of Conservation moved this motion. One would have expected that the new Minister of Labour and Industry, whose responsibility this Bill now is, would have been only too anxious to prove himself—

Mr. Hall: And pick up the wreckage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and to pick up the wreckage, as the Leader says. Only last Wednesday evening I said that the Minister of Conservation had introduced only one major piece of legislation—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and that was a disaster.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member does not take notice of the Chair, he will be ruled right out of order.

Mr. Clark: This is deliberate and cheeky.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently, the Minister of Conservation considers that he must nurse his colleague and finish the mess that he began. It is a sorry mess, but we could make it less so if we accepted this amendment.

Mr. HARRISON: Once again the Leader of the Opposition has thrown out challenges to the Government, saying that members on this side were not game enough to say something on this matter. He claimed that an injustice would be done if operation of the present trading hours was not extended until July 1 next. He claimed that to do otherwise would be unfair and he challenged the Government members to say that it would be fair. Well, I am saying that it is fair. I accept his challenge and indicate that January 1 is a fair date to fix, as this would do justice, not injustice.

The Leader of the Opposition used the word "injustice" in relation to some people, but I say that fixing January 1 as the date will do justice to the people who have suffered for many years because of the unfair trading practices adopted on Friday night, and on Saturday afternoon and Sunday. The fixing of January 1 as the date for closing these shops on Friday night will remove all those anomalies, and this will be welcomed by most of the people concerned, although the Leader of the Opposition claims that it would be fair for them to have an extension until July 1. The Leader's statement was ridiculous, because before the referendum the Government had said that it would accept the wishes of the people and, therefore, immediately the decision was given, the people and businesses affected would have known that the decision was against them and that they would have to accept it. These persons will have had from September until January 1 next, about three months, and that is a fair time. The Legislative Council wants to fix July 1, for an ulterior motive, namely, to keep the issue alive. The Legislative Council will kick a dead horse until it almost starts to kick again. I sincerely hope that January 1 is accepted as the date, because that date does justice. I support the motion.

Mr. HALL: It is a matter of dead ambitions, not of dead horses. Livelihoods will be affected severely. The member for Salisbury has said that the persons concerned with trading in these areas knew that the decision would be against them. He is therefore admitting by his very defence of the Minister that this will act to the detriment of these people. The honourable member does not deny that, as he said that the Government stated it would abide by the result of the referendum. The Opposition is merely saying that this action should not be taken so urgently and dramatically.

Mr. Harrison: That's unfair trading practices: that's my explanation of it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member, by his interjections, adds nothing coherent to his argument. However, I do not want to continue the old argument. The people concerned have certain rights, and nothing but six months' grace is being offered to them. The Minister apparently speaks for the Government, the Premier and the traders, but what

traders does he speak for? I should like to read a letter sent to me by G. J. Coles and Company Limited.

Mr. Payne: Is this one of those—

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is so vocal in his interjections. Does he say that this is a small trading company or that it should detract from the South Australian trading scene? Does he say that it is a company that South Australia does not want? If the honourable member does not want it, let him say so; I merely said that the company sent me a letter on November 13, enclosing a copy of a letter sent to the Premier on the same day, part of which is as follows:

My company is greatly concerned at the proposed changes in retail trading hours in South Australia, and our Chairman and Managing Director (Mr. N. C. Coles) has written to the Rt. Hon. The Premier on this matter. Our Chairman has asked me to inform you of this and a copy of his official letter, setting out the company's views, together with my covering letter, is attached for your information.

The following letter was sent to the Premier on the same day:

My company is greatly concerned at the proposed changes in retail trading hours and our Chairman and Managing Director (Mr. N. C. Coles) has asked me to place before you the views of our company on this matter. In support of our Chairman's letter to you, I would also like to mention some other factors which, as State Manager, I think warrant full consideration to the request to delay any action for a period of at least two years. Where the establishment of retailing outlets has taken place as part of a Housing Trust development, it has been necessary to build in line with the trust's programme. This requires the facilities to be provided before the completion and occupancy of all homes. For this reason, Friday night trading has been necessary to allow tenants of retail outlets to establish their businesses and at the same time to provide a facility which is necessary to the public in those areas.

It is also pointed out that services other than retail stores have been provided in our centres in many of these areas and I refer to such services as post offices, banks, Mothers and Babies Health centres, medical clinics, libraries, and so on. Having established shopping centres and facilities in Friday night trading areas it is, I think, reasonable to expect that if any change is contemplated then retailers would be given time to effect adjustments. It would therefore be appreciated if further consideration could be given to the maintenance of the *status quo* for a period of at least two years.

That letter was sent to the Premier on November 13.

Mr. Groth: Dummy!



Mr. HALL: The member for Salisbury is obviously suggesting that this letter was written at my behest, but I absolutely deny that. The honourable member's remark is yet another slur cast by him on a reputable South Australian trading company. I also have a copy of another letter that was sent to the Premier on November 11, part of which is as follows:

Your attention is directed to the great concern this company feels about the proposal by your Government to legislate and end Friday night shopping in certain areas of the State of South Australia. Although it is not clear when this ban will commence, we must record our opposition, as we believe it will create a great deal of hardship to companies such as ours, which have completed developments including the erection of shopping centres and free-standing supermarkets, thus incurring considerable capital expenditure running into millions of dollars, on the basis that late Friday shopping would be a feature of the area in which these developments were established. A late shopping night has a very definite effect on the overall pattern of trading in these areas and the reduction of sales by banning late shopping will have a very marked downward effect on the results of the units so affected. We would cite as a typical example Reynella, where the company has incurred considerable capital expenditure in the provision of the shopping centre which includes a number of shops, one of which is a large modern Coles New World Supermarket. This development was in co-operation with the Reynella City Council and a very important factor in the economics of the whole scheme was the augmented trade which would be brought because shops would open on Friday nights.

There is more to this letter in the same vein, not all of which I will read. However, the last paragraph of the letter states:

We believe that a decision which your Government is now considering should take into account conditions which have existed for many years and which have been undoubtedly appreciated by the shopping public in the areas mentioned. In this respect we further believe that your Government should be prepared to maintain the *status quo* in this matter for a period of at least two years before the introduction of the new shopping hours. You will appreciate that an alteration of hours as at present under consideration would require shopkeepers generally to adjust financial planning to accommodate the change and also to adjust staffing arrangements. We would strongly urge you to give further consideration to this point of view, not particularly in the interests of any individual company but in the interests of the community as a whole.

That letter is signed by Mr. N. C. Coles (Chairman and Managing Director of G. J. Coles and Company Limited). The obvious result of this is that a large company, one of many interested in South Australia, will gain a bad impression of what the South Australian

Government stands for, and this at a time when South Australia is trying to counter competition from other States. Trying to sell itself as a forward-looking State, South Australia is again throwing away one of its inbuilt advantages: its late night shopping. This aspect has set us apart from the other States and has given us an advantage, of which people in other States would approve. However, we are to destroy it under the heel of Labor policy.

Only recently I heard a prominent South Australian citizen say how much we in Adelaide need to have activities outside the 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. period and how we needed to expand our activities and spread them over a protracted period of the day. Would members opposite like to know the name of that prominent South Australian citizen? His name is D. A. Dunstan (Premier of South Australia): only last week he opened new commercial premises in Adelaide and, considering the policy of his Party, made that rather fantastic statement. It is easy for one to see what view he took at the secret meeting held recently in one of our northern suburbs. Obviously, his policy was more than offset by the weight of opinion of the representatives of his Party.

Can we afford to ignore the statements of a man as prominent as the man whose letter I have just read? South Australians tend sometimes to be a little insular in the face of the competition that exists in other States, and they tend to ignore the tremendous effect that activities in the metropolitan areas of Sydney and Melbourne are having on the development of Australia, as well as on the widening development of the industrial communities around those two great Australian centres, which are advancing at a greater rate than is the case in South Australia. If we give away or suppress the features that have attracted industries to this State in the past, on which industries our success story as a State has been based, we will no longer progress, and the responsibility will lie with the members of the Government front bench. That is why I oppose the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I, too, should have expected that the new Minister of Labour and Industry, after his self-acknowledged victory for the trade union side of his Party, would be dealing with this matter, which is probably the most important one involving his portfolio during the normal life of a Parliament. I suggest that the Government would be wise to accept this modest amendment and that ample reasons

exist for doing so on the grounds of simple justice. By this legislation, we are, leaving aside the matter concerning Friday night trading, delivering a sharp blow to those people, small investors as well as large, who have invested money in establishments in the areas concerned. It is now suggested that these people should have a further six months in which to rearrange their affairs.

I noticed that a member on the Government side a few minutes ago said that these people had had three months in which to rearrange their affairs, but that is not so. Even if agreement were reached and the Bill passed through both Chambers today, it would still not become law for another day or so, and that would really only leave December. What chance would the proprietors of those shops, which will have to undergo considerable structural alterations in accordance with the list of exemptions, have of effecting those alterations during December? Nor would there be much chance in January, because, as everyone knows, builders are generally on holidays during that month.

We are expecting an almost impossible task from those people affected by the list of exemptions. The main point, however, is that these people in the areas concerned have a considerable investment that has already been deeply affected by the loss of weekend trading. Although I do not know much about the northern areas, I am familiar with the southern areas, including Aldinga, Aldinga Beach, Port Noarlunga, Christies Beach, Reynella and Morphett Vale, in which areas trading will be affected, thereby affecting also the investments of many people, including small investors. Nothing is heard from the member for the district.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet he is sitting here.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The trading of shops in these areas will be cut off as at January 1, if the Government has its way. I suggest the Government would be wise to regard the amendment as providing a comparatively modest extension; if it takes my advice, it will accept the amendment quietly, and the legislation would then go through without any further fuss.

Dr. TONKIN: In spite of the Minister's explanation, it is apparent that the Government does not intend to consider the needs and requirements of the people in the fringe areas who voted overwhelmingly in favour of late-night shopping. I suggest to the member for Albert Park, who referred to the

Leader as being immature, that, once again, this Government is displaying a complete lack of maturity. People do matter: the majority demands to be considered, but minorities deserve special consideration to ensure that they are not victimized in any way. The provisions of the amendment are reasonable and go a little way towards helping the people who are committed financially to make other arrangements and to find other jobs. The Labor Party, which is supposed to care for people, including minorities, obviously has no thought whatever but for its own reputation and a thought that it is always right. I condemn the Government's attitude.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that the amendment is completely reasonable. But for the inexperience of some members, an amendment would have been made to the Bill before it left this Chamber, and it would have suggested a far greater period than the six months we are now considering. This afternoon we have seen several examples of the Government's lack of lines of communication, which has been suspected for some time and which has now become apparent. In an interjection, a member used the word "dummy" in relation to the Leader's referring to a letter. At that time members opposite looked at the same document. Why were the contents of the document withheld from so many people for so long? Several members opposite conveniently failed to keep up with things happening in the districts that they represent. It was stated that the Mayors of Elizabeth and Salisbury had put forward their own opinions.

However, the member for Salisbury would know that the meeting he attended at the youth centre at Salisbury was called at the direction of the Salisbury council, and that the Elizabeth council directed that a deputation come to this Parliament last week to intervene on behalf of the city of Elizabeth and to make representations to the Premier, the Leader and to other persons (I do not know the full list of persons concerned) for an extension of time to benefit the people they represent and for the matter to be further considered. It is no good for members conveniently to forget these facts. Members representing areas concerned should take stock of what is happening and reconsider the matter. In my district, the Gawler Chamber of Commerce suggested that late shopping should be permitted to continue at least in the

Gawler area. Therefore, that traders' organization does not share the views of other organizations that have been listed in the press. By virtue of voting for the Leader's amendments originally, I failed to receive a telegram from the Myer Emporium (South Australia) Limited congratulating me for my action; I am glad that I did not receive such a telegram, and I do not look for one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are members opposite not going to defend the position? Each time I have spoken, I have waited deliberately before getting up to see whether the member for Mawson, who has been in this Chamber throughout the discussion, the member for Playford, who has now come in, or the member for Tea Tree Gully, who I think has been in the Chamber all the time, would get up to defend the motion moved by the former Minister.

Mr. Hopgood: This is an Opposition filibuster.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not a filibuster: this is an important matter for the honourable member's electors. Let me put one additional point in the hope that he or the member for Playford will defend the vote that I am sure they will give on this occasion.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Dead right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that is the hand of the master again. This is a Caucus decision that members opposite have to abide by, whatever the consequences. I ask them to think of this point: I have several acquaintances and friends, particularly in the Elizabeth area, who have talked to me about this matter from time to time. One chap, who lives in Elizabeth, is an English migrant who works on Friday evenings in one of the shops in the area, his wife working there too.

Mr. Groth: Where does he work the rest of the week?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but he has a regular job. The honourable member should listen, for I am sure that this affects people in his district as well as people in the District of Mawson. This man said to me, "It is the extra earnings we pick up on a Friday night that allow us to pay the instalments on our car. If we are robbed of this right to work on Friday night and if our income drops because of this, we will not be able to make the payments on our car or to run it." That situation could undoubtedly be repeated many thousands of times in the areas represented (and the word should be inverted

commas) by the members for Mawson, Playford, Tea Tree Gully, and others. Their vote will create a great deal of financial distress for people living in their districts who will be robbed of a chance to augment family incomes by working overtime on Friday night. I ask these members to consider this aspect of the matter and at least to speak on it before a vote is taken. The member for Elizabeth is now in the Chamber, and this matter affects people in his district, too. This is not merely a matter of shopping convenience. Through that convenience, which is enjoyed by so many thousands, hundreds of people who augment their income will not be able to maintain their standard of living if this legislation operates. The amendment suggests a six months' respite. In view of these arguments, I ask the Government to relent in its attitude. I suggest to members whose districts are vitally concerned that they consider and speak to the arguments that have been put forward.

Mr. McANANEY: I give qualified support to the amendment. Some convincing arguments have been put forward that there should be a waiting period. At no time could I condone the suggestion that a minority group should be allowed indefinitely to have trading conditions different from those that apply to other people. The Government may say that the vote has shown what the people want, but we must remember that other persons live on the other side of the street, and we cannot be guided by such a weak argument. We must do justice to everyone, and that is why I give qualified support to the amendment, which gives persons a longer time to adjust to the new trading conditions. The trade unions have been dogmatic in their approach to this matter. Instead of looking after their own interests, they should look after the interests of the people and allow a roster to be drawn up so that employees could work voluntarily on Friday evening or Saturday. I support the amendment, but I would support a longer trading period if the trade unions thought of the people rather than of themselves.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. I do not agree that an injustice arises because shops on one side of the street may open while those on the other side may not. If we close down something, someone loses. Therefore, there is some injustice to those being closed down and this amendment gives an opportunity to even out financial resources, before the rope is pulled more tightly around.

the neck. I do not agree that the Government is thinking of trade union members in closing shops. I think the Government is taking away an opportunity to work, and we should encourage people to use initiative to earn extra money. That is one reason why I support the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister has said that the amendment would increase the period of time in which the people would be denied the right to purchase the extra exempt goods, because all features of the legislation were tied together, and that this denial would disadvantage our constituents. However, I say that the persons who will be denied the opportunity of making arrangements about hire-purchase and other financial commitments would be at a far greater disadvantage than those who would not be able to purchase extra goods for a further six months. These goods would be available on the other days of the week. Social issues will arise from denying persons the opportunity to work for the extra period.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller) and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hoppood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

*Amendments Nos. 2 to 6.*

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 to 6 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Amendment No. 7.*

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move to amend the Legislative Council's amendment as follows:

In new subclause (7) to strike out "not".

The Legislative Council has set out in more detail a provision that was contained in the Bill when it left this Chamber, but has included a new provision (to which the Government objects) that provides that voting at a poll shall not be compulsory. Members will recall

that the provision for conducting a poll replaces the petitioning arrangement. A council, having obtained the views of its residents, may apply to create or abolish a country shopping district. Under the present Act a petition can be presented to the Government, but it is not compulsory for people to sign it. The significant difference between the present provision and when it left this Chamber is that the Legislative Council is insisting that, if a poll has to be taken, the vote shall not be compulsory. This proposal is unacceptable to the Government, because, if a voluntary poll is taken whether to create or abolish a shopping district within the country districts of the State, it is apparent that the same pressures that are used under the petitioning system will be used by groups of people who will be interested in the result of the poll, and they will campaign for people to support their point of view. If it was proposed to abolish a shopping district the Shop Assistants' Union would be opposed to it. As a result, the Government could be faced with the position that, if a poll were not conducted with a compulsory vote, it would receive a minority view of the people, and that is undesirable.

Mr. HALL: The Minister is saying that it is wrong to obtain the result of a poll at which interested people vote. What is wrong with the Government's receiving the views of people who care and who are affected by the question of shopping hours? Why should people who are not concerned be asked to submit to a propaganda campaign, such as that employed at the last referendum, which the Minister realizes wrecked what he thought would be the result of that vote? It is nonsense to reject the result of a poll if that result shows what the people want. The Minister said that a poll could be held in the country if a nebulous uninformed group of people decided that there was enough interest to require one. What sort of people is he talking about?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You haven't read the Bill.

Mr. HALL: What sort of uninterested pressure group would initiate a poll? Is it the same group as the group in my district that is talking about reinstating the Bluebird service?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause being considered has nothing to do with the Bluebird service.

Mr. HALL: Very well, Sir. One wonders what will happen if this sort of attitude prevails. The Minister cannot explain what sort of popular movement will result in a poll being

conducted on the shopping hours the local people want. Who will frame the question? Will it be the same sort of inept question that the Government put to the people at the last referendum, or will it be the sort of question that will not enable the people to express their true opinion? I am certain that had the people not been compelled to vote, there would have been a majority of "Yes" votes at the recent referendum. This would have suited many retailers to a far greater degree than has the present result, and tens of thousands of people would not have been forced to vote "No", thinking that they were voting to retain the *status quo*. If a voluntary vote were taken, it would enable the views of only the sectional group interested in the matter to be obtained. There is no reason why a large group, unaffected by trading hours, should be required to vote on their retention or otherwise. Conversely, there is every reason why those interested should be given a say. This is the principle behind voluntary voting, a principle which is accepted by most Governments throughout the world and which could and should apply in this respect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the Leader in what he has said. However, the Opposition is unfortunately up against a brick wall. The Labor Party believes in compulsory voting for every sort of election on all matters and, therefore, it cannot afford to accept the Legislative Council's amendment. Again, I suppose the Opposition will be overruled, although what the Leader said was correct. This is a matter that will concern sections of the community in a certain area. Why on earth should those people not be permitted to express their opinions, and why should those who have no opinion or have not sufficient interest to go to the poll be forced to vote and express an opinion that is worthless because they have no interest in the matter? It is incorrect for the Minister to say that everyone has to be given the opportunity to express his opinion. By making this a voluntary vote, we are not robbing anyone of an opportunity to express his opinion: we are merely saying that those who want to express their opinion may take the opportunity to do so. That is not robbing anyone of an opportunity to vote. Indeed, it is a good idea and, if one looks at the other parts of the amendment that are acceptable to the Government, conforms completely with the suggestion that there should be a voluntary vote.

The Committee divided on the amendment to the Legislative Council's amendment:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller) and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

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

*Amendments Nos. 8 to 13.*

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 8 to 13 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 was adopted:

Because the amendment would cause unnecessary delay in the implementation of the legislation.

*Later:*

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendment No. 1, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed, and that it disagreed to the House of Assembly's amendment to its amendment No. 7.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That disagreement to amendment No. 1, and the amendment to amendment No. 7 be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Broomhill, Eastick, Hall, McKee and McRae.

#### HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

Council's amendment:

Page 2, line 16 (clause 3)—Leave out "substantial".

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

For completely different reasons from those advanced in the Legislative Council, I intend to accept this amendment. The reason for

the original wording of the provision was to overcome a difficulty that had been created by the former Government in general and by the former Minister of Roads and Transport in particular, when the former Administration thrust the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan on the people of Adelaide, and then completely confused not only the public but also itself by deferring some aspects of this plan. All in all, the juggling undertaken by the former Government left people in certain areas virtually without an open market for the sale of their properties, and this involved the Highways Department. The Act currently provides that the Highways Commissioner can purchase property, but only for specific purposes. The specific purpose in this case was for roads that were intended to be built. The former Government announced that it intended to adopt the M.A.T.S. plan, which had provided for a Hills freeway and expressway, and subsequently withdrew these proposals. It was not only hopelessly and utterly confused in doing this, but it also confused the general public. We have tried to get out of the mess that the previous Government created.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Members opposite can laugh. However, I suggest that the member for Flinders might inquire of his predecessor (Hon. Sir Glen Pearson), who would have more knowledge of the finances of the State than any Opposition member and who would tell the honourable member that the properties purchased under duress were financed by the Treasury and not by the Highways Department. This means that the money used to try to keep some sort of faith with the public by purchasing properties was not available to be used for education, health and so on. That is why we have introduced an amendment to enable the Highways Commissioner on the authority of the Minister to purchase properties notwithstanding the positive proposition for the building of a road. In the relevant clause there are three definite criteria about which the Minister must be satisfied. The amendment moved by Hon. Murray Hill in the other place is not nation rocking, and if that is all that Opposition members in the other place can find wrong with the Bill it must be a fairly good Bill. It is frivolous to take out the word "substantial". I defy the Hon. Mr. Hill or any Opposition member to define what "substantial" means.

Dr. Tonkin: Why was it in there in the first place?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because we believe there should be some form of qualification. If the honourable member looks through the Statutes, he will see the word "substantial" commonly used to provide a degree by which something occurs. This Bill provides that the Minister must be satisfied, so it does not matter one iota if the word "substantial" is there. I assure members that I will not need much satisfaction before I issue a certificate, which I will do if there are any problems whatever. We could go further, cutting out the word "hardship" and putting in a much milder term than that. The amendment is frivolous and does not alter the purpose of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: I support the amendment, but I cannot accept all that the Minister has said. He said that "substantial" was difficult to define. I should say it is a most confusing word in the legislation in which it appears. It has been dealt with by the courts in relation to urban farm lands under the Local Government Act. The Minister has said that the word can be removed from this Bill, and that he will still be the person making the decision. However, the presence of the word could have meant that some people might fail to apply for consideration, because they considered that the word meant at least 50 per cent, as has been found by the courts in regard to the Local Government Act.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not true.

Dr. EASTICK: The courts have defined "substantial" as meaning 50 per cent or greater.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Not for urban farm lands.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and I will provide references. One case related to lands which were vineyards in the Marion area. Judge Gillespie brought down this decision, and I will supply it and another case for the benefit of the Minister. I am more than happy that this word has been struck out of the clause. An alternative that would help people who may apply would be to have a distinct percentage referred to.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL (VOTING AGE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from November 19. Page 2896.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose parts of this Bill. I do not believe the age at which a person can vote should be reduced to 18.

years while there is compulsory voting. If we give to persons 18 years of age in this State or in Australia the right to vote, in terms of the various Constitutions in Australia, we shall be the only country that I know of in the Western world that has compulsory voting for this group. We must consider that when we are considering the effect of this Bill. I agree with the provision that gives to ministers of religion the right to stand for election to Parliament. However, I disagree with some comments made by the Attorney-General in his second reading explanation. He states:

The proposed granting of franchise to the age group between 18 years and 21 years is consistent with the policy of this Government, whereby persons within that age group are recognized as a force in the community as potentially responsible citizens.

I wonder whether the Attorney-General means that he hopes these persons are responsible or that they have the potential to be so. I admit that young people of today are just as responsible as were those of past years. I also admit that they have a wider education, which they need if they are to survive in the world of today. However, that does not mean that they are more mature or more responsible than the younger generation of days gone by.

The Attorney also refers to the right to vote, in relation to the provisions in the Bill. However, he is not giving them the right to vote but is telling them that they shall vote, or be fined if they are unable to give a suitable reason for not voting. He also states (as I and other members said during the last State election campaign) that we are dealing with the best educated generation in our history, a generation that possesses political consciousness. I agree that a percentage of our young people has an extremely high degree of political consciousness. If voting were voluntary, these people would contribute much to Parliamentary elections and to Parliament and I do not deny that it might be right to give these people that opportunity. However, the Bill also makes voting compulsory for persons in that age group who have no political consciousness. I realize that people in our community in an older age group also have no political consciousness, and what I have said applies also to that group in relation to compulsory voting. Compulsory voting is not needed and should not be introduced. The Attorney-General also states in his explanation:

Therefore, the principle that the right to vote should be conferred on people at the age of 18 years has now won recognition throughout the Commonwealth of Australia and, indeed, is spreading very rapidly through the whole of the western democratic world.

I wonder what the Attorney-General means by "the whole of the western democratic world." What countries have either compulsory or voluntary voting for 18-year-olds? The records show that few countries have this system. The member for Playford has said that the Bill is one of the most important pieces of social legislation to come before an Australian Parliament in our generation. The honourable member sees this as a piece of social legislation, but I wonder whether the Government team will be allowed to vote on this matter according to conscience or whether the vote will be on Party lines, because I understand that the Labor Party's platform provides for giving to 18-year-olds the right to vote. I do not think the Labor Party will regard this as a social issue, because the Leader of that Party did not imply, in a statement in the *Advertiser* of May 25 last, that that was the case. That report states:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday that Labor would introduce legislation but drinking and betting at 18 would be a matter for a free vote.

He was referring to giving the vote to 18-year-olds but he did not include that in his reference to a free vote. However, the member for Playford considers that this is a social issue and I wonder whether the issue will be considered that way when the vote is taken. The honourable member also spoke of the right to vote, but voting by compulsion is no right. The third point made by the member for Playford was the same as that made by the Attorney-General about persons being more responsible now than they were in the past, and I have said that I do not consider the young people of today to be more responsible than were young people previously.

I ask members to consider the case of two young persons aged 15 years attending high schools, both with about the same academic capacity. One decides to become apprenticed to a trade and the other continues at school and, when he reaches 18 years, goes to university. I doubt that there would be any difference between the two when they reached 18 years, in regard to maturity to face responsibility in society.

I do not consider that education necessarily makes a person more mature, and that is the only fair way to consider this issue. Young people should be given the opportunity to blend into society and accept responsibility after they have completed their education and settled down as citizens. They do not necessarily want the responsibility of having to vote, or other responsibilities. These are burdens to them if they are still studying. The member for Playford also states:

In some cases this situation becomes so extreme that these people have dropped out of our society and created their own society, based on self-interest and drugs.

He is dealing there with whether young people perhaps are retaliating against our way of life and against society. This has always been the case. There has always been a group that considers the present way of life to be wrong and ought to be changed, and the voting age does not make any difference to that matter. The member for Playford has said that many people are not willing to consider change. I have considered it and, because I come down on a different side of the fence from him, he says I am wrong. I do not say that he is wrong, but that I have considered the matter. One must go on one side of the fence or the other. One of the benefits of being a member of this Chamber is that one must make a decision that he thinks is the best decision for the community, not for expediency or because a certain decision benefits one Party. It is wrong to say that people have not considered the matter.

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

Mr. EVANS: The member for Playford also said:

Our parents and grandparents thought that, by changing the distribution of wealth in the community and providing a better education for all, they would cause the problems of society inevitably to vanish. In fact, the reverse has occurred.

He also said:

On the contrary, people are confused, bewildered, full of doubts, and sometimes despairing in the face of all this accumulated new knowledge.

This proves my point that it is all right to have the knowledge if it can be put into practice effectively for the benefit of society. The member for Playford admits that he doubts whether what our parents and grandparents thought was desirable for society to give young people (that is, all this knowledge) has proved that they are using it to benefit society. I am sure that forcing them to vote at the polls would

not improve the situation, but I believe that if they were given the right to vote voluntarily the situation would be improved. The member for Playford said:

The faith and hope that was previously supplied by religion have been severely shaken, as religion tries to adjust to the discoveries of the twentieth century.

I think we will all agree that possibly one of the faults in our society is that churches have lost their grip on people. Whether that will apply in the long term I do not know, but we seem to be floundering. We seem to be looking for leadership: it may come, but at present I do not think we have it. The member for Playford also referred to Vietnam, the moratorium, and wars. I will not canvass the moratorium and Vietnam, but he said that young people did not believe in wars. I do not believe that old people believe in wars, either, but sometimes they are inevitable. Our grandparents and parents fought in the First World War (a war to end all wars), and the Second World War was also considered in the same vein. However, we have to accept that while people believe in material gains more than in anything else and in helping themselves instead of helping others (and that comes back to us here) wars will be inevitable. Whether it be a family war or a war on a larger scale, whilst we have greed in our society we will have wars.

The member for Mitcham said that the Prime Minister had said that the reduction in age would be made by the time of the next election: that is, the 1972 House of Representatives election. The Prime Minister did not say that in the press release. On May 21 he said that further talks on the voting age were expected and that he had no doubt there would be some discussion between the Commonwealth and the States on the lowering of the voting age. Before the last Commonwealth election the Prime Minister said that he expected 18-year-olds to have the vote in time for the 1972 House of Representatives poll. He only expected it: he did not say that they would have the vote. He admitted that he had not discussed it with his Party. He said that he personally expected it, but he did not say (as the member for Mitcham said he did) that it would be introduced by 1972.

The member for Mitcham said that it was happening in the United Kingdom and in the United States of America but, most important of all, it was happening in Australia and that is why we must come in, too. If we honestly



believe it not to be correct to lower the age to 18 years, there is no need for us to play follow the leader. We can set an example by being the first to have it at, say, 20 years, if necessary, or to leave it at 21 years. We could be the first State to decide what we should do.

The Hon. L. J. King: Does the converse follow: if we believe it should be 18 years, should we go ahead irrespective of what others think?

Mr. EVANS: Does the Attorney-General believe that if we accept the age of 20 years we should legislate for that age and see whether the other States will follow us?

The Hon. L. J. King: Of course I do, if that is our state of mind, but that is not so.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mitcham said that the Bill gives entitlement to people to vote and that it does not make voting compulsory or decide whether voting shall be voluntary or compulsory. The former Attorney is wrong in this statement. It does not give young people an entitlement to vote: it gives them the entitlement to enrol, and once they are enrolled they are compelled to vote. Once a person is enrolled and exercises the right (if one can call it that) to vote once, he will be compelled to vote in the future or pay a fine. I believe that that situation is wrong, and I have always said that. Many members have referred to countries that have changed. One example has been the United States of America, and I should like to discuss its present position. In the magazine *Time* of January 31, 1969, an article appeared about an organization called Luv, which means Let us Vote. The person behind this organization was Dennis Warren, who was 21 years of age, a pre-law student at the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California. The article states:

A total of 153 congressional resolutions to amend the Constitution to allow 18-year-olds to vote has been introduced in Congress since 1943 and all have failed.

Mr. Payne: Including the war in Vietnam, where they have the same thinking!

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Mitchell wants to go on yacking, he can. It seems that President Nixon has had the normal trouble getting what he wants from a Democrat Congress, but last week he got what he did not want and did not need, and that was a package Bill from the Senate. The Bill included the provision to allow 18-year-olds to vote, which is something which the President believed in but which he thought

was unconstitutional to introduce by this method. When he finally signed the document introducing it as law, he and his Government faced the challenge of a law suit on which judgment has not yet been brought down. America is in difficulties in putting into operation the law that Senate and Congress passed. I shall now quote from the *United States News and World Report* dated November 23, 1970, a copy of which it was not easy for me to obtain today. Part of that article is as follows:

Nine more States have just gone on record opposing the vote for youngsters. It's a rebuff at the polls of a federal law lowering voting age to 18. The idea of giving the vote to teenagers—already passed into law by Congress—is running into opposition around the United States. It went largely unnoticed in the immediate aftermath of the latest election, but in 14 States where a lower voting age was proposed on the ballot, nine went against it. Since 1952, 19 States have turned back proposals to lower the voting age from the traditional 21 years. Despite that, Congress on last June 17 approved a new law giving 18-year-olds the right to vote in all national, State or local elections after January 1, 1971. This new federal law would take effect even in those States where lowerage proposals have been defeated.

The article later continues:

High Court to rule: The question is now before the U.S. Supreme Court. A decision may be handed down before the first of the year. If the federal law is upheld, there will be 11,400,000 people of voting age under 21 by 1972, in addition to the total of 127,500,000 older Americans of voting age. In all, 14 States held voting-age referendums on November 3. Voters in Maine and Nebraska approved lowering the voting age from 21 to 20—

not to 18—

In Montana, Massachusetts and Minnesota, they authorized a change from 21 to 19—

not to 18—

But in nine other States the idea was turned down. Voters in Washington, Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota and New Jersey defeated proposals to lower the voting age from 21 to 19. Connecticut, Florida, Michigan and Hawaii rejected suffrage for 18-year-olds—although Hawaii permits qualified residents to vote at age 20. The referendums were defeated despite the fact that many major candidates supported lower voting ages, and, in Connecticut, the question went on the ballot with the approval of the legislature.

The article later continues:

Low participation. Studies by the Economic Unit of *U.S. News & World Report* indicate that younger voters have a poorer voting record than their elders.

Young voters who are interested in voting in America vote in the States in which they are entitled to do so, and they vote voluntarily. However, many of them do not exercise their right to vote because they are not interested. In this country some people are talking about compelling young people to vote, and in this State we compel them to do so. The report continues:

In 1968, these studies show, 61 per cent of the population of voting age actually voted in the presidential election. But examination of the figures indicated that the younger the age, the lower the number voting. Persons between 45 and 64 had the best voting record, with 75 per cent of them casting ballots. Among the 432,000 civilian young people under 21 and eligible to vote in 1968, only 145,000 indicated they had voted. This was 34 per cent, the lowest participation of any age group. The 1970 returns on the 18-year-old issue indicated among other things a feeling on the part of most voters that as past statistics have shown, the right of franchise is wasted on many young people.

We are wrong in compelling any group of people to vote. A Bill, lowering the voting age to 18 years in the federal sphere, was introduced into the Canadian Parliament in May of this year, although it has not yet gone through all stages. In the State sphere, it is not expected that this age will apply. I will now indicate the ages at which people in some of the various provinces are entitled to vote. In Alberta, if a person is 19 years of age he can vote; in British Columbia a person must be 19 years of age; in Manitoba he must be 21 years of age and resident in the State for 12 months; in New Brunswick he must be 21 years of age; in Newfoundland he must be 19 years of age; and in Nova Scotia and Ontario he must be 21 years of age. Those States have made no moves to have the voting age reduced to 18 years. Indeed, in one country in the world (France) has it been stated that the voting age should be reduced. Francois Missoffe, French Minister for Youth and Sports, launched a vast survey in 1966 that queried the young people themselves, their clubs and associations, and those who act as their spokesmen. Nearly 100,000 questionnaires were sent out all over France. The Minister is reported as having said:

The survey seems to be of value, and the conclusions to be drawn from it of interest. For the first time a useful dialogue has been established between the Government and those young people whose behaviour is often surprising, sometimes shocking, but always a little mysterious and secret in the eyes of adults.

He later continued:

In sum, the White Paper gave young French people a much less black image than some would like to paint.

I believe that applies to our young people. Many people condemn our younger groups and say they are bad or that they are rebels. However, they are not: this would apply to only a small minority, as most of our young people are good. A journalist, quoting a certain report, wrote a long article on this matter entitled "A dominant youth who we do not know", part of which is as follows:

Aware of their immaturity, France's young people do not want the legal voting age to be lowered to 18, and they consider military service to be a highly beneficial and "toughening" experience. Some 82 per cent of the girls endorse conscription. Those affected are obviously a little less enthusiastic (63 per cent for the boys, and this figure drops as the draft age is approached). The young Frenchman, although considering himself still too young to vote and expecting to gain moral and physical vigor from his military service, is eager to get married.

The member for Spence has said that people are marrying at an early age, and that therefore they are more mature. That would be an immature statement. The article continues:

Today, in proportion to total yearly marriages, twice as many young men between 18 and 19 are getting married as 30 years ago. And these youthful marriages obviously lower the age of procreation. There are more and more students who are fathers, which testifies if not to their wisdom (the average budget of the independent student is \$175 a month) at least to their endorsement of the middle-class ideal.

There is a footnote to the effect that 72 per cent of the boys and 75 per cent of the girls are opposed to any reduction in the voting age. In France, the voting age is 21 years, and I venture to say that any group of people in this State with whom I have discussed this matter would be against lowering the voting age to 18 years. Who is asking for this reduction? It is politicians who have run out of new ideas. It is people who have had perhaps an academic education such as the Premier and the member for Mitcham, who support the lowering of the voting age to try to win some friends in the younger age group. However, I assure them that they will not win any friends this way: the younger people are sufficiently mature to know that the reduction is not desirable. In fact, I regard them as being more mature in this respect than are those trying to force the reduction on them.

Why not give young people between the age of 18 years and 21 years an opportunity to say, by referendum, whether they desire compulsory voting at 18 years? In Austria, a person must be 19 years before January 1 of the year of the election to be able to vote

at that election; in that country in the federal sphere it is compulsory voting, whereas in the local sphere it is voluntary voting, and a person must be 25 years of age before becoming a member of Parliament. In Sweden, a person must be 19 years of age in the year before the election to be able to vote at that election, and he can become a member of Parliament at 20 years. In Switzerland a person must be 20 years of age to vote, this age applying to both Houses, although in the federal sphere it is compulsory voting, without fine if a person does not vote; he must merely give an excuse for not voting. In the local sphere in Switzerland, it is voluntary voting, and a person must be 21 years before he can become a member of Parliament.

In Denmark, where there is only one House, 21 years is the voting age, and voting is compulsory. In Finland, the voting age was reduced from 21 years to 20 years in 1969, and voting is voluntary. In Spain, people are compelled to vote as soon as they reach 21 years of age. It is voluntary voting at the age of 18 years in Turkey, one of the first countries to adopt this age, and in that country a person may become a member of the Lower House when he is 30 years old and a member of the Upper House at the age of 40 years. In Portugal, the voting age is 21 years in all cases, with voluntary voting. In Greece, a person must be 25 years of age before he can vote and also before he may become a member of Parliament. In Pakistan, which is only at this stage trying to implement a democratic form of Government, marshal law having existed previously, the voting age is 21 years. The voting age was lowered to 20 years in New Zealand in 1969. Voting is voluntary in that country, and a person may become a member of Parliament at 20 years of age.

In Italy, the voting age is 21 years for the Lower House and 25 years for the Upper House, and a person must be 25 years old before he may become a member of Parliament. In the Netherlands the voting age is 21 years for both Houses, and a person wishing to become a member of either House must be 25 years of age, although only 12 months ago he had to be 30 years before he could marry without his parents' consent.

The Hon. L. J. King: Would you want that provision here?

Mr. EVANS: The Attorney-General says that all other countries in the Western world are moving towards implementing a voting age of 18 years, but he knows that that is

not the case although, as the Minister introducing this Bill, he should know. In Japan, the voting age for both Houses has been reduced to 20 years, and a person wishing to become a member of the Lower House must be 25 years old, or 30 years in the case of the Upper House; it is voluntary voting in that country. In Belgium and Luxembourg, the voting age is 21 years and compulsory voting applies, although a person must be 25 years of age before becoming a member of the Lower House and 40 years of age before becoming a member of the Upper House. In Germany, the voting age has been lowered to 18 years, voting is voluntary, and a person cannot become a member of Parliament until he is 25 years of age.

Pending the solving of a constitutional problem, the United States is to have a voting age of 18 years in the federal sphere, but voting is voluntary there. The situation in Canada is similar: once the relevant legislation is passed, people will be able to vote at the age of 18 years, and voting is voluntary. Members opposite, apart from citing Russia, cannot name any major country in which a person votes compulsorily at the age of 18 years. If we implement a voting age of 18 years, either in the States individually or in the Commonwealth, people will argue that because a person can vote at 18 years of age he should be able to marry and sign contracts at that age; indeed, we already have people in this Chamber saying that. I believe that signing contracts and getting married are matters that should be watched more closely than enabling people to drink in licensed places or to vote at 18 years of age. Do young people want this added responsibility? Are more people of this age now going to school and still having study pressures? The Senate election on Saturday was held at the time when examinations were being conducted. Would we want the pressure of voting at an election placed on young people who were trying to finish their studies? Will there be a move to increase the compulsory age at which children must attend school to 16 or 17 years, and will the same people argue in favour of reducing the voting age to 16 years and 17 years? Are we to bring the two together? Possibly this will happen.

I believe that in this Bill we as politicians are simply attempting to win a little sympathy from people who say that this is progress, although I do not believe it is progress. The responsible attitude for the States and the

Commonwealth to take is to accept the age of 20 years as the age of majority, as it is accepted by our next-door neighbours in Japan and New Zealand. The new law in England has not operated for long enough yet for anything to be proved. These innovations have applied for only a short time, so no proof is available that the changes are successful. If we look at the matter in this light, we should be prepared to accept 20 years as a satisfactory age at which people should vote in this State. If the age is reduced to 18 years, we will be the only western-type community in the world that compels people to vote at that age.

Mr. Langley: They don't have to vote for the Assembly, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: I have about a minute left to tell the honourable member that once a person is enrolled he is compelled to vote from then on.

Mr. Langley: He doesn't have to enrol.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member knows that if a person decides to vote at one election he cannot then decide not to vote at other elections. This is not giving people the right to vote: it is compelling them to vote. We should not force young people to vote. If the House decides that the voting age should be 18 years, we should then give people an opportunity to vote and not make it a duty. I ask honourable members not to support this provision until we have dealt with the electoral legislation and decided whether the vote for these people should be compulsory or voluntary.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Until the member for Fisher spoke, there had been some general agreement in principle regarding the reduction in the voting age. The member for Fisher adopted the old reactionary attitude of opposition to change. It appears that he wants to give the vote with the left hand and take it away with the right hand. The major areas of disagreement amongst members are in relation to the time of implementing the reduced voting age and in relation to a voluntary or compulsory vote. The Leader and other members opposite desire the Commonwealth Government to initiate this new voting age, or alternatively say that we should act in concert with the other States. However, in introducing the Bill, the Attorney-General said that at a meeting of State and Commonwealth Attorneys-General in July this year the principle of introducing legislation to reduce the voting age was agreed on. Also, I presume we can place some faith on a

recent announcement by the Commonwealth Government that legislation in this respect will be introduced before the 1972 House of Representatives elections. Therefore, I suggest that South Australia should give the lead. Any confusion that might arise in the minds of electors, as suggested by the member for Mitcham, is purely problematical because legislation passed in this State may not operate here before any general State or Commonwealth election.

The latest figures available on this matter are for the year ended June 30, 1969. The number of persons aged between 18 years and 21 years in South Australia is about 83,000. Estimates indicate that 65,000 of these are members of the work force and consequently taxpayers, about 12,000 are students, and several thousand others are in the armed forces. The figures indicate that this group comprises 7.2 per cent of the population. At present these people are disfranchised and their energy, enthusiasm and intelligence are excluded from our political system. It must be agreed that 18-year-olds today are more politically conscious, educated and articulate than were their forbears. Also, they mature physically at a much younger age. These people can bear arms, drive motor vehicles, pay taxes and assume certain other responsibilities. By parental consent, some people under 21 years are married; indeed, many of them are parents.

If a person of 18 years is apprehended by the police he is charged, appears in court and is treated as an adult. In entertainment and sport, 18-year-olds are treated as adults. Therefore, it is difficult to accept that, despite all these responsibilities, they are denied the right to vote. As the member for Playford has pointed out in some detail, one of the reasons for the restlessness and resentment of youth towards today's society may be that these people are denied an opportunity to seek redress and change. Despite the comments of the member for Fisher, a reduction in the voting age to 18 years is becoming the accepted principle throughout the world.

I believe this State should give the lead in Australia. After all, South Australia has pioneered many important legislative measures, such as those providing for women to vote and for the secret ballot. Possibly this State started out with one of the most democratic systems, although for some considerable time it had one of the least democratic systems, and we are still suffering some disabilities in this respect. We should regard voting and the

complementary legislation to come before the House regarding contractual rights not as matters of privilege or benevolence but as democratic rights.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill. However, I think one must be careful to say that the issues involved are not clear cut. I cannot share the unqualified support given by the member for Gilles or the qualified opposition of the member for Fisher. I think we must look at the whole problem in its context. Much has been made of the generation gap in recent years, and I think this gap is real, although I think the meaning of the terms is often misunderstood.

The term simply tends to show that there is a tremendous lack of understanding between two generations. This is easy to understand because, as the member for Gilles has said, members of the younger generation are seeking and actively working for change. They are full of ambition for change and, finally, after a certain time, having achieved this change or reform (call it what you will) they sit back and say, "We have everything as we want it now."

Then the next generation comes along, sees what it does not like, and works to change what the previous generation has worked so hard to achieve. The tragedy is that the first generation says, "I cannot understand what they are agitating about. Things look fairly good to me." This is the basis of the generation gap. Understanding is two-way traffic, and the tragedy is that often there is a lack of understanding. I have no quarrel with the statement that young people in this age group are now recognized as a real force in the community and that they are potentially responsible citizens. I also agree with the Attorney that this is the best educated (I think that was the term he used) generation in our history, and it certainly possesses a degree of political consciousness that we have never had before. It says much for our teachers and our education system generally that, despite the crisis we often hear about, our teachers have been able to educate our young people to this high standard. It is a great tribute to them.

Of course, there have been great changes in teaching techniques with the change from study by rote and learning by heart to a system of learning to think and reason things out. I remember vividly that in my day, which is now some time ago, it was possible to study for the Intermediate examination by learning

everything by heart, and it was almost the same in regard to the Leaving examination. However, if one was silly enough to try to study for the Leaving Honours examination by trying to learn everything by heart, one fell by the wayside. That happened because no-one got around to telling us how to think and reason things out for ourselves.

Today this barrier to learning has been largely overcome and I think that people now learn to understand fundamentals and to reason things out for themselves. Young people today have inquiring minds and, that being so, they want to learn, and they are taught to think and learn reasonably. New subjects, of which social studies is one, are being taught. Frequently we see many children in the public gallery of this Chamber and we can understand how well they are being taught the basis of Parliamentary democracy. They are taught the details of the Parliamentary system, as well as their civic responsibility in exercising a vote. I hope that they are taught that they must have an overall responsibility in exercising their vote thoughtfully, after due consideration.

I think the Attorney also said that this political consciousness and desire to participate in the democratic system could sometimes be misdirected, and I agree that this may be so, but I think it simply points to the need for further education so that this possibility can be removed, as young people are taught and shown what can happen. No-one can deny that the standard of education available is extremely high and that it will certainly qualify many of our young people to exercise their vote thoughtfully at an election.

People change throughout their lives. They are never the same from day to day, week to week, or year to year, strange as that may seem. It is easy to see changes in photographs taken a year apart but less easy to see changes in those taken, say, a day apart. However, changes are going on all the time, such as changes in the body, changes in physical characteristics, and changes in the amount and type of knowledge one acquires. There are also personality changes, although these are less identifiable. Many of us can recall people who have changed considerably in their manner and approach to life as the years have passed. This change is never more marked or more rapid than in adolescence, and this is roughly the period of the teens. The changes are unusually dramatic, and take place more quickly than at any other time. These

changes result in stormy passages, mood swings, and emotional upsets. There are four areas of change in the adult body when maturity occurs. First, in intellectual maturity, there is a change in the way of thinking, where changes in childish ways of thinking, feeling, adjusting and acting towards people and reacting towards situations take place. There is a change towards a more realistic, disciplined and adult way of thinking where realities and necessities, rather than wishes and imagination, are thought about.

At emotional maturity, people's feelings, reactions to things that please or displease them, bore or frighten them, or attract them, undergo change, and people grow up and mature as the body does. As well as change in existing emotions, maturity brings in other emotions such as (and here is the obvious one) the development of the capacity for emotional or romantic love, together with parental love, mother love, father love, and family love, and then development of a degree of self-discipline and self-recognition.

Physical maturity is hardly necessary to consider. Here sexual characteristics become more marked and the personality of the individual must adjust to these changes. These body changes often cause embarrassment to young people who do not realize adequately what is involved. They have not been told or taught carefully what is happening to them, and this emotional problem can often stem from physical changes. I suppose, if we wanted to define maturity from the point of view of physical characteristics, we could take the classical medical definition of fusion of the long bones. This takes place at 21 years or 22 years in males and at 18 years or 19 years in females. It would be easy if we could judge maturity on purely physical characteristics. That would solve many of our problems.

The fourth area of change is that of social maturity. The difficulties associated with this area are most important, and they are hard for young people to overcome. These are adjustments in varying aspects of relations with other people generally, with members of the opposite sex, with adults, and with society as a whole. Social maturity often places adolescents under severe stresses and pressures; it demands extensive adjustment and psychological change, and adolescence is well known as a time of suffering, of conflict and environmental stresses, and any parent who has had a family of teenage children knows of what I am speaking.

Heredity also plays some part in this, and some people mature earlier than others because of an inborn tendency to do so. Heredity influences physical development and the degree and stage of physical maturity. It governs intellectual capacity, but the physical form one achieves has a profound effect on one's emotional and social development, because if there is any defect in physical maturity, any malfunction, or any lateness, it will have a profound emotional effect on the individual. We are fortunate in this country to enjoy a high standard of living, and the physical development of our young people is excellent. Indeed, our young people are growing taller now than they have grown for many generations. They are healthier and have better teeth, although I would not say that the latter could not be improved even more. However, generally their intelligence and emotional development is at a high level, too.

Environment can also affect the degree of development. Intelligence, as it can be observed and measured, remains relatively constant in all individuals; basically, it is man's innate capacity to learn plus whatever he has already learnt. Thus, teaching, a desire to learn, an innate ability and an emotional adjustment will all add up as factors to govern the individual's best use of his capabilities. The Attorney-General said that young people show a sense of responsibility and maturity to carry the responsibility of adult citizenship, particularly relating to the right to vote. I agree with him that maturity and responsibility do indeed go hand in hand, and it is right that young people, if they enjoy the full privileges of adulthood and of voting, among other things, must be prepared to accept their civic responsibilities. This maturity is not directly related to a standard of education; nor is it related to the age in years. Indeed, it varies from individual to individual, and it is particularly difficult to assess when someone is mature.

We have not touched on the matter of legal maturity, which is what we are really dealing with in this Bill. Legal maturity is the one thing that can be changed by altering the law. How easy it would be if we could manage all our problems of adolescence and maturity as relatively easily as we can change the law! It is not always easy to measure the degree of maturity; nor is it easy to tell whether an advanced education and physical maturity will add up to emotional maturity and responsibility.

The average age, I think, should be taken at 18 years. Inevitably, we will include some immature people in that category. Indeed, some people never grow up completely. I will go even further and say that no-one is completely mature. The member for Tea Tree Gully, when she spring cleans every now and again and changes the furniture around, is, in fact, reverting to a stage of her childhood when she enjoyed playing with dolls' houses. In case the honourable member thinks I am victimizing her, I should remind every male member who is a parent of the enjoyment that he has derived from playing with his young children's train sets. Some people never mature completely. Marked degrees of immaturity are shown in some people by their immature behaviour, where they revert to juvenile behaviour, a reversal to almost the four-year-old or five-year-old stage, where a young child lies down on the floor of the supermarket kicking his heels and screaming because his mother will not buy him the sweets he wants.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Can you remember doing that?

Dr. TONKIN: No, and I hope my maturity is evident in more than that respect. However, other members of our community do that sort of thing, and demonstrate immaturity in other ways. They are reverting to what I believe to be juvenile and immature behaviour. In this context, I will not argue with one's right to demonstrate; I simply point out that it is a rather immature way of trying to get things done. With maturity comes the development of tolerance, of respect for the other man's point of view, for other people's opinions, and for the ability to recognize that one's own opinions could be wrong, no matter how strongly they might be held. Young people must learn that if they hold opinions, no matter how firmly they hold them, it is their duty to try to persuade other people in the community that these ideas are right, and if it is a reasonable idea they will probably get the message across. If it is not a reasonable idea, they will probably not be able to do so and they must learn that, if they cannot persuade people in this respect, they should perhaps sit down and, after having another look at their ideas, modify them, as they may be wrong, after all. This is a mature and responsible attitude, and is an attitude that I believe will be adopted by the young people who desire to vote at 18 years. If these young people have immature

ideas they will tend to act in a juvenile manner. I repeat that they should reassess the situation and obtain other opinions on their ideas, and then, if necessary, accomplish changes through the recognized legal channels. Although it could be said that many people are immature at 18 years, the same could also be said about persons of 20 years or 21 years.

Mr. Clark: Or even 41 years!

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. I think we will find that if people are not well on the way to maturity at the age of 18 years they probably will not be much further on at the age of 21 years.

The Hon. L. J. King: Or 41 years!

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. I support the principle that 18-year-olds are mature. I think we must realize that the population structure is so changing with our own population increases that so many more of our population are under 25 years of age, and it is right that these people should be given the responsibility of exercising their vote and having a say in the affairs of this country commensurate with their degree of maturity; in this respect I think 18 years is the right age to draw the line between these numbers and their degree of maturity.

Mr. Evans: But by compulsion?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not believe that these young people should be compelled to vote. Such is the maturity of some that these mature young people are not always ready (and realize this) to recognize the responsibility of voting. Indeed, it is frequently the mature young people who are prepared to admit that they do not want to vote, because they are not ready to vote, and it is the immature young people who tend to seize the vote and to exercise it without thought. I think we should emphasize and make it as widely known as possible that at present enrolment for the House of Assembly is on a voluntary basis, because I believe that these young people should not be penalized if they decide that they do not wish to exercise their vote. I still cannot reconcile the idea of democracy with compulsion to vote.

I think that if certain action is taken regarding other business before the House, young people will have a safeguard in realizing that enrolment for the Lower House is voluntary, at present anyway. I have every confidence in young people: I think they are a thoughtful

generation, and they are certainly a growing generation numerically. Young people have a high sense of moral values, and I think it is a great shame that many adults (adults in name, anyway) do not heed the moral standards of our young people in the community. Although young people are not always right, they are right in some respects. The point made by the Leader of the Opposition about acting in concert is an important point: I should like to see this measure introduced at the same time as similar measures are introduced in the other States and the Commonwealth. That would certainly make life much easier for everyone, electoral officers in particular. However, my support for 18-year-olds' having the right to vote is sufficiently strong for me to support the Bill, whether or not the amendment is carried.

It was unfortunate that the Leader was reported as saying that he thought the Bill was stupid, because that is not what he said in this House: he said it was not wise to introduce this Bill in isolation or to pass it without a governing factor to bring the other relevant legislation into operation at the one time. Young people are ambitious and anxious to improve society. They are the biggest proponents of free enterprise and liberalism generally that we can ever find in the community. If a young person at 18 years is an apprentice, he looks forward to the day when he will be his own boss or running his own shop; if he is a schoolteacher, he looks forward to the day when he will be a headmaster, or, indeed, perhaps even a member of Parliament; and if he is a public servant he looks forward to the day when he will be head of his department.

Mr. Jennings: Is that private enterprise?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, indeed; it is free enterprise. I have no fears in regard to 18-year-olds' voting: I think they have much to contribute to our society by playing a responsible part in it. I support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I, too, support the Bill. Having for some years advocated the principle of 18-year-olds' voting, I do so again here. Although I differ with the member for Fisher on some of the comments he made, I point out that that is a privilege that we have on this side of the House at least, namely, that we can speak for the good of the State and yet have the privilege of differing among ourselves and of expressing personal views, without being bound by threat

of expulsion or being told rigidly what to do. However, I compliment the member for Fisher on the research he has obviously undertaken in preparing his speech, which was a well-prepared speech for the case he advanced. The honourable member advocated 20 years as the voting age, but that is where I differ: I prefer 18 years. Rather than have 20 years, which is neither one thing nor the other. I should prefer to retain the voting age at 21 years. However, I wish to make it clear that I support the view that the voting age in this State should be 18 years. This is complementary and in line with other legislation before the House regarding the age of majority which members will be considering in due course and which involves a principle of 18 years.

There is no doubt in my mind that more and more of our younger people today are at least exposed to greater and better educational facilities than were many of the adults in our community today. The number of young people in this category will increase year by year not only because of the population increase but also because more and more schools are being built each year. Today, we have two universities, whereas when I was a student we had only one university and, in addition, the Institute of Technology enrolment is double the enrolment that existed when I was a student, and after a certain period the enrolment will be treble. The opportunities that exist today were denied many of the older voters in our community today. I am proud of the great majority of the people in the 18-21 years age group. In discussing serious matters with them, I have found that they are far more coherent and rational as a whole than were people of this age about 10 years ago and that they are ready and able to discuss matters seriously. This is mainly because they have had better educational facilities. Younger people today are thinking and reading more than did young people some years ago. No member would deny that many people in this age group are better informed on many matters than are some older people. In this regard radio and television have played a great part. People who are lucky enough to have a night at home can look at the news and see at firsthand what is going on in the world. My own family watches the national news on most nights of the week. People in this country were not able to do this about 10 years ago. Of course, as with all age groups, there are dropouts and weirdos, but I am proud of many of the young people today.



Years ago when the vote was given to women many diehards regarded the move as revolutionary and said, "The country is going to the dogs," "Shades of Emmeline Pankhurst," and so on. When, along with New Zealand, we gave the lead to the world in giving women the right to vote, we also gave them the right to be members of Parliament. No provision is made in this Bill for people under 21 years to be members of Parliament, although this may be the subject of later legislation. This inconsistency can be easily remedied, but I do not advocate that at present. After all, it was not until the member for Davenport and the Hon. Jessie Cooper came into Parliament together (and later the member for Tea Tree Gully) that we enjoyed their adornment, even though we had been the first Parliament in the Commonwealth to introduce legislation providing for female members of Parliament. The Bill does not provide for voluntary or compulsory voting but merely gives the right to vote. Several members have discussed the matter of uniformity. The Minister said that the Attorneys-General at their meeting (and they seem to have numerous meetings) agreed that uniform legislation should be introduced providing for 18-year-olds to vote. The Prime Minister has intimated that he intends to introduce legislation in the Commonwealth Parliament to provide for this reduction in the voting age. I have given much thought to the question of uniformity. The amendment on the file provides, in effect, that we can agree to this Bill but that it will not operate until the Commonwealth passes similar legislation. I do not care what the other States do, but it would be ludicrous if, at an election such as the election last Saturday, people over 21 years of age were able to vote, whereas at an election on the next Saturday for the State Parliament people over 18 years of age were able to vote. I discussed this matter with several people at the polls last Saturday, and the general consensus was that voting should be uniform and that it would be ludicrous to have two sets of rules. We should consider the amendment, because it would enable the Minister to have the Bill passed, and this provision would then apply as soon as the Commonwealth passed its Bill.

Members have also raised the question of voluntary voting for people between the ages of 18 years and 21 years, and I believe this is a good idea. Incidentally, not all people to whom I have spoken in this age group have expressed the desire to vote. Although I believe it would be to their advantage and the

advantage of the State if they voted, when I have asked them why they have not wanted to vote, some have not been able to give a sound reason, others have said that they believe they are not old enough (I do not agree), and others have said that they do not want to be pushed around, that they want freedom and do not want to be fined if they do not vote. Voluntary voting would give them an option to vote. We should seriously consider this aspect when we deal with the electoral legislation. If we provided for this reduction in the age of voting it would be a progressive move. I oppose a reduction in the age of voting to 20 years as postulated by the member for Fisher. Having said that I prefer 18 years, I say that, if I were given the choice to vote for 20 years, I would prefer the age to remain at 21 years. When the legislation to alter the liquor laws was before the House in about 1967, I voted for the legal drinking age to be 18 years. Subsequently an amendment was moved to provide that it should be 20 years. As I thought this was foolish, I believed it would be better to leave the age at 21 years. For obvious reasons I preferred 18 years and thought that lowering it by one year to 20 years was silly. However, the majority wish of members prevailed and the age became 20 years. In the context we are discussing, I also consider that 18 years should be the age, and I am opposed to providing for an age of 20 years.

I have spoken because I do not want to cast a silent vote. I have indicated what I believe and have believed for many years. Most members of my Party support the move because it is progressive and liberal legislation. I do not know how many members of my Party will vote in favour of it but, once again, we have the privilege of differing if we want to differ, without suffering any repercussions. We believe our electors should have a say in this and that we should not have to vote on rigid Party lines. That is why the member for Fisher can express his view (a very learned view, I may say, but one with which I do not agree). I thought that some aspects of his speech were good. However, I will support giving the vote to 18-year-olds and, in the Committee stage, I intend to support the amendment to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): In supporting the Bill I agree, first, that priests, ministers, and men of the cloth generally should be eligible for election to Parliament. I think it is well

to mention now that in the last Congressional elections in the U.S.A. a Catholic priest was elected. He was Father Robert Drinan, a Jesuit priest and Professor of Law at Boston College Law School, who was elected for Third District, Boston, Massachusetts, on a Civil Liberties platform. Before these people can be elected, they must be able to convince the electors that they are worthy of support. This is the same guideline by which members on this side have been elected and by which they would hope to be elected. Father Pedro Arrupe, the head of Father Drinan's order, speaking about priests in politics, asked:

How can a Jesuit priest remain passive in the face of racial injustice and in the face of institutional violence?

Father Drinan, the successful candidate, said:

As a person, as a lawyer and as a Christian, I feel compelled to speak out.

I think it reasonable that these people, who have a knowledge of the world we live in, should be eligible for election. They would be useful members in Parliament. I should like the religions to take a more progressive attitude to world problems, to educate the people, to speak out and criticize many of the injustices in the world that deserve condemnation and criticism. I favour compulsory voting. Every citizen in our society must live under the laws made by our Parliament, so I believe that these citizens should have the responsibility to elect the people who make these laws.

If the electors are compelled to vote, the political Parties can get down to the issues at hand at election time. They will not have to spend all their money and effort merely to get people to the polls; they will be able to concentrate on the issues of the day. We could well have, with voluntary voting, the same circumstances as prevail in the United States, where the successful candidate is more often than not the one able to afford the most expensive campaign.

Mr. McRae: And the biggest prize.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. We know of the marching girls, the top hats, the cigars, and the big badges that are used in efforts to arouse enthusiasm among people to bring them to the polls to vote.

Mr. Jennings: The Liberals tried that here last time.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, it was tried during the last State election campaign in South Australia but it did not come off. The ordinary

citizen who cannot afford to mount a campaign of this magnitude could not be elected to Parliament if this system were introduced. It is no good hiding our heads in the sand: that system would come in if voting was voluntary. It would reduce elections to the survival of the richest. Those who could afford the most expensive campaign would be the most successful, and that could bring about the end of the Parliamentary system as we know it, under which people of ordinary means and average background can become members of Parliament. This is important, and it is necessary to have these people in our Parliament. If the only people we are going to elect are millionaires, or near millionaires, they will not be able to discuss the problems facing this State and this country. However, that could be the ultimate result of voluntary voting.

I believe that the voting age should be reduced to 18 years, and I consider this an extremely good move. What has convinced me that people of this age should have the vote is the number of visits I have made recently to schools in my district, where the political awareness of the students has astonished me. Children in grade 7 at primary school, although I know they are sometimes prompted, ask questions that are rather pointed and show intelligence. One would not have found the awareness they show in a Grade 7 student a few years ago. The same applies to students in secondary schools, although it applies to a greater extent. First-year students are aware of politics. They see political matter on television every day and they are encouraged to read the newspapers. Politics is discussed in the homes and, with the number of elections we have had recently, politics has been discussed continually. These children are politically aware.

It is frightening to stand in front of Leaving students and discuss politics, because their questions are extremely vital, pointed and pertinent, and they want to be given facts, not half-baked replies, and they are entitled to have them. These students are 16 years of age and they know what politics is about. They know why our Party differs from the Party opposite. They are familiar with the issues that we debate here and elsewhere and they are concerned about them and want to know where the individual politician stands. If I am to go to these schools I must tell students exactly where I stand, because they know when a person is trying to put them off and they will not accept that.

I have also spoken to a group of students at the Institute of Technology. These students were in the 18 years to 20 years age group, and it would be ridiculous for anyone to suggest that these people were not greatly informed or intelligent or aware enough of the political issues in this country today to be eligible to vote. As members on both sides have said previously this evening, the 18-year-old today is much more aware politically than was the 18-year-old of 10 years to 20 years ago. Because this is so, today's young people are more concerned about the issues facing them.

Mention has been made of education, and in this respect I refer to the turmoil that it is causing in the world today. As we educate our children in this society and in other societies (including the Communist countries), and as they leave universities with degrees, they will not accept their lack of say in the Governments of today. This applies not only in the Communist countries but also in this country. We say much about ours being a free country and about our being free to do certain things. However, we are free merely to obey the law: that is the extent of our freedom. We must obey the laws, and today's young people are unhappy about some of our laws which we have accepted but with which they do not want to be forced to comply. Because they cannot have any say in the repealing of these laws, they become frustrated. They know that the laws are wrong, but they are unable to do anything about them.

It is fruitless for people of my generation and those older than me in a sneering manner to label today's young people as rebels and to say that, because they have long hair and do not dress as we do, their views are not worth while. We should look at the type of world we have given them: a world which knows only war and in which the only answer we have is to drop a bomb on those countries that do not agree with us, and *vice versa*. In today's world the value of human life means nothing. We are eager to rush into wars. Indeed, wars have been fought continually since 1939, and it is this atmosphere in which these young people have grown up. Because they are disgusted with it and do not want a part in it, they want to opt out of it. We are giving them a world which has pollution and which in many ways does not meet with their ideas of what human life should be. Because these people are educated to expect a better life than they are able to get, they want to change the system, although they meet with opposition.

I consider 18 years of age to be a good age at which a person should be able to vote, as at that age they are aware of what is happening around them and are able to cast an intelligent vote. Because of this we should have no fear of giving these young people the right to vote.

I should like briefly to refer to one or two statements made by members opposite. The member for Fisher said that young people should not be given the responsibility of voting at 18 years of age; he said that they should be allowed to blend into society. I wonder whether the honourable member can explain how these same young men should be able to blend into National Service.

Mr. Evans: At 20 years of age.

Mr. KENEALLY: But that is still less than 21 years of age. When subjects of this kind are debated in this House and Government members ask Opposition members their views about our young men having to enter National Service at 20 years of age, we receive no reply; members opposite are afraid to give their views about or to say where they stand on this important issue. They are happy to discuss the standing of youth in our society on any subject but this one. What do they say about sending our young men away? They agree to our young men being called up for National Service, being given a gun and being sent away to war to be killed.

The member for Fisher sneeringly referred to our young people as rebels. However, I suggest that rebels in our society today are necessary. If people are prepared to accept the *status quo* and do not rebel against society and the norms that we have accepted, they will not be able to change the world, and it will stagnate. The world must continue to change, and there must always be people who can improve it. I compliment the member for Bragg on his definition of the generation gap, although in this respect he was a little conservative. He said that if a youth or young person did not accept the standards as we knew them, he should rethink the matter and accept what the older people told him; in other words, he should compromise. I say that is wrong: unless we are able to convince a young person that he is wrong, that person should retain his philosophies and convictions and should not throw them aside merely because they are unacceptable to society generally. Non-acceptance does not always mean that a principle is wrong. If such a person compromises merely because someone older has said he should do so, he is on the

wrong track. The member for Fisher also said that most people to whom he had spoken about this Bill opposed it. I should think that most older people opposed it, because older people resist change.

Mr. Gunn: And the younger ones, too. How many younger ones have you spoken to?

Mr. KENEALLY: I would probably mix with younger people as much as, if not more than, any other member of this House does, as I am still active in many sports and meet many people who are somewhat younger than I am. However, because I am a political person, I discuss politics with these young people, who are eager to have the right to vote. I realize that some of them probably are not keen to have the right to vote because they are not interested in politics. Generally, however, today's young people are interested in politics and want to have a say on the political issues confronting us.

The member for Fisher gave us a long report on the countries that have 18-year-old and 19-year-old voting. He pointed out the countries that did not accept that, because a person was 18 years of age and could vote, he was eligible to stand for Parliament. However, this has nothing to do with the Bill. If a person is able to vote at 18 years of age, he should, in my opinion, be able to stand for Parliament at that age. If one is 18 years of age and wants to stand for Parliament, it does not mean that one automatically walks through the doors of Parliament as a member, because one must obtain preselection and gain the proper support. If one is able to get preselection and support, one can then attempt to be voted into Parliament and, if the electors want an 18-year-old person as a member of Parliament, they should be entitled to have one.

It is juvenile to say that, because a person is 18 years of age, he should not be able to enter Parliament. As members know, entry into Parliament is difficult, although it may be much more difficult in some districts than it is in the Stuart District. Nevertheless, I do not think any district would rush into a decision to elect an 18-year-old to Parliament unless such a person justly deserved that honour. If he deserves it, such a person should have the right to be elected.

The member for Torrens said repeatedly that members on his side were free to vote on all issues as they wished. In view of opinions held by some of his colleagues, I think it is absolutely essential that he

should be able to express an opposing view. When for many years 18 members were on each side of this House and an Independent Speaker was in the Chair, the Liberal Government was not brought down by any of its members' voting against it. Despite all the propaganda one may hear, members opposite vote on important issues as they are told to vote. It is hypocritical to deny that. I support the Bill, which is a good Bill, and I commend it to other members.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. However, as I still oppose any form of compulsion, I do not think young people should be compelled to vote. The point made by the member for Stuart in this respect was weak: he said that, with voluntary voting, only the wealthy people would vote, but the Labor Party has far more finance at election time than has the Liberal Party. Indeed, this is borne out by the amount of advertising, etc., that is used by that Party whenever there is an election. With tight union control, the Labor Party would have an advantage as a result of voluntary voting that we, with our greater sense of freedom, perhaps would not have. Young people today are physically much stronger than were young people years ago; they are taller and weigh more, and they become engaged and marry at a much earlier age than previously. Generally, I think they are becoming more responsible citizens.

What do we mean by supporting a voting age of 18 years? A person who turns 18 years of age may be 21 years of age before he votes at the next election. At present, a person who turns 21 years may be 24 years of age before receiving an opportunity to vote. Many married people today have two or three children but are still not entitled to vote. I think that 18 years would be a far more logical voting age. Gallup poll results over a recent period in regard to various national issues show that young people are more responsible and mature nowadays. The member for Stuart talked about sending young people to war: in a recent Gallup poll 69 per cent of those interviewed said that they were in favour of the war in Vietnam, and this shows that they have a sense of responsibility to defend what they think is right.

In 1965, when a teen-age group of people was asked how they would vote, 31 per cent said they would vote for the Liberal and Country Party, 26 per cent for the Australian Labor Party, 5 per cent for the Democratic Labor Party, and 38 per cent said they had

no idea. However, as a result of changed attitudes with the advent of greater education facilities, when asked a similar question in 1968, 41 per cent said they would vote for the L.C.P., 27 per cent for the A.L.P., 4 per cent for the D.L.P., and 28 per cent said they had no idea. This shows that young people are taking more interest in politics and are thinking along the lines of greater freedom. If it is suggested that these young people want to vote, I instance what happened at the last Midland by-election when half the people entitled to be enrolled to vote for the Legislative Council did not go to the bother of being enrolled. People who were enrolled and who went along to a booth and asked whether voting was compulsory simply got into their cars and drove home when told that voting was voluntary.

Mr. Keneally: That would be in your area.

Mr. McANANEY: This is in the districts of the members for Elizabeth and Salisbury. However, I think that we must give young people a chance to vote and that nowadays parents of, say, 15-year-olds are letting their children make their own decisions. At present, 8,000 students are enrolled at the University of Adelaide. I think the biggest number that ever supported the Students for Democratic Action was 700; indeed, when a meeting was held to decide what to do about the university Act, 400 or 500 students walked out of the meeting when lectures were due to start, it having been suggested to them that they take off the afternoon. People in certain groups nowadays say they are opposed to Communism, to the Labor Party (perhaps this shows maturity on their part) and also to the Liberal Party; they are opposed to everything. When asked to say in what they believe, they say they do not believe in anything; they simply try something and, if it works, that becomes their policy. Many things in the world today are unsatisfactory, and we want to see them changed. I believe we can rely on young people to straighten out the hypocrisy in the world. There are shocking things, such as the Pratt case, when a man cannot even sell his wool—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I am confident that these young, upstanding people will correct the deficiencies in the world. In her speech to the Commonwealth a year or two ago, the Queen called to the brains of youth. We do not always agree with what some of the

most active young people do but I am sure that, if they are given some sense of responsibility, they will react and become better citizens than perhaps those who are not so active and accept things as they are. It rather amazes me that the 7,950 hard-working students at the university do not get to work and scrub and shave the other 50 students there. However, it is probably a good thing that they are prepared to let these people go, because the sillier they get the less harm they do. If television and the press were not looking for headlines involving the scrubby 50, and if the media spent more time giving publicity to the thousands of people who were pulling their weight and being good citizens, there would be greater understanding between the two generations.

I do not think that there is nearly as big a gap between the two generations now as there was in my day. In those days, there was little communication: a young person was seen and not heard most of the time. Unfortunately we have too many immature adults around today, but most parents communicate with their children and listen to their opinions. I have had six children. When I remonstrated with one child, she said "You know I am an individualist; you can't do anything with me." I am proud of her, as she has made good decisions. By getting together with their children, parents enable them to be individuals and to make their own decisions. It is not possible to keep control over people until they are 21 years old by making laws that they can and cannot do things. If children are brought up to respect their parents' decisions, the parents will have far more control over them than will any action Parliament can take.

I support the Bill. However, I am entirely against the idea of a compulsory vote. At present it is not compulsory for people to enrol. However, once a person enrolls he will be compelled to vote. When the Commonwealth Government introduces compulsory voting at 18 years young people will go, as people go now, have a card put in front of them, and automatically enrol for the Commonwealth and the State unless they object. If the Government does not meddle with the Electoral Act the position may solve itself. I find it abhorrent to compel people, and I cannot understand that attitude to life. I was about to say something rude about what drives people to take that attitude and to dictate to people, but I am in a mellow mood. I support voluntary voting for people of the 18 years to

20 years age group who show an interest in voting. I am completely against compelling to vote those who do not want to vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The member for Torrens said that there was no great merit in casting a silent vote. In debates there is a fair bit of repetition, so I do not want to go over ground already covered by other speakers. However, I believe there is merit in putting a point of view, particularly if that can influence the Government. I have read the Attorney-General's second reading explanation to see the Government's thinking in introducing the Bill. The first point he made was that this was the Labor Party's policy at the last election. I am far from convinced that, because the Government won the last election, receiving a vote very little different from the vote it had received on other occasions, it has a mandate for every line of its policy. I am far from convinced that that is a cogent argument.

In his rather brief explanation, the Attorney made one or two points with which I can agree, although overall I am not impressed by the general burden of his argument. One idea is that, if one does not jump on the band wagon in all of these measures, the conclusion is that in some sort of obscure way one is being critical of young people. That is not the case. I have probably had as much to do with young people of this age (with matriculation students, in particular of 17 years of age, turning 18 years) as has anyone in this House. I think I have a fairly good consensus of their opinions on many of these matters. Anything I say is not a criticism of them, for I hold them in the highest regard. One of my own children is in this age group and, despite what certain members may think of me, my child is fairly normal. I have the opinion of a good cross-section of the community of about the age group dealt with by the Bill.

I agree with the Attorney-General that this is the best educated group of young people in the history not only of the State but also of the world. People are staying at school longer. We have a rising generation that is better educated than has been any generation in the past. In the explanation of one Bill dealing with 18-year-olds, reference was made to the wearing of armour and a lot of other claptrap that was quite irrelevant to this matter. These people are very well educated. They are widely read, but I am not convinced that some of the maturity we attribute to these young people does exist. As the member for

Bragg has said, physically they are more mature than other generations, but I think that young people mature more quickly when they take on tangible responsibility. From my observations, young people mature quickly when they go out and earn a living. I have also been in contact with university students and from my observations, they have not changed much from the university students of my day.

University students receive much criticism, quite unjustly, I consider, because in this day of the mass media controversy seems to get the headlines and people who tend to do something way out or cause a disturbance get publicity. Of the 8,000 students at Adelaide University, 300 at the most would interest themselves in these rather noisy, shall we say, way-out radical movements. Most of the students are hard-working young people, interested in equipping themselves to earn a useful living and in contributing to the welfare of this country. I am not critical of these young people but it is strange that, in talking to them, there is not only a lack of enthusiasm for voting at the age of 18 years among most of them, but they are not interested in voting at that age. Most of them would prefer that the provision be left as it is.

I consider that the Labor Party is trying to create the image of being progressive and that it is jumping on this band wagon, because that is the in thing to do. This motivates much of that Party's legislation. I intend to support the amendment that when this legislation is adopted by the Commonwealth Government and the other States, it would be pointless for us to be out of step.

Mr. Coumbe: With the Commonwealth Government, at least.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but I cannot see any point in our being first for the sake of being first. However, I think that is why the Labor Party is rushing in to much of this legislation and making us stay here until all hours of the night. The Government is trying to create the image of being progressive. My view of a progressive Government is one that manages the affairs of State and keeps things on an even keel, seeing that we keep full employment and maintain our position in relation to the other States and see that our way of life is not jeopardized by any way-out legislation.

I am not suggesting, of course, that this legislation will bring about the results I have mentioned. The Attorney-General has also

said in his explanation that the age of 18 years has won recognition throughout the Commonwealth of Australia and is spreading rapidly throughout the whole of the democratic western world. I would prefer to see this sweeping statement backed up by some documentation, because all the indications we have are that, although a similar provision has been introduced in Great Britain, it has not been introduced in Canada, Germany, or the United States, at all events. Those countries are not rushing into this as precipitately as the Attorney has indicated.

In fact, in reading some of the Attorney's explanation of this Bill and similar measures, the argument seems to be that, because we are doing this, we are forward thinking. However, I would like more argument to sustain this point of view. I am not vitally opposed to the Bill but I do not consider at present, first, that the Government has an overwhelming mandate to introduce this measure or that there is great clamour or demand by the people concerned for the right to vote at 18 years of age. In fact, my experience has been the reverse.

I think that, before we require young people to vote, they should have some sort of maturity in the decisions required in registering a vote and this maturity of judgment comes when they take a job and assume responsibility. One must agree that young people are better educated, but this alone does not bring the sort of maturity to which I have referred. Most of these young people still depend on their parents financially and otherwise. The sort of maturity I am speaking of comes when these people are earning an income, when they are left to their own devices, marry, and have families of their own. This matures people more quickly than anything else.

Having said that, I am willing to support the second reading and I shall support the Leader's amendment. I am convinced that the motives behind the Bill are not based in any logically developed argument in the mind of the Government. The Government tends to give the impression that it is progressive and it tends to jump on the band waggon. Voting at the age of 18 years is not compulsory anywhere else in the world. The Attorney argues that, because we have compulsory voting here, that may show that we are more advanced. However, all the great democracies, such as the United Kingdom and the United States of America, have not compulsory voting.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am not in favour of voting at 18 years of age. Being the youngest member of this House, I have some idea of the way young people think, and I have much association with them. It is not long since I was 18 years of age. Throughout the community where I have travelled recently, I have not heard any clamour from persons aged 17 years, 18 years, or 19 years that they want to vote. The Government has introduced this measure only to gain publicity, to present itself to the community as a progressive Party. However, it is not such a party. The people of this State do not want this burden and they should not have to carry it. The member for Stuart has said that he spoke to many school students and they were interested in voting at 18 years.

Mr. Payne: That's not what he said.

Mr. GUNN: I, too, have visited many schools, but I have not been asked whether I favour voting at 18 years and I have not raised the matter.

Mr. Payne: You didn't understand the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitchell has had his opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: Another aspect of the Bill to which I am opposed is the provision to compel an 18-year-old person to vote. I do not favour compulsory voting, because in a democracy people should be able to decide whether they exercise their democratic right to vote. Why should we align ourselves with the only other country in the world to compel 18-year-old people to vote, Soviet Russia?

Mr. Hopgood: That is no argument.

Mr. GUNN: It is: if the member for Mawson wants to support the Government of Russia he can do so because that is up to him, but I do not want to.

The Hon. L. J. King: They have conscription for military service, too.

Mr. GUNN: I favour conscription. After reaching the stage where we allow 18-year-olds to vote where do we go then? Do we allow those of 14 years and 15 years to vote: where do we draw the line? This is a relevant point, because students of 18 years are far better educated, but we can thank good Liberal and Country League Governments for this situation. A person who is 18 years old now has virtually grown up under a Commonwealth Liberal Government, and in South Australia and other

States most children have been educated under Liberal Governments. Are these people at 18 years of age more mature than were people of, say, 25 years of age now when they were 18? I do not think so. Children have to attend school until 15 years of age and many attend university, so they do not have the chance to be employed at this age. The greatest form of education to make one think and guide one is to go into the world and take a job in which one is constructively employed. A person who has attended a school or a university and is 18 years of age takes an academic point of view and has no appreciation of the basic practicalities of what is going on around him.

Mr. Hopgood: You would concede that he may have benefited from other people's experience?

Mr. GUNN: This could be so. I do not oppose the second reading, but I have reservations about the Bill, because I think it is not in the best interests of these people. I commend the member for Fisher for his contribution, which indicated that he had done much research on the subject and this proved of much benefit to the House.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): Like the member for Torrens, I do not wish to record a silent vote. I do not think that any Bill that has been introduced has caused me to do so much soul searching as this one has. With almost every Bill that has been introduced I have had fairly definite views one way or the other, but I have had no such feelings about this legislation. It was introduced on October 21, but long before this, and long before I became a member, I had given this matter much thought, because it had been obvious for some time that this question would become an issue sooner or later. This issue has been raised in almost all English-speaking countries but only one, the United Kingdom, has actually introduced this type of legislation. It seems that sooner or later this issue will become an accepted thing and I accept this fact, but several points have caused me to oppose this measure in principle. Government members have asked why should not South Australia lead the way in introducing such a measure, and cite the United Kingdom as an example. However, England has one Parliament and therefore the people have one vote, but here we exercise two votes: one for the Commonwealth Parliament and one for the State Parliament.

Mr. BECKER: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

*A quorum having been formed:*

Mr. CARNIE: As the member for Torrens said, we could have the ridiculous situation where a person would not have been eligible to vote last Saturday, but if a State election were to be held next week he would be able to vote. I am opposed to the principle of an 18-year-old person voting, but I support the second reading because, if the amendment foreshadowed by the Leader is carried, the Act will not be proclaimed until the vote for 18-year-olds is available for Commonwealth elections. This has been foreshadowed by the Commonwealth Government and in all circumstances I accept this position, but not happily. Another Bill, the Age of Majority (Reduction) Bill, has also caused me some concern, but I believe the age should be lowered to 18 years with respect to many aspects of that Bill. I have satisfied myself that I can, in all conscience, support the lowering of the age to 18 years for some things, but I cannot support it as the age of voting. This is in no way a reflection on 18-year-olds.

Since I became aware that this question would become an issue, I have discussed this matter with everyone that I could (parents, teachers, and 18-year-olds) and the thing that has honestly surprised me is that of the many people to whom I have spoken not one has been in favour of giving them the vote. Obviously, I must move in different circles from many members on both sides who say the opposite, but this is what I have found. I have not found one parent or teacher who thinks that 18-year-olds should have the vote nor have I found one 18-year-old who wants it. This situation finally decided me to take the stand that I have taken. Many young people to whom I have spoken are mature enough and politically aware enough to vote, but many others are not. Also, I have found many people aged 30 years, 40 years, and 60 years who are not mature enough to vote. However, I do not believe that anyone should be made to vote, and particularly no 18-year-old should be made to vote.

If voting for them was voluntary I could perhaps support the vote for 18-year-olds, but I could not support the circumstances of compulsion as it is in this country at present. I do not believe that we should force the vote on 18-year-olds, because in the United Kingdom, where the vote for 18-year-olds has become law, voting is voluntary, as it is in the United



States and New Zealand, where an age reduction is being advocated. These countries have voluntary voting and, as has been said in many debates in this House, ours is one of the few countries in the world that have a compulsory voting system.

As I have said, I cannot support this measure in regard to compulsory voting. Under the Bill as it stands, we would once again be forcing on the people something that they have shown they do not want. Although I should like to see voluntary voting, I am becoming resigned to the fact that we probably will not see it as long as the present Government is in office, because it has shown continually that it is scared stiff of voluntary voting. Indeed, after witnessing the result of the recent Legislative Council by-election, one can understand the reason.

Mr. Clark: Every State in the Commonwealth has compulsory voting.

Mr. CARNIE: But not every country in the Commonwealth has it. I think that for those who are 18-21 years of age there should be voluntary voting, if we cannot have voluntary voting generally. I will support the second reading to allow the Leader's amendment to be moved and debated but, if that amendment is defeated, I will not support the third reading.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Although I do not wish to be involved in a silent vote, I will not support the Bill in its present form, for I am not in favour of compulsory voting, especially at the age of 18 years.

Mr. Payne: Or at any age?

Mr. WARDLE: Yes, I would say that. Also, I do not believe that there are any countries in the world where 18-year-olds are compelled to vote. I shall prefer to support the amendments placed on file by the member for Fisher. I believe that a correct decision was made when 20-year-olds were permitted to consume liquor in hotels, for I believe that this recognized that our young people mature earlier today than in past generations, and I believe that a reduction in the age of one year compensated for this earlier maturity. Although the member for Stuart has said that the young person of today is keen on politics, I cannot confirm that statement from my own experience. I base my argument entirely on two points: first, the point that young people are not demanding for themselves the right to vote at 18 years of age; and secondly, I do not find that parents believe that their

teenage children are ready to accept the privilege of voting at 18 years of age.

One of my own sons who is in a teachers' training college is the member of a group of third-year students, and in that group of 32 students only five wish to vote at the age of 20 years. Although the member for Gilles (I think it was) said that 18 years is becoming the accepted principle throughout the world, I believe that most political leaders throughout the Western world are making valiant attempts to have the 18-21-year-olds believe that they are clamouring for a vote, when I do not believe that there is much evidence to confirm this. From the *Book of the States of 1970-71* under "Constitutions and Elections", at page 31, I quote the following interesting information dealing with the voting age:

A major new direction in election legislation during the past biennium involved serious efforts to lower the voting age. Some kind of action was taken in at least eight States during this period, although no State actually reduced the age limit. The Maryland electorate voted heavily against lowering the age to 19. The proposal lost in 21 of 23 counties with 43 per cent of the electorate participating and was close only in Baltimore. North Dakota voters turned down, by a 3,000 vote margin, a plan to lower the age to 19, despite endorsement by both parties and most of the candidates in the election. The only section of the constitutional referendum defeated by Hawaiian voters would have reduced the age limit from 20 to 18, and the electorates in both Nebraska and Ohio rejected proposals to lower the voting age to 19. New Jersey and New Mexico voters rejected proposals to lower the voting age to 18 and 20 respectively. Other Legislatures have approved constitutional amendments to be submitted to their voters, reducing the minimum voting age. In general the pattern has been official approval and endorsement but rejection by the voters at the polls.

I believe that that is significant and that it fits exactly the pattern of my own investigations and of those of many members. Young people are not asking for this vote. The reaction of so many of the people concerned is as follows: "Well I have been at school all my life; let me finish my university career, or my teachers training courses, and then I will have time to give my mind to things political." I commend the Government for altering the principal Act so as to allow clergymen and officiating ministers to become members of Parliament. As I think the member for Stuart reminded us, history records the impact of many such professional men on the life of Governments. I believe that the recorded history of our Parliaments shows the contributions such men have made to the political

life of the country. I am not prepared to support the Bill as it stands, but I will support an amendment to reduce the voting age to 20 years.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): My contribution will be brief. With other members, I do not intend to cast a silent vote. In January, 1970, 50 per cent of the world's population comprised people of 25 years of age or younger. It is inevitable in that situation that consideration be turned to the greater participation of those people in the events of the day. Although many young people involve themselves in levels of activity with which they are associated, from discussions I have had with them and from information I have sought from them I have not found any clamour for a reduction in the voting age. Obviously the direction to have them participate in voting at 18 years comes from people much older than 18 years (in fact, much older than 25 years), and I speak of the Government, which has introduced the Bill. I will support the amendment which will provide that this Bill will have effect at the same time as similar Commonwealth legislation has effect. The alternative, which could be provided in another Bill, would be to make possible voluntary voting for people in this age group. Although I support the second reading, I do not guarantee that I will support the third reading of the Bill.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): This has been a long debate in which a relatively large number of members has participated. Few of those who have spoken have opposed the principle of votes for persons between the ages of 18 years and 21 years. Amongst those who have spoken, there have been many expressions from members on both sides in support of this principle. The case for reducing the voting age to 18 years has been fully argued by members, and this will enable me to make my reply brief. The only real opposition that has been raised to the Bill has been twofold. First, there has been a suggestion that the age of 18 years is too young, and that the age should be 20 years. To this, I can only say that I agree entirely with the member for Torrens. It seems to me to be a futile proceeding to reduce the voting age by one year. Indeed, those who have spoken have really put forward no reason why the age should be reduced by one year and not by three years.

Mr. Gunn: Neither have you.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I set out reasons in the second reading explanation that have been reiterated and supported not only by members

on this side but also by several of the honourable member's colleagues. The other ground of opposition put is that the reduction in the voting age should be deferred until the Commonwealth (and I think some speakers suggested this applied to the other States, too) actually implements a reduction in the voting age. I fail to understand why, as I indicated in the second reading explanation, when the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the other States have indicated their acceptance of this move and their intention to implement it, South Australia should defer the implementation of the reform, if it is desirable, until the other States and the Commonwealth have introduced it. The member for Fisher said that, if the correct age was 20 years, South Australia should be prepared to implement a voting age of 20 years even though other parts of the Commonwealth took the view that the appropriate age was 18 years. I do not dissent from that; I think the honourable member is correct and that the converse applies: if the proper age is 18 years, this Parliament should implement what it believes to be correct and should not be concerned that the Commonwealth and the other States may not yet have got around to implementing what they, too, regard as a desirable reform.

The only suggestion made was that made by the member for Mitcham that it might produce confusion if the voting age were 18 years in the State and 21 years in the Commonwealth. I do not see why it should produce confusion. In many areas there are different laws affecting people's lives depending whether the Commonwealth or the State has the requisite jurisdiction. People in this country who live in a federal system are accustomed to Commonwealth and State laws and accept this in their everyday lives. If it should happen (it is unlikely) that there was a period of time in which the Commonwealth Parliament involved a different voting age from that for the State Parliament, I do not see that that presents a problem. It seems to me that the Parliament of this State should consider what it believes to be the appropriate voting age and should have the courage of its convictions. It should be prepared to act on its convictions, and implement that change in the State. Other Opposition members have suggested that they agree to the voting age of 18 years but that they would oppose voting being compulsory for persons between the ages of 18 years and 21 years. I believe that is an untenable position.

Compulsory voting is part of the law of this State, as it has been (and I pointed this out on another occasion) for many years. Becoming the law of the State during the term of a Liberal Government, it remained the law of the State for many years while Liberal Governments remained in office. It has been the law of the Commonwealth for many years during which Liberal Governments have been in office in Canberra. As I have said before, it is remarkable to hear the sudden spate of opinions expressed opposing compulsory voting for the State. One wonders what has led to this attitude on the part of certain Opposition members, although not all of them by any means: I suggest to them that it is a mistake for them to change the course that has been settled at a time when they are smarting under electoral defeat, because sometimes judgments can become clouded. In those circumstances I suggest that it is wise to wait until the pain subsides before forming settled judgments.

The measure is one to reduce from 21 years to 18 years the age at which members of the community are entitled to be enrolled to vote. Once a person exercises the right to become enrolled if it is conferred on him, he assumes the full responsibility of citizenship as an elector, and I see no valid basis for distinguishing between electors over 21 years of age and electors under 21 years of age as to the obligations imposed on them in relation to exercising duties of citizenship. Therefore, if a person between 18 years and 21 years decides to become enrolled, it seems to me that he must accept the responsibilities of citizenship and the obligation that goes with this responsibility, namely, the obligation of exercising the franchise that he has accepted. The point was made by two members of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The Attorney-General is replying to the debate.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Kavel made the point (and he was supported by another Opposition member: I think the member for Light) that there was no clamour or demand for this measure. I merely say that this proposal has been discussed in the community over a period of years. It has caused much discussion and interest and I can only say that those Opposition members who claim that young people between 18 years and 21 years are not interested in having the right to vote must mix with different young people

from those with whom I mix, and I do mix with quite a few from time to time. They, particularly the more politically conscious and intellectual amongst them, are extremely interested in this matter and many of them see an opportunity to direct the political energies of the young along lines that are acceptable in a democratic community. The member for Kavel went further, and I think he used the term "overwhelming mandate" for this measure. I am not sure how one distinguishes an overwhelming mandate from a mandate *simpliciter*.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What I said was that the Labor Party cannot claim a mandate for this measure merely because it got 52 per cent of the vote.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The Attorney-General is closing the debate and I will not continually call members to order. There is too much interjection and audible conversation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not think that is what the member for Kavel said.

The SPEAKER: He is out of order.

The Hon. L. J. KING: However, the point is that this was part of the Labor Party's policy at the last State election. It was stressed not only in the policy speech but also in a series of television shows, in some of which I had the privilege to participate. It was mentioned in programmes in which the very expression referred to by members opposite was used: namely, that this generation was the best educated generation in our history. Nothing could have been brought to the attention of the electors during the last election campaign more than the Labor Party's proposal that, if elected, it would reduce the voting age to 18 years. The result of the election provided the mandate. If it did not, it would be extremely difficult to understand in what circumstances any Government could claim a mandate.

The only further thing I want to say in reply to this debate is to refer to something that I said in my second reading explanation: namely, that at that time I could not give the House information as to the circumstances in which the prohibition against ministers of religion being eligible to be members of the House came into our Constitution. I have since remedied that defect in my knowledge and can now confirm what the member for Mitcham has said: namely, that it seems to have had its origin, at least to some extent, in notions of

the separation of church and State, which notions were extremely prevalent and strongly held by dissenting radical groups, in particular, at about the time of the framing of our Constitution and it seems that the prohibition dates back to the framing of the Constitution. It seems to have arisen from a demand by the radicals of the time and seems to have been part of a package deal arrived at by way of compromise following a controversy that waged fiercely over several years. The controversy seems to have settled around (and times do not change much) the topic of State aid for denominational schools, but the controversy extended beyond the mere question of State aid for church schools. The radicals were against this aid and the conservatives favoured this programme and policy. The whole matter then became involved in a controversy over the powers and franchise of the Upper House and a deal was arranged between the radicals and the conservatives in which the radicals traded the limited franchise for the Upper House in exchange for excluding ministers of religion from the Parliament, a bargain which, in retrospect, I cannot help commenting was a rather unfortunate deal. At all events, this Bill provides for conservatives in this Parliament the opportunity to rectify the mistake made in 1856, and I therefore commend this provision.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, providing for an alteration of the Constitution relating to the House of Assembly, its second reading, to be carried, requires an absolute majority in accordance with Standing Order 300. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question "That the Bill be now read a second time." I hear no dissenting voice. The Bill, having been passed with the requisite statutory majority, may now be proceeded with.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2) The Governor shall not make a proclamation for the purposes of subsection (1) of this section unless he is satisfied that legislation has been enacted by the Parliament of the Commonwealth, providing that the age at which persons shall become entitled to vote at elections for the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth shall be eighteen years, and that legislation is in operation.

The need for this amendment is self-evident, and I do not have the same view about this as does the Attorney-General. I believe that there is a need in Australia to standardize these provisions as much as possible, especially when voting is compulsory as it is under the existing law. To require people between the age of 18 years and 21 years to vote compulsorily for the State when the requirement does not exist for Commonwealth elections is contradictory and will add to the growing attitude of derision held by members of the community. Many people do not distinguish between State and Commonwealth Parliaments when they vote, and we should not add to their confusion.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I remind members that the Commonwealth Government intends to implement this requirement, as do the Governments of other States. No reason has been advanced by the Leader for this State's deferring reform until the Commonwealth Government implements its measures. He suggested that it could lead to confusion or disrespect for government, but I do not know why this should be so. This Bill simply entitles persons between the ages of 18 years and 21 years to obtain enrolment, if they desire, for State elections. The argument of uniformity advanced by the Leader is surprising, because if his argument is correct it means that there should be compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. If this Parliament is satisfied that the appropriate voting age is 18 years there is no reason why we should not implement it. I refuse to believe that citizens of this State, brought up under a federal system and accustomed to differences between State and Commonwealth laws, will be thrown into confusion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because it suits the argument, the Attorney tries to minimize the difficulties that will arise if there is a different age for voting for Commonwealth and State elections. Perhaps he does not realize that about 90 per cent of the population is confused about what is Commonwealth and what is State. If we continue with this legislation and the Commonwealth Government, for one reason or another, does not, at the next Commonwealth election people between the ages of 18 years and 21 years will expect to be able to vote. They will not get a vote, and this will be confusing and most inconvenient to all concerned, not least of all those who are working as officials at a polling booth. We believe that

the age should be uniform, and members who were in this Chamber during the last Parliament will know that the only reason why we did not go ahead with this when we were in office was the desire to achieve uniformity.

The Hon. L. J. King: Your New South Wales colleagues have a different view.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow discussion on elections in other States. We are dealing with the commencement of the Act in South Australia, and the amendment refers to the Commonwealth of Australia, and to the House of Representatives. The member for Mitcham must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I am sorry you said that, because it shows you really have not been following the point I have been making.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am dealing with the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the Bill stands, clause 2 provides that it is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation, so that even without this amendment it will be possible for the Bill to operate only from the date when the Commonwealth legislation comes into effect also. Therefore, to that extent we do not need the amendment: we wish to insert it merely to ensure uniformity. Therefore, if the Government opposes the amendment, I am afraid it will do so out of sheer cussedness, because it does not want to concede any credit to the Leader of the Opposition, however well justified his amendment may be.

Mr. COUMBE: The amendment provides that the Governor shall not make a proclamation, etc. The Attorney-General said that it had been agreed at meetings of the various Attorneys-General that this type of legislation would come into force. Some of us are supporting the move regarding 18-year-olds, and what the other States do does not concern South Australia: we are concerned only with the Commonwealth and South Australia. If the Attorney-General and the Government wish to claim credit for being the first to introduce this measure, they can do so by accepting the amendment, for it will not deter them one iota from claiming this honour. I canvassed this matter as recently as last Saturday at the polls, and most of the people to whom I spoke said that confusion would exist and that they would prefer uniformity. The Bill is being supported, but it cannot come into operation until the Commonwealth legislation is enacted. Someone has said that it might involve only a few months; the measure

can stand and then by proclamation it can come into effect. I think it is a reasonable amendment, and I suggest that if the Government wanted to have the Bill passed it should accept the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I, too, support the amendment. The Attorney-General would seem to justify or validate this legislation by referring to it as a reform, but he has not advanced any argument that would tend to confirm this. The Labor Party is seeking to implement this measure simply to give effect to a part of its policy.

The Hon. L. J. King: Liberal Parties in the other States are doing the same.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: By introducing the measure in this State before the Commonwealth legislation is enacted, the net result must surely be confusion in the minds of the people, particularly the young people affected by this legislation. Nor can I see the burden of the Attorney-General's argument when he says that an argument exists for compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. In fact, voting for the House of Assembly at present is not compulsory, in that enrolment is not compulsory, and the Government does not seem to have taken any steps to alter this situation. Far from being convinced by the Attorney-General's rather nebulous argument, I completely agree with the Leader's argument that this legislation should not be implemented until there is uniform legislation. The Attorney-General has made no valid point to justify opposing the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Tonkin, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3—"Qualification of electors for House of Assembly."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

To strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty".

The Attorney-General said that I had given no argument for retaining a voting age above 18 years. At this time once a person enrolls voting is compulsory. If the Government is prepared to accept voluntary voting my attitude may change. Many countries at present have the voting age at 20 years. In this category are Austria, Sweden, Switzerland—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with clause 3 and I must ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the clause.

Mr. EVANS: As I have moved an amendment to reduce the voting age to 20 years rather than to 18 years, I trust you will allow me to draw a comparison by illustrating the practice in other countries with which we trade, and which have consulates in many cases in South Australia. New Zealand and Japan are other countries in this category. I believe there is a basis on which we should consider 20 years as the voting age. Except for Russia, with which we do not trade, we find that where 20 years is the voting age voting is not compulsory. Young people today are no more immature than were young people in the past, but neither are they more mature. I do not believe there is any necessity to lower the age, nor has any demand or request been made for it even by intellectuals in this age group. The reason I believe we should reduce the age to 20 years is that we have a National Service Act which compels those whose names come out of a barrel to be conscripted and to serve in our armed forces. The same basic argument was used in the United States for reducing the age to 18 years, because in that country people are taken into the forces at 18 years. As the legal drinking age is 20 years in this State, we have a basis on which to work.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The reasons why we believe 18 years is the appropriate age have been fully canvassed. The point raised by the amendment was effectively answered by the member for Torrens. It seems strange that the member for Fisher should move this amendment immediately after supporting, by his vote, the Leader's amendment, which was justified on the basis that there ought to be uniformity between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government. One thing is certain if this amendment is carried. It would not produce uniformity between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government. At present the Commonwealth voting age is 21 years, so it would destroy

uniformity immediately, but when the change came in the Commonwealth, the change would be to 18 years, as the Commonwealth Attorney-General has announced, so there would be a difference and lack of uniformity between the State and the Commonwealth. This makes it difficult for me to reconcile the attitude of the member for Fisher to the last amendment with the attitude that he is taking now.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause." Those in favour say "Aye"; those against say "No". The "Noes" have it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Divide!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Ring the bells.

*While the bells were ringing:*

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. A similar incident occurred in the Chamber recently. There was no call and the vote was taken. It was said that, because there had been no call, we could not divide. On this occasion, there was no call for "Aye" and you then called "Divide". I take the point that, if there is no call, a division cannot be taken.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not in order, because a division can be called for at any time. I ruled that the "Noes" won the vote on this occasion, and then a division was called for.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I raise a further point of order. My understanding of Standing Orders always has been that the side that loses on the voices can only ask for a division if there has been a call and only a person who has actually called is entitled to ask for a division. With great respect, there was no call at all from the Government side. I was watching.

Mr. Langley: You were watching!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly, the Attorney-General did not call, but he has asked for a division. I suggest, with great respect, that if this division is allowed to proceed, that is contrary to the invariable practice of this House and, as the member for Fisher has stated, the position arose only last week.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ruled on this occasion that the "Noes" had the vote. That was my ruling. A division was called for and I ordered that the division take place.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With very great respect, the only person in the Chamber who called was the member for Fisher.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair gave a ruling. Pursuant to Standing Order 213, I ruled that the "Noes" had the vote. Then a division was called for and I ordered that the division take place pursuant to Standing Order 213.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, in that case, I suggest that you have misinterpreted Standing Order 213.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the honourable member moving dissent from the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If you compel me to do so to make the point, I will. I hoped that I would not have to do so.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have ruled—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But Standing Order 213 says that a division cannot be called for unless—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! At this stage there is no point of order. I ruled that a division should take place in accordance with Standing Order 213.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on my original point of order, that a similar incident occurred last week and it was ruled that no division could be called. My voice was the only voice that called. Members of the Government were caught off guard and did not call. All I ask is for uniformity and the same treatment in each case. What is the difference between this call and the one last week?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. We are dealing not with something that happened last week but with a ruling I have given in pursuance of Standing Order 213. The question before the Chair is "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided on the question:

Ayes (33)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Carnie, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Eastick, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (7)—Messrs. Evans (teller), Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Jennings. No.—Mr. Allen.

Majority of 26 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed. Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act and to alter the Constitution of the House of Assembly, its third reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 300, I now count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I put the question, "That this Bill be now read a third time." For the question say "Aye"; those against "No". There being a dissentient voice, it will be necessary to divide the House. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (32)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (10)—Messrs. Carnie, Eastick, Evans (teller), Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, and Wardle.

Majority of 22 for the Ayes.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2014.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): As the arguments for this Bill are substantially the same as those we have lately rehearsed on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, there is no need to go over all of them again. Indeed, this Bill and that Bill really go together. That Bill dealt with the political matters affecting the reduction in the age of majority and this Bill deals with the legal matters. As was amply illustrated in the other Bill it is very much a matter of opinion whether the age should be left at 21 years or reduced to 18 years or to some other age, and there are no arguments of such compelling force as to lead by a process of logic to any conclusion. In fact, the policy of the Liberal and Country League at the last election was for a reduction in the age of majority to 18 years, and every

member on this side of the House was elected under the banner of the Leader of the Opposition, who enunciated this policy in his policy speech.

Mr. Evans: You be careful!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hear some stirrings from the back bench on this side, and I am not for a moment denying the right of any member on this side to oppose this measure now. I can say that in this place that is one of the freedoms that is peculiar to our Party in politics, namely, that we are not bound by a rigid Party line, as members on the other side are bound and as we have seen lately concerning the Industrial Code Amendment Bill debate. I support the principle of reducing the age in legal matters, as I supported it with regard to voting. I think it was the Premier himself, on one of the rare occasions, who moved the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not know what you mean by "rare".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is unusual for the Premier even to be in the House these days, let alone in charge of a Bill, but this measure is one in which he has interested himself and he, in fact, apparently moved the second reading, although I was a little hazy about it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You usually are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think it was necessary for the Premier to speak at such length when he made his second reading explanation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If I do not speak at length, you say I am being discourteous to the House. I can never win!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is funny to hear the Premier say that, because I was reading a debate of a couple of years ago in which he said just the same thing when I was speaking.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was as true then as it is now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know why the Premier should have such a predilection to criticize me when I say anything about him.

The SPEAKER: Personalities are out of order, and the honourable member must refrain from answering interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At least the Premier will have to admit that I am consistent in my criticisms of him. I prefer to look at the New South Wales Law Reform Committee report on this matter, although in that case it was limited to—

Mr. Evans: Were any lawyers in it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Justice Manning was then the Chairman of the Law Reform Commission, and he signed the report. That report is limited to contracts in property, but I suggest to the member for Fisher, who apparently from his interjections as well as from the views he has often expressed in this House as one of those who do not favour this Bill, that he have a look at the report of Mr. Justice Manning and his colleague, because it sets out pretty well the reasons why they have recommended in favour of a reduction from 21 years to 18 years. I suggest that he look particularly at paragraphs 9, 12, 14, 16, 25 and 26. I shall quote from only paragraph 26, as the time is getting late and members can look at it for themselves. Paragraph 26 is as follows:

Why 18 years and not 17, 19 or 20 years?

I quote this particularly in deference to the member for Fisher, in view of the amendment he moved in the previous debate.

The SPEAKER: That cannot be referred to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is, of course, entirely out of order of me to think of it, I suppose, Sir. The paragraph continues:

We reject 17 years or any lower age simply because we do not think it would be safe. Had we not had the advantage of knowing the views of others, we might have recommended some higher age than 18 years, but in recent years a great body of opinion, both in New South Wales and elsewhere, has come to favour 18 years as the age of majority. The weightiest expression of this opinion is the majority report of the Latey Committee, but there have been many others throughout the English speaking world. We have formed the view that 18 years may be adopted as the age of majority without undue risk, thus promoting uniformity with what has been done or is in prospect in other places.

I respectfully concur in that opinion. Therefore, as I have said, I support the principle of the Bill, but I have a greater doubt about the way in which the Government is to put that principle into practice. The Bill has only a few clauses and then it proceeds, in a schedule, to amend 34 South Australian Statutes. I can only hope that the draftsman, in his industry, has not overlooked any particular Act and that we do not find that this is a thing of shreds and patches and that the law in the future is 18 years for most things but 21 years for those which have been forgotten by this Parliament. I am not suggesting that a mistake has been made, but one thing I looked for immediately and did not find was in regard to the Legal Practitioners Act. I could not find in that Act any reference to a qualifying age for



admission as a practitioner of the court, but I heard it said about His Honor Mr. Justice Sangster yesterday that he was an infant when he finished his course and was ready to be admitted but had to wait for admission, and I have often heard that said about other practitioners. I presume from that that either the bar has been taken out of the law and that a person can be admitted at any age or, more likely, that it is contained in the rules of court. Unless Their Honors the judges are moved to amend the rules of court the age for admission to the Bar will still be 21 years even though the general age of majority goes down to 18 years. I refer to that as an example of the way in which parts of the law can be missed.

Members may recall that when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1968 the Premier introduced a Bill on this subject. I was successful in persuading the House to reject it on the ground that our best and safest course was to take the law section by section and amend it over a rather longer period than proposed by the Premier then and as he proposes now. I believed that in that way we would make sure that we covered the field adequately, even if we did not do it all at the one time. However, the Government has not seen fit to heed the advice I followed in 1968 and has introduced this Bill. In his explanation, the Premier had the gall to say:

Honourable members will remember that in 1968 I introduced a similar Bill into this House.

I had a look at the Bill which the Premier introduced in 1968 and which I opposed on the grounds to which I have referred and because I believed it was badly drafted, and I found no resemblance whatsoever between that Bill, which had only eight clauses, and the Bill he has now introduced. I think he was allowing himself far too much liberty, probably hoping that no-one would check up on him, when he said that the Bill he has now introduced is similar to that which he introduced before. I can only conclude from the fact that he has seen fit to introduce a Bill in an entirely dissimilar form this time that he now acknowledges, if only tacitly, the criticisms I made of the draftsmanship and general construction of his 1968 Bill. I support the principle of this Bill, hoping that what it sets out to do it does effectively. I have my doubts about that, and only time will tell.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the Bill be now read a second time." Those in favour say "Aye", those against "No". The Ayes have it.

Mr. McAnaney: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that vote a nullity?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What do you want it to be?

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for Heysen was on his feet before I put the question, but I did not notice him. I do not have a list of speakers and it is not possible to see everyone in the Chamber. In future I should appreciate co-operation in regard to members who want to speak, otherwise when I put a question it will have to stand.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not suggesting that the member for Heysen should not be allowed to speak: I am simply asking you whether the vote apparently taken was a nullity.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I will speak briefly. I have an amendment on the file relating to teenagers drinking in bars. Members of the Police Force have said that they will not be able to control teenage drinking until it is illegal for a person under a certain age to be in a bar. I know that such a provision can be awkward in that in certain places families wish to be together, and it is suggested that hotel dining-rooms be exempt from this provision. The Vice Squad is worried about teenagers drinking in bars. Teenagers should not be permitted in bars if they are under the age of 18 years. We realize that parents should be responsible and know where their children are, but many parents allow their teenage children to wander about. Even though this may prevent families from going into beer gardens, it is up to Parliament to make it illegal for teenagers to be in bars. If young children are involved, the police will not take action against them but will act with common sense. The community as a whole must suffer some inconvenience if we are to support the police in their efforts to keep young children out of bars. Only the week before last, the head of the Vice Squad told me that the police were worried about the position and were not able to take effective action until it was illegal for anyone under the legal drinking age to be allowed into a bar. I also object to a discretion being given to a person serving a drink. It is guesswork to try to work out whether a person is 17 years or 18 years old.

Gallup polls show opposition in relation to the mortgaging of land, but I do not understand the objection. Before one mortgages one must have assets. I do not understand why anyone between the age of 18 years and 21 years cannot give a mortgage. Many persons in this age group conduct businesses, and it seems ridiculous that they cannot mortgage assets.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Clauses 3 (4) and 4 (5) provide that this legislation shall not apply to apprenticeship and employment considerations. I express the hope that this is not the thin edge of the wedge and that, because so many people are granted benefits by a reduction in the age of majority, soon there will be a clamour for increased salaries in the latter age group of apprentices, that prices in industry will be affected. I also refer to the provisions dealing with pistol licences, which provide for persons to obtain a pistol licence at 18 years. In the past the police have exercised a major discretion regarding who may obtain a pistol licence. This has been an even greater discretion than that applying to a gun licence. Because a pistol can be concealed so easily, difficulties could arise with young persons. It is not unusual for persons in that age group who go to hotels or discotheques to become involved in fights, and frequently we read of injuries inflicted by knives or other weapons.

The member for Mitcham has indicated that several professions, particularly that of which he is a member, are provided for in the amendment, but some professions are not. Inquiries suggest that, for example, in the case of the Veterinary Surgeons Act, the university will still have control of the age at which a person may graduate. Therefore, although the provisions for registration by virtue of State law at an age less than 21 years is made, it will still not be possible for a person to obtain the necessary certificate from the university from which he graduates. I agree with the member for Mitcham that, basically, the arguments put forward in the last Bill we have dealt with are similar to those applying here, and I will not canvass them again. I support the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I oppose the Bill, for reasons similar to those for which I opposed the Bill to reduce the voting age. I will show that no other western country goes as far as we are going. Some honourable members consider that the United Kingdom goes as far, but it does not. It is not possible there to be

a member of Parliament at 18 years of age, a person is not liable for jury service at that age, and a person cannot be sent to prison as an adult at the age of 18 years.

Other countries that have reduced the age of majority from 21 years to 18 years or 19 years have kept the age for signing contracts higher. In Austria, a person may vote when he becomes 20 years of age but he may not sign a contract until he is 21 years old. In Sweden a person may not sign a contract until he is 20 years old, unless he has his guardian's consent. The age fixed in cases where he has a guardian's consent is 16 years. In Switzerland, where the voting age is 20 years, a person may not sign a contract until he is 21 years of age. He must be 21 years old before he can sign a contract and accept sole responsibility. In Denmark the reverse is the case: a person may vote when he is 21 years of age and may sign a contract when he is 20 years of age.

In the United States of America an attempt is being made to alter the law in regard to voting but the law has not been amended in relation to the age at which a person may sign contracts or drink or purchase alcohol. In Hawaii a person may purchase alcohol at 20 years of age, in Louisiana at 18 years of age, in New York at 18 years of age and in Nebraska at 20 years of age. They are the States in the United States in which a person may purchase liquor if he is under 21 years of age. In all the other States of the United States, the age is 21 years. We cannot draw comparisons with America about the age of majority merely because in that country the voting age is 18 years.

In Japan and New Zealand persons may purchase alcohol or sign contracts at 20 years of age. In New Zealand there is one variation in relation to signing contracts: a minor may sign a contract at 18 years but a court may waive a part of the contract that it considers harsh or oppressive. We are not even suggesting that: we are opening up the whole matter. In the Netherlands, a person may not sign a contract until he is 21 years of age but he is permitted to drink alcohol at 18 years of age. In Belgium he has to be 21 years of age before he can sign a contract or drink alcohol. In Germany, with voting allowed for 18-year-olds, a person is permitted to drink alcohol at 18 years of age but cannot sign a contract until he is 21 years of age. In Canada the law relating to contracts has

not been interfered with: it permits 21-year-olds to sign contracts, except in certain cases of common law. Most Canadian provinces have chosen the age of 21 years for the drinking of alcohol, and few countries have chosen an age below 21 years.

Marriage is not provided for in this Bill, but no doubt it will be used as a basis for States to accept the age of 18 years as the age of majority for all other matters. I believe that only an immature person will marry at 18 years of age. The question of National Service is also covered by Commonwealth legislation, but in most countries that have a form of National Service the age starts at 20 years. If the age of majority is reduced to 18 years, will people of this age be paid a full adult wage? Will this action increase the cost structure in this State if other States do not introduce this type of legislation? Will we place ourselves at a disadvantage compared to other States when competing for industries? I believe we will.

I am most concerned about contracts. I see nothing wrong with a young person asking his parents or friends to be a guarantor in a deal. However, our present forms of advertising batten on the weakness of young people and tend to encourage them to purchase goods that are usually classed as luxuries. When speaking about the age that a person should be permitted to enter licensed premises I said to the then Attorney-General (the member for Mitcham) that if we found that we had no difficulties with a permitted drinking age of 20 years I might agree to reducing it to 18 years. However, what has been the result? In the press of July 28 this year the following report appeared:

Juvenile court magistrate Mr. W. C. Beerworth said yesterday he was satisfied that 18 years of age was too young for people to drink in hotel bars.

"They should not be allowed to drink indiscriminately in bars, or buy liquor in bulk from bottle departments," he said. He was amazed at the effect that liquor had on young people. In his three months on the juvenile court bench this had been reflected in the large number of drink-driving cases dealt with by him.

"The behaviour of young people who have consumed liquor has been amazing," he said.

He had no objection to young people between 18 and 20 drinking provided it was under supervision.

"It is the indiscriminate and uncontrolled type of drinking that is causing me so much concern," Mr. Beerworth said.

Earlier this year Superintendent Calder spoke about the drink problem after another juvenile court magistrate (Mr. L. M. Wright)

had said that Saturday nights were becoming a "drink-up" night for juveniles. Mr. Wright urged parents to be concerned about their teenage children's drinking habits. Superintendent Calder said that, when the legal drinking age was 21 years, many people 18 years of age and over went to hotels. With the legal drinking age of 20 years, even younger groups were entering hotels. If we reduce the permitted drinking age on licensed premises by two years, will a younger group drink in our hotels? The member for Heysen has said that it is up to the parents to supervise their children, but the argument was used today that these children are more mature and should be given some independence. Now, it is suggested that they need to be supervised.

I have no doubt that alcohol is a problem in our society, particularly if we reach the stage where young people of 14 years and 15 years of age are entering hotels and police are having difficulty in apprehending them, because they have to be caught drinking the liquor. I know a minority group of people cause these troubles. The Minister of Roads and Transport said today that we must do all we could to reduce the accidents on our roads. With this in mind, we should be aware of the problems that we may create and ensure that we do not allow children to drink at an earlier age.

In Victoria, where 18-year-olds have been permitted to drink on licensed premises for 40 years, about 65 per cent of schoolboys and 50 per cent of schoolgirls between the ages of 15 years and 18 years drink alcohol. I believe that there is nothing wrong with that if it is done under guidance at home. However, this result of a survey of 1,000 schoolchildren in Government and non-Government schools was reported in the July 1969 edition of an educational magazine issued by the Victorian Education Department. We know that in our community many problems have been caused by accidents in which young and old people are involved and with which alcohol is often associated.

I believe that the age of 20 years has worked effectively as an age at which people may enter licensed premises and consume liquor. I believe that we must tighten up the provision to the degree suggested by the member for Heysen; indeed, I believe that Superintendent Calder would expect us, as Parliamentarians, to give the police power to prosecute anyone under the age of 18 years who was in a bar.

Although in opposing the Bill I shall be fighting a fruitless cause and I am in the minority, I know that I have many supporters in the community. Further, if the Government were prepared to spend on a referendum concerning this matter the money that it spent on a referendum concerning trading hours, most people would vote "No". We are merely giving certain business proprietors the opportunity to sell to the young, at times to the detriment of the young as well as perhaps to the detriment of society. I cannot support the Bill as it stands.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support only the second reading of the Bill, for I have mixed feelings about the measure; at this stage I term turn myself an agnostic on this matter. First, we have here a provision whereby apparently young apprentices who have not served their full apprenticeship, even though that apprenticeship may have been reduced to four years, will be able to take out a licence under the Builders Licensing Act. How ridiculous this would be, bearing in mind that nearly every week questions about housing problems are asked by members on both sides, particularly questions about jerry-built houses. We should not in any circumstances support the registering of young people who have not even served their apprenticeship in a trade.

Another amendment contained in this Bill relates to the Juries Act. I ask the Government at what age it considers that young people, who are expected to serve on juries, reach maturity. As these people are expected to carry out important duties that affect the affairs and future of other people, I think this matter must be carefully considered. Another matter of concern involves the taking out and signing of contracts. Undoubtedly, young people have much more money than their counterparts had previously, and surely this provides bait for unscrupulous dealers, who are willing to sell any type of ware to young people, or any other person for that matter, silly enough to take out a certain form of contract. Unfortunately, there will always be people who, having signed their name to a contract, will not be able to fulfil the terms of that contract. It is our responsibility to ensure that haphazard practices in this regard are stopped. Indeed, I find it difficult to support a provision permitting the signing of a contract by people of 18 years of age.

Awards in various organizations and trades provide certain payments according to age, a

person generally receiving the full award payment at the age of 21 years. What happens when people are regarded as adults at 18 years? Do they then receive the full adult rate? I refer to clerks in trustee corporations, banks and the Public Service, to mention a few of the various organizations concerned. Has the cost to the State been considered? I suppose that everyone deserves more money, because it takes more money every year to live, but we must be sensible about the matter, particularly when millions of dollars may be involved. I support the second reading, but with reservations.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. The measure that we have just dealt with has a direct bearing on this Bill and, the House having passed that measure, we are bound to this Bill to some extent. I think the nub of the matter is contained in the preamble of the Bill relating to the various Acts to be amended. Clause 3 (3) provides that "this section shall not affect the assessment or imposition of succession duty", etc.; and subclause (4) provides that "this section shall not affect conditions of employment or rights or obligations arising from employment". Clause 4 (5) then provides:

This section shall not affect the construction of any industrial award, order, determination or agreement, or any instrument made or entered into pursuant to any Act that prescribes wages and other conditions of or relating to apprenticeship.

I understand that that means that, where a court has laid down an award or where an agreement has been made regarding people who are at present classed as minors or journeymen, the awards in question shall stand, irrespective of this measure.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the Minister for confirming that. The member for Glenelg referred to the Builders Licensing Act in which in two cases the age is reduced from 21 years to 18 years; I think he will find that an apprentice will still have to serve until about the age of 21 years, despite the proposed reduction of the apprenticeship term to four years. In other words, this may not cover 18-year-olds. The Act provides for a fit and proper person who is qualified to hold a licence. That deals with trades in which apprentices are employed. If apprentices are not employed, this provision applies, as in the case of casual labour.

I was concerned about the matter of industrial awards. Will the Minister confirm that industrial awards are not touched on and that apprenticeship provisions and awards are not affected? Other provisions reducing the age are worth while. Several members have referred to the Licensing Act. When that Act was last before us, I voted for 18 years to apply and I will vote for that again. On that occasion, an amendment was introduced to provide for 20 years. Although mine is a small district, it has many hotels in it and there is a great problem, especially in lounges, in that it is hard to tell whether a girl, particularly, is 19 years or 18 years. We must make 18 years the age that applies and cut out much of the discretion that is presently provided to the publican. Having gone through the various Acts that are amended, I believe that this legislation conforms to the Bill that has just passed the House.

[Midnight]

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Greek philosopher Aristotle defined a citizen as "one having the right to take part in the legal and judicial processes of his community". I support this legislation, for I truly believe that the younger people of today are given a broader education and are reaching maturity more quickly than ever before. No-one would ever have thought 20 years ago that it was possible that the age of majority would be reduced to 18 years. However, if we are to make progress as a nation we must ensure that the younger generation is equipped to assist in that progress. I believe that young people today are prepared to accept their responsibility within the community.

I see some dangers in the Bill, and I warn honourable members that several clauses could be dangerous in the case of young people who are not properly equipped or qualified to handle their responsibility. First, I deal with the ability of young people to borrow money. We know that they receive a reasonable salary or wage. There are unscrupulous money-lenders within the community. I can see that a young person could borrow several thousand dollars at 18 years and be bankrupt by the time he was 21 years, thereby ruining his credit rating for the rest of his life. I do not think we can provide any measure to prevent that. Probably we can introduce some legislation at a later stage to protect such dealings, but the young person will have to be taught the value of money and the responsibility attached to it. This is one of the responsibilities facing

the modern banker today; it is easy to lend money, but he has to be a shrewd individual to ensure the repayment. I hope young people do not over-commit themselves. I also warn people in responsible positions with regard to lending money to ensure that they do not take advantage of these provisions in the Bill and thereby lead young people up the garden path.

I also refer to the provisions relating to industrial awards as they affect 18-year-olds. The age of 21 years applies to adult salaries. This will mean that people will receive an increase of several hundred dollars if the provisions in the Bill are accepted by the Industrial Commission. This may be a good thing for the young people concerned, but it will make banking more expensive and will increase the expenses of other industries, too. There is also danger with regard to 18-year-olds making out wills. We know that in large family concerns certain shareholdings in properties are transferred to children at an early age. I can envisage a case of an 18-year-old obtaining a fair share in the family business, living dangerously, and making out a will to leave the money in such a way that the family loses control. Although that is unlikely, it could happen. This places a big responsibility on parents to ensure that their children are properly educated to handle their finances and affairs. I believe young people are generally equipped to do this.

Mr. Slater: They can get married at 18 years.

Mr. BECKER: If they do, they mature much more quickly than do people who marry later in life, and I think I can prove that. I support the Bill but I issue the warning that people who have responsibilities should not take advantage of young people.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Removal of disability of infancy from persons over the age of 18 years."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty".

I move this amendment to test the feeling of members. I believe I used earlier all the arguments that need to be used.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (6)—Messrs. Evans (teller), Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Rodda and Wardle.

Noes (33)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Carnie, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hoppgood, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 27 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. COUMBE: I referred earlier to employment; the Premier could reply to that now. Whilst we are not supposed to deal with clause 4 at this stage, the Premier may be able to link up his remarks with that matter. Sub-clause (4) provides:

This section shall not affect conditions of employment or rights or obligations arising from employment.

Does this mean that awards covering the rights of employment of what are commonly called minors at present and tradesmen under the age of 21 are not affected today; that, where tribunals have laid down rates of pay for male and female minors, apprentices, improvers and journeymen, their rights of employment are not affected by this Bill? I do not think we need worry about rates of pay at the moment, but we should be concerned with the general question of industrial employment and rights and obligations. Will the Premier elaborate on these points?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Bill does not disturb the present provisions for conditions of employment contractually or subject to awards, determinations or agreements. This is clear from subclause (4), and from clause 4 (5), which provides:

This section shall not affect the construction of any industrial award, order, determination or agreement, or any instrument made or entered into pursuant to any Act that prescribes wages and other conditions of or relating to apprenticeship.

So the present contractual relations which are at common law or are authorized pursuant to a particular Statute or awards, determinations or agreements, remain. It may well be that at some subsequent date there will be changes in the view of the court or an industrial tribunal as to what is appropriate to be prescribed in an order or award arising from the fact that the community generally regards a condition of employment as being related to what is the age of adulthood within the community.

Mr. Coumbe: That will be a function of the court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We are not laying down anything here other than that the community generally regards 18 years as the age of adulthood. While we are in no way interfering with existing contractual relationships or with what the court has done to date or with what occurs in apprenticeships, in due course the appropriate tribunals may come to some conclusions as the result of representations before them. However, that will be in their discretion, and this Statute lays down nothing that prescribes what their decision shall be.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment and construction of Acts, regulations, etc."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan). Two small clerical adjustments are necessary in this clause.

Clause passed.

Schedule.

Mr. McANANEY: I move:

In Part XXI, clause 7, to strike out paragraphs (b) and (c) and insert the following new paragraph:

(b) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:

(2) Any person under the age of eighteen years who at any time when liquor may be lawfully supplied to members of the public in licensed premises is on any portion of the licensed premises (except a dining room) in which liquor is normally supplied to members of the public shall be guilty of an offence.

At present, when the minimum age for drinking alcoholic liquor is 20 years, the police have publicly stated that they cannot stop teenagers under the prescribed age drinking in bars. Immediately the police enter a bar the teenagers push the glass of liquor along the counter and say that they have not touched it. My amendments will enable the police effectively to enforce the provisions of the legislation. Members of the vice squad have told me that at several places in the last few weeks girls of 12, 13 and 14 years of age were under the influence of alcoholic liquor, but the police could do nothing about it. The sergeant in charge of the vice squad was sincerely worried about the problem. Although the amendments will curtail liberties, perhaps in hotel lounges where people could be accompanied by their children, to overcome the difficulties I have mentioned we must take firm

steps. If my amendments are not carried I will oppose any change in the laws relating to consumption of alcoholic liquor. I have recently heard lectures on drugs by the member for Bragg and by an officer of the Public Health Department. They said that alcohol was one of the most dangerous drugs we had to combat. It is our job as Parliamentarians to see that there is an age limit that can be enforced by the police; otherwise, it is ridiculous to have a law at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendments, which markedly change the present practice under the Licensing Act. There are many occasions when, under the Licensing Act, whole families go to hotels. They are there in circumstances which are now generally accepted in the community as being part of family occasions. The honourable member's amendments would completely prevent that from taking place, and I do not believe that this is something that the community wants. While the honourable member may ask the Committee to agree that the police should have some means of enforcing something other than what he proposes here, I do not think that, in order to do that, we have to throw the baby out with the bath water—or with the beer slops! With great respect to the honourable member, that is what I think he is proposing to do. This would be a grave interference with a number of social habits that are in no way undesirable in the community but in fact encourage a mode of dealing with liquor which is quite other than dealing with it as a beer swill. Drinking should be encouraged under conditions where there is a family occasion and it is sensibly done. I therefore oppose the amendments.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Acting Chairman, are we taking the whole schedule in one vote? What will be the position of a member who supports, say, 29 of the 34 parts of the schedule?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the schedule as printed, to which amendments have been moved.

Mr. EVANS: If the whole schedule is put, there is no chance of voting against a particular provision.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have already accepted the amendments of the member for Heysen.

Mr. EVANS: I may desire to vote against one particular provision, but I may not want to vote against the remaining provisions.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Any member can move an amendment to the provision under consideration at any time.

Mr. EVANS: I raise a point in relation to Part XIX, the amendment of the Juries Act, that a jury may consist of a group of persons who are 18 years of age and these persons may still be at school. Difficulty may be involved if they are called for jury service.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with amendments moved by the member for Heysen. I have taken the schedule as a whole because at this stage the only amendments on file are those moved by the member for Heysen. We will move on to Part XXI of the schedule. We cannot deal with an amendment prior to the amendments moved by the member for Heysen. The only way in which an honourable member can move an amendment previous to the amendments now being considered is if leave is sought to withdraw the amendments under consideration.

Mr. EVANS: All honourable members thought they were dealing with the whole schedule and that that meant that we could discuss it. You are saying that we cannot deal with any section of it up to Part XIX.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I did not rule that at all. We are dealing with the schedule as a whole and an honourable member may discuss the schedule as a whole but I cannot accept an amendment previous to the amendment now being considered.

Mr. EVANS: The amendments moved by the member for Heysen give the police power to apprehend any person under the age of 18 years who is in the lounge or bar of a hotel. The police have stated that they cannot enforce the law as it stands. The Premier has offered no alternative, but he must admit that a problem exists. The member for Heysen has explained that persons 14 years of age are drinking on licenced premises and that it is virtually impossible to apprehend them and secure a conviction. I support the amendments.

Mr. McANANEY: I shall read the whole of Superintendent Calder's statement about the difficult position that the police are in. If the Premier has a social conscience, he must know about the problem. The report states:

Relaxation of the drinking laws was one reason for more teenagers drinking, Superintendent E. L. Calder said yesterday. Under-age drinking was a growing problem in South Australia and the police were paying particular attention to it. Superintendent Calder is in charge of G Division, which includes the vice squad. He was commenting on a statement by Mr. L. M. Wright, S.M., in the

Adelaide Juvenile Court that Saturday nights were becoming drink-up nights for juveniles. Mr. Wright urged parents to be concerned about their teenage children's drinking habits. Superintendent Calder said that when the legal drinking age was 21, many 18 and over went to hotels. With the legal drinking age now 20, even younger groups were entering hotels. The problem was greatest in the bigger hotels where the teenager was undetected in the crowd. The vice squad was continually checking hotels. The legal drinking age of 18 in other States encouraged teenagers to drink. Young people in contact with teenagers from other States thought they should have similar rights. He did not want the age lowered to 18 but felt it would come. Should the age in S.A. be lowered, he hoped it would be made illegal for anyone under 18 to be in a bar. At present police who found 16 or 17-year-olds in a bar could take no action. When the police left, the youth's older friends could buy him a drink.

Police would seek the elimination of the statutory defence which took the onus off the licensee who served a drinker two years or less under the legal age.

That two years has now been reduced to one year. The Superintendent is concerned about the situation in hotels, and perhaps the Premier could provide an exemption if these young persons were under parental supervision. If this rotten apple is left in the schedule, I will vote against the whole schedule.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (10)—Messrs. Carnie, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, and Wardle.

Noes (29)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Gunn, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 19 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negated.

Mr. EVANS: I do not support the general movement within Part XXI to lower the permitted age of drinking from 20 years to 18 years. I recently heard the member for Mitcham say that we as members of his Party flew the flag with the Premier for the lowering of the age at the last State election. What was said was that Cabinet had agreed to the principle of reducing the age of majority, including the age to vote, from 21 years to 18 years. We did not support overall as a group

any principle to reduce the age of majority to 18 years, and it was not a decision that the Party was bound by. We signed no pledge to abide by any such decision. I disagree to lowering the age to 18 years more now because we have refused to accept amendments by which the police could apprehend a person who was in a bar. Government members may smirk and say that it does not matter if someone 14 years or 15 years is intoxicated in a bar and the police cannot make an arrest because they did not see that person consume the liquor. That is what is happening, and the Premier knows it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not the case at all.

Mr. EVANS: The Premier is well aware, if he chooses to speak to those in the Police Force (although he may have some difficulty in this), that he will find that that is so. No-one is trying to stop young people from drinking at home or with friends, but our magistrates and a Superintendent in the Police Force have said that there is a problem of juvenile drinking on licensed premises. Victoria has a similar problem. It seems that members consider that nothing can be done about it, but at least we should try to reduce its impact and not accept it in the way we are accepting it. We are here to represent the community and offer protection where it is necessary, but that principle seems to have been forgotten. The Premier knows that some people need to be protected from themselves and I hope that he realizes that, by lowering the permitted age to 18 years, there will be 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds drinking on licensed premises.

It is difficult to decide whether a girl is 15 years old, or 18 years old, and it is also difficult to judge the age of a male, whether he is 16, 17, 18 or 19 years old. We should give the Police Force the power that it needs and we should not decrease the age that a person is permitted to drink on licensed premises from 20 years to 18 years. I ask for your guidance, Mr. Acting Chairman. If I move that the whole clause be deleted does that mean that there will be no restrictions at all? As I am now guided by an experienced colleague who is sitting behind me, I will adopt another course. I move:

To strike out Part XXI.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: At this stage, the Committee cannot deal with any amendment occurring prior to the amendments already moved by the member for Heysen. The honourable member may move an amendment to



any section of the Part occurring after the member for Heysen's amendments.

Mr. COURCEL: I see the dilemma of the member for Fisher and, although I do not agree with some of his comments, I believe that he has made certain valid points. According to your ruling, Sir, it would be possible to move an amendment to any part occurring after the amendments moved by the member for Heysen. Therefore, would I be in order in moving in Part XXI to strike out clause 7 (c)?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: At this stage, I cannot accept such an amendment, because the Committee has already decided on that part of the schedule, having already dealt with paragraphs (b) to (d).

Mr. COURCEL: I am asking whether I can move an amendment to strike out paragraph (c). The Committee has dealt with amendments commencing at paragraph (b), and we are still dealing with the schedule.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee has already decided that any amendment occurring prior to paragraph (c) cannot be considered.

Mr. EVANS moved:

In Part XXI to strike out clause 8.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (5)—Messrs. Evans (teller), Ferguson, Goldsworthy, McAnaney, and Wardle.

Noes (34)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman, Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Carnie, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Eastick, Groth, Gunn, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood,

Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Payne, Rodda, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 29 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. McANANEY: I move:

To strike out Part XXII.

As gambling is one of the worst evils in society, I do not think the age at which people gamble should be reduced from 21 years to 18 years. I realize that people under the age of 21 years do not gamble very much. The other day in a Totalizator Agency Board branch I saw mostly middle-aged people, and I think it is this section of the community that mainly patronizes lotteries, too.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. Only recently the number of mid-week race meetings was increased and provision has been made for racing on a Monday in May. Also, we have provided for gambling on dog-racing. I do not believe it is wrong for people who can afford to gamble to do so. However, I do not think that by lowering to 18 years the age at which people can gamble we will help young people.

Amendment negated; schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 1.5 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 25, at 2 p.m.