HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 7, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

SEVEN STARS DISPUTE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry report to the House on the discussions in Cabinet this morning concerning the union black ban on the Seven Stars Hotel? Last evening this matter was aired, I think on the *This Day Tonight* programme on ABS2. This morning I was speaking to Mr. Scheurich, the head barman at the hotel, who is one of those who so far have declined to join the union, and he told me that only a few minutes before my telephone call (the call was a little before 11 a.m.) the Minister had telephoned him at the hotel and told him that he was a trouble-maker and that the others were trouble-makers, and the Minister had been, I gathered, generally abusive, and the conversation had not been of a friendly nature.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I have not finished making my explanation, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take the point of order that I have not finished making my explanation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There are other matters I wish to canvass in making the explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is most discourteous. He knows the Standing Orders as well as does anyone else in this House, and when the Speaker is on his feet the honourable member must resume his seat. To be continually interjecting is not in good Parliamentary standing. The honourable member sought leave of the House to make an explanation. He was commenting and he continued to comment. It is the prerogative of the Speaker to call on the next honourable member, and I called on the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry to reply to the question.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that the member for Mitcham was making an explanation when he said that the Minister had telephoned a certain gentleman and used abusive terms. As I understand it, this is the information that the gentleman imparted to the member for Mitcham, and I ask you, on this point of order, how that can be a comment by the member for Mitcham, if he is passing on the terms put to him by the person with whom he had the conversation. That is only descriptive in the explanation of the honourable member's question and is not comment by him. This is an important decision, because it could govern and restrict all members of Parliament in giving any descriptive explanation of their question. Any honourable members listening to the explanation of the question would like to know, if they are to follow this matter fully and in detail, the type of conversation the Minister had with the gentleman in question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the Leader taken a point of order?

Mr. HALL: Yes. The point of order I put to you, Mr. Speaker, is that any member is entitled to know the type of conversation the gentleman had with the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham has said that the conversation the Minister had with the head barman at the hotel was abusive, which term was used not as a comment but as a description.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 125 provides:

> In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question.

The honourable member for Mitcham made personal comments about a Cabinet meeting, and in my view that is commenting. I call on the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: True, this morning I had telephone conversations with the licensee of the Seven Stars Hotel and with the barman, Mr. Scheurich. I pointed out to them that we thought that the employees ought to be in the union and that it was Government policy to give preference to unionists. I also told him that there could be implications that would probably involve other members who, I had learnt, had previously been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: —members of the union.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is replying to a question. Honourable members know that it is most rude, discourteous, and not in accordance with good Parliamentary

practice to be continually interjecting. Interjections must cease.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: However. I make it clear that the conversations I had with the barman and the licensee of the hotel were conducted on a most friendly basis and that no abuse was used. What the member for Mitcham is trying to imply in the House is utter lies. I also spoke to the solicitor. Mr. Maidment, who rang me later in the day and said that it was most unfortunate that the member for Mitcham had raised this matter in the House because, if he had not done so, the problem would have been solved.

Mr. HALL: Was the Minister of Labour and Industry aware that the provisions of section 91 of the Industrial Code forbid anyone in South Australia from prejudicing the employment of any individual in the community on the basis that he does or does not belong to an association, and was he therefore aware at that time that he was urging those concerned to contravene this law?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You hate trade unions, don't you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The Industrial Code was dealt with in 1967. when an entirely new Code was introduced by the Labor Government in South Australia. That Code expressly forbids pressure being applied to make people join an association at the expense of their employment. This is one of the inherent rights that exist in South Australia today. The Government has adopted a policy of preference for unionists that it applies in all Government contracts wherever it is involved, and the Government has supported in this House previous moves, especially in relation to bus operators, that were designed illegally to force employees to join a union. Therefore, in the light of the past performance of the Government and in the sure knowledge—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have always been reasonable with the Leader of the Opposition when he has asked questions, but I regret to say that he has exceeded (and has for some considerable time) what I believe to be his rights under Standing Orders. I am going to rule that he has gone beyond explaining his question, and I call on the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry to reply.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is getting some bad legal advice, and there are facilities in the court if he desires to test this advice. I commenced negotiations this morning that I think will solve this problem, but I cannot say more without prejudicing the negotiations.

Mr. Hall: Were you aware? Answer the question; you have the protection of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hall: But you—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is time that members on the front benches learnt to conduct themselves in a proper manner, and I am not going to allow crossfire between the Leader of the Opposition and Ministers or between any honourable members. I ask them to try to conduct themselves in accordance with the standards that are expected of members representing districts in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the Minister has admitted that he spoke this morning to a member of the staff of the Seven Stars Hotel, can he say whether this conversation was held before this morning's Cabinet meeting took place? If it was, did Cabinet discuss the conversation and endorse the language used by the Minister, wherein I am informed that the Minister told this staff member that he was a trouble-maker?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It is just too stupid to ask such a foolish question. I am surprised that the member for Alexandra is allowing himself to be put in this position by his legal adviser and by his Leader. I thought he had a little common sense, but I am completely convinced now that he has none. Members opposite frequently ask us to use our good offices. The telephone call I made was friendly; no-one was told that he was a trouble-maker. I also point out to members opposite that the licensee of this hotel is a member of the Australian Hotels Association, and I have been told that that association, throughout Australia, has a written agreement with the unions whereby its members are never to employ non-union labour. Furthermore, I understand that several of these people have been members of the union, so that at this stage they are actually unfinancial members. It is likely that legal proceedings could be taken against them, and we want to avoid that possibility. Judging by the questions asked by Opposition members this afternoon, however. it appears that they do not want the matter settled: they are setting out to aggravate the situation. I do not want that to happen, because negotiations are proceeding that may result in the issue's being settled.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Since the Minister replied to my question about the black ban on the Seven Stars Hotel, I have spoken both to Mr. Maidment, the solicitor whom he named, and to Mr. Stoyich, the proprietor of the hotel. I reported to them what the Minister said about my raising the matter in the House, which I had done at the request of two of the employees. Mr. Maidment has authorized me to say that he categorically denies having said to the Minister that, if I had not raised the matter in the House, it would be over by now. Mr. Stoyich told me that the Minister insisted in his conversation that the staff had to join the union, whereupon he (Mr. Stoyich) invited the Minister to try to persuade the employees to do so.

Mr. Jennings: Keep on going; you'll send them broke!

Mr. RODDA: In view of what has taken place in this matter, I should like to know whether the Minister intends to consider the position relating to country licensed premises, where people employed on shift work on these premises are required to work eight hours in 10 hours. I seek leave to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER: I am not trying to stop the honourable member unduly, but in my view this is a matter for the court and not for the Minister. It is an award matter, and I am afraid I will have to rule the question out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: When, by way of interjection, he made the statement "Send them all broke", did the member for Ross Smith have inside information that the unions would exert pressure and put this hotel out of business if the management did not accede to the demands of the union?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ross Smith is under no obligation to reply to this question.

Mr. JENNINGS: It was an interjection based on nothing but a natural assumption that would apply if the member for Mitcham continued his practice.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry, in view of his forthright statement this afternoon that he intends to invoke compulsory unionism in liquor outlets, say whether this will be his policy across the board throughout the State, including the rural areas to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I feel sorry for the honourable member. I want to be reasonably kind to him. I did not think he was such an untruthful man, because everyone in this House knows that I did not make such a statement in this House this afternoon or at any other time.

ATHOL PARK LAND

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about railway land in Athol Park?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The land in question was reserved for a possible future railway line and at present the Government does not wish to dispose of any land that may be useful for future public transportation, whether it be road or rail. The land will continue to be held by the Railways Commissioner, and not offered for sale at this stage. However, I have asked the Railways Commissioner to discuss leasing arrangements with the Corporation of the City of Woodville.

POLICE INTERROGATION

Mr. JENNINGS: I ask my question of the Attorney-General, but I do not know whether he will reply to this question in his own right or refer it to the Chief Secretary.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. JENNINGS: The question is whether or not the honourable gentleman will have investigated the possibility of, say, a motorist or any other citizen in the community being held up by a policeman and interrogated about some alleged misdemeanour, there being in the policeman's possession a book with a carbon copy that would then be signed by both the policeman and the person who was being interrogated, the carbon copy being handed to the person being interrogated as a record of the conversation and the general interrogation. This question arises out of the fact that a constituent of mine was recently taken to court on a driving offence, and he alleges that the evidence given by the police officer from that officer's notebook was completely different from what transpired on the occasion in question. 1 make no comment on that; indeed, Sir, you would not allow me to comment on it. However, I am asking whether the honourable gentleman, if he thinks there is any purpose in pursuing this matter, will have it investigated.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I recently asked about the possible purchase by the National Parks Commission of an area of land on the eastern boundary of Belair National Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOM HILL: The Chief Ranger of the National Parks Commission has contacted Mr. Heyer of Upper Sturt and has arranged to inspect the area in order to determine whether it is suitable for national parks purposes. The price being asked by Mr. Heyer is high in comparison with the price which has been paid generally for national parks land but, in terms of land within 10 miles of the city, is quite reasonable. Following an inspection of the area, full details and definition of the area, together with a recommendation in relation to the priority which should be placed on the acquisition of this area, will be forwarded to me.

Mr. WRIGHT: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about the method of reserving tennis courts at Belair National Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The booking procedure which had formerly operated at Belair and Para Wirra National Parks was first introduced 50 or 60 years ago when park usage was geared to larger formal picnics to which many people travelled by train. In recent years the trend has been to more informal picnics attended by small groups in the family car. Many of the facilities which had previously been provided for the larger groups were no longer in great demand and much of the equipment had fallen into disrepair. Park visitation has increased dramatically to the present when about 1,200,000 people visit Belair National Park each year and about 140,000 and 120,000 a year visit Cleland and Para Wirra National Parks respectively. Many complaints have been received in the past over the booking procedure which had become cumbersome and difficult to administer with the increased visitation rate. In order to provide the public with a simple and effective means of ensuring that they were able to reserve sporting and picnicking facilities at each park, a new procedure was devised in conjunction with the auditors which required the person making the booking to pay in advance in return for a ticket of authorization to occupy or use the facilities.

The usual small booking fee charged by the agency for each booking is considerably less than the previous cost of administering these bookings. As is likely with any change in procedures some minor difficulties were experienced which had not been expected. Such matters as the vagaries of the weather and the need for refunds in these circumstances have caused a few problems which have now largely been overcome. The change in procedure must be regarded as a complete success which has received the overwhelming support of the people using the park.

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister a reply to my question of September 22 about fire control in national parks?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The National Parks Commission is most concerned that drying off of the extraordinary lush growth of vegetation after the above-average rains of the past winter will bring in the coming summer a serious danger of bushfires in several national parks. The commission is fully aware that it has responsibilities to adjoining landowners, particularly where valuable property is concerned, as well as its charter to preserve areas placed under its control in substantially their natural condition. To this end the commission has always, where possible with its limited resources, taken every action to prevent bushfires and to render assistance in controlling fires, both in national parks and other areas. Such measures include the equipping and manning of fully operational fire trucks and four-wheel drive vehicles with smaller tanks and pumps. A further subsidy unit is planned for Belair National Park this year.

In addition, the commission has taken action to establish and maintain fire trails in many areas and to provide fire breaks by slashing and burning where possible. The commission has also co-operated with the Bushfires Research Committee in the establishment of a fuel buffer zone by control burning in Cleland National Park. The commission also recently established a major policy on control burning in national parks, and intends to use this method of fuel reduction in certain areas where this method is applicable. I will provide the honourable member with a copy of the policy on the use of fire as a management tool in national parks. In addition, the commission intends to equip more vehicles with two-way radios before the coming fire season in order to establish greater vigilance and preparedness in controlling park usage.

Experience has shown that in many cases fires in national parks have resulted from the careless or criminal actions of people using the parks. The commission considers that

more effective and intensive patrolling of trouble spots will alleviate some of these problems. Where flagrant cases of misuse of fire in national parks are brought to its notice, the commission intends to institute proceedings against the persons concerned in order to protect the majority of careful and thinking people using national parks. However, no matter how effective control and preventative measures may seem, there is always the possibility of a dangerous situation occurring from the unthinking actions of people in and adjacent to national parks. An intensive publicity campaign is required to inform the public of the way in which they should conduct themselves in national parks.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether his department has further considered the provision of gas barbecues in selected areas in national parks? Last year, I canvassed the possibility of providing these or other types of barbecue on selected sites (for example, inside concrete huts in national parks) for the benefit of people using the area. This would solve the problem of people trying to start barbecues on undesirable sites. The Minister said then that consideration had been given to the proposal and that, in due course, he thought he would be able to comment further on the matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can only say that the matter is still being considered. This idea certainly deserves consideration because such facilities would be useful to people who visit national parks. One problem involved is the fire risk during fire-ban periods, and that is one reason why it would be better if these barbecues were in enclosed areas. In addition, there is the problem of the cost involved in establishing this type of barbecue arrangement. I have seen such facilities operating in parks and reserves in other States where the person wishing to use the barbecue operates the equipment by inserting a coin, this money offsetting the cost of establishment. As final decisions have not yet been made on these questions, which are still being considered, I cannot tell the honourable member of any firm conclusions yet arrived at.

MAIN NORTH ROAD

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 28 about widening the Main North Road, especially the section between Fitzroy Terrace and Regency Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Widening of the Main North Road from Fitzroy Terrace to Enfield Avenue (north of Regency Road) by the Highways Department is dependent on land acquisition, accommodation works and relocation of public utilities. Land acquisition is well in hand but extensive remodelling of predominantly commercial premises will be necessary before public utilities can be relocated on the new alignment. At this stage, it is expected that road widening will be carried out in the following sequence: (*a*) Enfield Avenue southwards to Third Avenue (including Regency Road intersection), starting in October, 1972; (*b*) Fitzroy Terrace to Nottage Terrace, starting mid-1975; and (*c*) Nottage Terrace northwards to Third Avenue, starting late 1975. The completion of the whole length is scheduled for December, 1976.

KINGSTON PARK

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked him on September 1 about the beach at Kingston Park?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Marino Progress Association has, in a letter to the Premier, drawn attention to erosion in the Kingston Park area. I, as Minister Assisting the Premier, replied and forwarded a copy of a report from the Director, Tourist Bureau, which included the following statement:

> A considerable amount of filling has been placed covering the lookout area . . . and stone wall edges constructed. In the process, much stormwater from adjoining streets has been diverted. It is believed that any tendency for remaining stormwater to erode the adjacent cliff will be arrested . . . The channels will be levelled over shortly and regeneration assisted.

The erosion channels have been filled in and some progress has been made in the necessarily slow work of regeneration. The foreshore and beaches committee has identified the beach at Brighton as one of several in need of sand replenishment. It has noted, however, that the beach immediately in front of Kingston Park is relatively stable. Marked beach erosion occurs to the north of Kingston Park. Included in the $250,000 provided on the Loan Estimates for foreshore protection is provision for sand replenishment in the Brighton and Kingston Park area, and for stone protection works in the vicinity of the Marion-Brighton council boundary. Both of these measures will greatly help solve the problems referred to by the honourable member.

GAWLER HOUSES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 30 about

the allocation of funds in respect of houses being built at Gawler by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust's cottage-flat building programme has done much to assist in meeting the growing demand for this type of accommodation, but funds have been limited and the trust has constantly stressed the need for special Commonwealth assistance to provide more housing for aged pensioners and particularly for single elderly persons. Until the end of 1969 no Commonwealth assistance for housing this group had been forthcoming and the trust had been able to provide only a limited number of single-person units. With the passage of the State Grants (Dwellings for Aged Pensioners) Act in September, 1969, State housing authorities for the first time received the funds required to satisfy this urgent demand. Under the terms of the Act, single pensioners meeting certain age and income qualifications are now eligible for housing, and the money has been made available to the States to carry out projects on their behalf. The allocation of funds is over a five-year period. The trust has applied to the Commonwealth Department of Housing for the project of 14 single-person cottage-flat units at Gawler to be approved in terms of the State Grants Act of 1969 for the estimated sum of $84,000. When the anticipated approval is given, the trust will draw the total cost of these 14 flats from funds provided under the above Act. The money is a grant paid to the trust through the State Treasury. In respect of the three two-person units estimated to cost $20,100, these will be financed from the trust's own funds. The rents to be charged for the single-person units is expected to be $3 a week each.

UPPER MURRAY PLAN

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what stage has been reached in the preparation of the draft development plan for the Upper Murray, which is referred to briefly in the latest annual report of the State Planning Authority?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me of his interest in this matter, I am able to tell him that work is proceeding on a development plan for both the Upper Murray and Murray Mallee planning areas. The Upper Murray, in which the honourable member is particularly interested, was declared a planning area in December, 1969. Recently I called for a progress report from the Director of Planning (Mr. Hart), who advised me that plans for both regions could be ready for authorization by late next year. I might comment, in addition, that general recommendations regarding the future use of the Murray River will be included in the reports for the Upper Murray and Murray Mallee planning areas. I understand that the State Planning Office is also preparing a report at the request of the Sedan District Council. Again a detailed study of the Murray River will be involved. The report will recommend the best ways of treating this section of the river and its banks and surrounding area so that the amenity of the area is not destroyed. Discussions are also in progress with the Loxton District Council for a similar plan.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when the burns unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is expected to be operating? The Attorney will remember that I raised this matter last session and the reply given was that the Burns unit would be opened fairly soon. I have received information suggesting that no further progress has been made, that the doors to the ward where the unit will be housed are still locked, and that the ward is not being used. I have also been told that the laminar air-flow beds still have not been obtained. The only bed available is a makeshift arrangement and has been obtained through the efforts of a private outside organization. The situation is intolerable, my correspondent states, and must be given the highest priority. I have no doubt that the Attorney-General may well tell me that he cannot say whether the Chief Secretary will state when the unit will be operating, but the prime purpose of my question is to ask that something be done.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question regarding the establishment of family planning clinics?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As the member for Bragg has also asked a question on this matter, this information from the Chief Secretary may serve as a reply to both questions. The Government provides financial support to the Family Planning Association of South Australia and the Catholic Family Planning Association. In addition, a Government Family Planning Clinic is conducted at

the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Government does not intend to set up further Government clinics at this stage. However, it is intended to investigate needs in this field before the next financial year.

AWOONGA ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say what will be the financial allocation by the Highways Department towards the reconstruction and widening of about half a mile of the northern section of Awoonga Road. Highbury, between Lower North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Hope Valley? The remaining southern section of Awoonga Road from Grand Junction Road was constructed on a new alignment about three years ago by the Tea Tree Gully council, with the assistance of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which required the re-alignment to protect the Hope Valley reservoir from pollution.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter investigated and bring down the information for the honourable member.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say when I may expect a reply to the question I asked on September 14, more than three weeks ago, about construction of the Port Lincoln High School? I and other members on this side have often been forced to complain about the tardiness of Ministers in replying to questions, and this is yet another instance. As the question was simple and would have required a reply that stated either "Yes" or "No" from the officers in the Minister's department, I think a period of more than three weeks is too long to have to wait.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My list shows that the question is still awaiting reply. From recollection, I think the question was about the possibility of using a local supply of bricks in the construction of the Port Lincoln High School. The necessary report from the Public Buildings Department was requested on September 15, the day after the honourable member asked the question. I imagine that the officers in the Public Buildings Department have had to consider the matter and perhaps even to arrange to go to Port Lincoln to investigate the local situation. This would certainly have been the position if the officers concerned had been unaware directly of the situation at Port Lincoln. I assure the honourable member that every effort is made to provide replies as speedily as possible and, in view of the honourable member's complaint, I shall be pleased to follow up this matter and see that the reply is suitably hastened.

FLINDERS RANGES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my recent question about direction signs in the Flinders Ranges? From my observations in the ranges last week, I believe that the reply will be satisfactory.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As a result of my recent visit to the Flinders Ranges, I have asked the Director of the Tourist Bureau to examine the matter of direction signs in the ranges. I agree that there is room for improvement in providing signs at entrances to beauty spots. The National Parks Commission has recently constructed large routed wooden signs at the entrances to the Oraparinna National Park and has erected similar attractive routed wooden signs giving directions to all of the more popular tourist and beauty spots within the park. In addition, a number of these signs will be erected, with the consent of adjoining landowners, outside the park, giving directions on how to proceed to some of the less frequently used entrances. It is also intended to erect interpretative signs that will explain some of the features and principles of conservation which have led to the dedication of the national parks.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Education say when work on the resealing of areas at the Morphettville Park Primary School will be commenced? I asked earlier questions on this matter on July 20 and on August 4. The Minister, on August 4, replied:

A firm of consulting civil engineers has prepared a report recommending the resealing of paved areas at Morphettville Park Primary School and the paving of the area adjacent to the bicycle racks. Tenders will be called as soon as possible to enable the work to proceed at the earliest possible date.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not familiar with the details of what has happened over the last few weeks, but it is conceivable that tenders have already been called. However, I will check on this matter and give the honourable member a reply in due course.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister inquire when the building of the new staff room at the Morphettville Park Primary School is likely to be commenced?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

GLENELG TRAM LINE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of September 21 about the Glenelg tram line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have had this reply since last Tuesday. Discussions have taken place between the Highways Department and the Municipal Tramways Trust regarding the installation of warning signals at the Glenelg tram crossings at Morphett Road and Marion Road. If agreement is reached on the technical details of the installations and the financing of the work, the signals could be installed in 1972.

SUPREME COURT HEARINGS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Attorney-General say what is the waiting time for cases to be heard in the Supreme Court? If the delay is between 16 and 18 months, as I have been told, what can be done to improve the situation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is difficult to estimate precisely the waiting time in respect of actions in the Supreme Court because it is impossible to anticipate the future course of events exactly. In other words, one cannot be sure, if an action is set down today, precisely when it will come on. Generally speaking, criminal cases are tried in the month following the committal for trial. There is no delay in criminal actions unless something in the case might cause a delay. There is no delay in uncontested matrimonial cases. There is a slight delay in contested matrimonial cases (it varies a little from time to time), but it is not a significant delay. However, there is a delay in the hearing of civil cases: the present delay is estimated at between 12 and 14 months from the date of the setting down of the action. A serious attack has been made on delays generally in the courts. At present there are no delays in the Adelaide Magistrates Court or in the Local and District Criminal Court.

I expect that, with the gradual shift of cases from the Supreme Court to the Adelaide Local Court as a result of that court's increased jurisdiction, the delays in the Supreme Court will be appreciably reduced in the next few months. As a result of the local court's increased jurisdiction, more and more cases which hitherto have gone to the Supreme Court are now being set down in the local court; so the actual intake of cases into the Supreme Court civil list is diminishing. In addition, I have arranged for the Master of the Supreme Court to communicate with the solicitors for plaintiffs who have actions in the Supreme Court civil list and to invite them to consider whether their cases could be transferred to the local court: in other words, to invite them to consider whether they expect to get in the case a sum that exceeds the local court's jurisdiction. I hope, as a result, that cases will be transferred out of the existing civil list into the local court list, which is up to date. As a result of these various factors, I think we can look forward to a drastic reduction in waiting time in respect of actions in the Supreme Court within the next few months.

WOOLENOOK BEND RESERVE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 24 about the Woolenook Bend reserve?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The land over which the Woolenook Bend Game Reserve is proclaimed is under the care and control of the Woods and Forests Department; however, those matters relating to the operation of the area as a game reserve are under the control of the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. A committee of management consisting of five members, one from the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department (Chairman), one from the Woods and Forests Department and three from the Field and Game Association Incorporated of South Australia, makes recommendations to the Director on matters pertaining to the management of the reserve. The game reserve is required to be managed in a way which will not conflict with the primary use of the area as a woods and forests reserve. Arrangements have been made to cease grazing on the remainder of the forest reserve outside the game reserve within 12 months, and it is understood that the Woods and Forests Department is taking active steps to obtain regeneration on the area. There is no intention at this stage of extending the game reserve to the remainder of the Murtho Forest Reserve.

SCEALE BAY JETTY

Mr. GUNN: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Premier consult with the Marine and Harbors Department to see whether it will reverse its decision to remove the jetty at Sceale Bay? A constituent of mine has approached me and expressed concern at the department's decision to dismantle and

remove the jetty, which is used by at least 40 or 50 tourists each day in the tourist season and by cray fishermen and other fishermen for refuelling purposes. The availability of the jetty has encouraged at least one person to build a shack near by, and other people have bought land on which to build shacks. It would be a step in the wrong direction if the department went ahead with its plans.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Premier reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask my colleague to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL PROGRESSION SCHEME

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a student progression scheme?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: An increasing emphasis is being placed in primary schools on the need to cater for individual differences in learning in children. Heads of schools and teachers are encouraged to vary classroom organization so that opportunity is given for children to progress more at their own individual rates of achievement. Many different ways are available of organizing the learning programme: many of these are not major changes, and where this is so heads have the freedom to make changes on their own initiative. In the case of major changes in organization the policy is that the headmaster should discuss them with his district inspector first. Final approval is then given by the Director of Primary Education. Kilkenny and Taperoo are working at present as ungraded schools, which means that the organization of each school is directed entirely to achieving individual progression for its students.

The honourable member may have been referring to the Mount Compass Area School, where the Headmaster had planned to introduce a form of ungradedness in 1972. These plans have been discussed with the parents, a minority of whom have expressed opposition. They were also discussed with the district inspector and senior officers. Following these discussions the Headmaster agreed to postpone the scheme until improved facilities could be provided at the school, so that the plan would have a better chance of success.

In relation to any plan for the development of an ungraded school, it is important to ensure that staffing arrangements are adequate and that extra equipment and material of one sort or another are available. If these provisions are not made, the scheme that is proposed may well founder because of the inadequacy of facilities. The honourable member can rest assured that the proposal of the Headmaster of the Mount Compass school has the support of most of the parents of students at the school.

FUEL OIL SPILLAGE

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of September 1, about the number of times that fuel oil spillage has been found to be a contributing factor to accidents that have occurred on the main south-eastern road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board reports that an examination of accident statistics does not disclose the spillage of oil from tankers as the cause of any accident that has occurred on the South-Eastern Main Road No. 1 between the toll gate and the Onkaparinga River. Existing legislation under section 108 of the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1969, is considered to adequately cover the circumstances outlined by the honourable member.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the rural reconstruction committee has been functioning for some time, can the Premier say whether he or his Government has considered whether it would be advisable to appoint additional members to that committee? I do not reflect on the calibre of the present members of the committee—a pastoralist, a city accountant and an excellent officer from the Treasury Department. However, no representation has been included from banks, from commerce, from stock firms, from high-rainfall areas, or from the wheat and sheep-producing areas of the State. It seems to me that this may be a deficiency when the committee considers applications from certain areas or tries to gain specific information concerning a specific aspect associated with the commercial side of the industry. In other States the committees have more members with more varied representation, but the committee in this State is small and has a restricted representation. Will consideration be given to expanding the committee and, taking into account what I have said, appointing to it people from other groups, so that the committee will have a broader outlook on the problems to be discussed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with the Minister of Lands and obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered reviewing the terms under which assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme is provided for farmers in need, and has the State Government approached the Commonwealth Government with a view to having the agreement varied so that more people will be able to get assistance? In a letter, one of my constituents states:

I had the pleasure, or otherwise, recently to converse with one of the men on the reconstruction committee and was informed, quite candidly, that "the whole show is in a mess", regarding administration. He also implied that the small majority of applications receiving assistance would, in all probability, be bankrupt or in other employment by the time any money was paid out to them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from the Minister of Lands.

LINEAR ACCELERATOR

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what progress has been made in constructing a suitable building to house the linear accelerator which I understand is still stored at Port Adelaide?

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

MORGAN ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of September 23 about the sealing of the road between Burra and Morgan?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department intends to upgrade the Morgan-Burra road, and for this purpose funds will be made available to the District Council of Morgan progressively to carry out this work. However, the priority of this road must be considered in conjunction with that existing for other similar roads. In the first instance, it is intended that the money allocated to Morgan be used to upgrade the standard of the present open-surface road, and that the funds are not intended for the sealing of this road in the near future.

INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday, the Minister of Labour and Industry volunteered to give me statistics on the hours of work lost as a result of strikes. Has the Minister any statistics on the number of hours lost as a result of people being stood down because of strikes and, if he does not have this information, could these statistics be kept in future?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Although I doubt that such statistics can be obtained, I will inquire and bring down a report for the honourable member.

CHRISTIES BEACH ROAD

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him on September 22 about applying a speed limit of 20 miles an hour on the Esplanade at Christies Beach, near the boat ramp?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Esplanade at Christies Beach is within the normal township 35 m.p.h. speed limit, and it is not considered necessary further to restrict motorists' speed for what is essentially a problem only at summer weekends. The District Council of Noarlunga has, in conjunction with the Road Traffic Board, prepared a scheme to widen the roadway and to install a median refuge at the point of greatest pedestrian activity. A painted median will be provided over the remainder of this stretch of the Esplanade. At the same time, the parking bays will be tidied up and angle parking banned on the eastern side of the road. The road has already been widened, and the council expects to complete the remainder of the work before the end of the year. It is expected that implementation of this scheme will improve the safety of pedestrians and obviate the need to impose further speed restrictions.

WEEDS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 29 about the control of weeds growing in the reserve of the old train line from Adelaide to Glenelg?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Action will be taken shortly to improve the appearance of the land controlled by the Commissioner of Highways on the old Glenelg train line. Some delays to the normal programme have occurred because of the large amount of such work requiring attention at this time of the year and because of the mechanical break-down of some grass-clearing equipment.

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, bring to his colleague's attention the fact that there is an infestation of noxious weeds in the Happy Valley reservoir reserve? There is growing

concern among landholders, particularly in the foothills, at the spread of all types of noxious weed, some landholders arguing that they will not eradicate the weeds on their land until the Government department concerned eradicates the weeds on departmental land. The Happy Valley reservoir reserve is a typical example of a bad infestation of noxious weeds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

MELONS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier any further information concerning the possibility of exporting melons to Japan?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is an export potential for melons to Japan and the industry in South Australia would be interested depending, of course, on price and shipping costs. It is likely that refrigerated shipping containers would be available. At present Japan will not accept cucumbers, water melon, rock melon, pumpkin and other cucurbits because of the risk of importing the melon fly *chaetodaeus cucurbitae.* Japan lists a large number of countries including Australia from which these crops are prohibited imports. That pest is not present in South Australia but on occasions it is found by horticultural inspectors in cucurbits imported from the Eastern States. However, Japan looks at quarantine on a whole country basis and will not give preference to this State. The Agriculture Department is co-operating with New South Wales and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization in research at the Gosford laboratories on methods of disinfestation of melons and other cucurbits. If we can meet the Japanese quarantine requirements. I am sure we will be able to persuade the Japanese to adopt the same attitude to cucurbits from an area free of melon fly as they propose to adopt in relation to citrus exported from an area free of fruit fly.

POP MUSIC

Dr. TONKIN: I wonder whether the Attorney-General would ask the Minister of Health, if it is not too much trouble, whether he would let me have the reply to a question I asked in this House on July 28 about pop music. Although the Minister of Health may not consider this to be a serious question, I had an undertaking from the Attorney-General that he would obtain a reply for me. In the meantime, young people who are not informed of the dangers of loud music (I was about to say "noise", not "music") are running the risk of permanent deafness. I should be most grateful if the Minister could let me have a reply.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am confident that, if he has the reply for the honourable member, my colleague will not find it too much trouble at all to give that reply to him. However, I think he would probably be flattered to think that anything he said was likely to dissuade young people from listening to loud music, if they are otherwise minded to do so.

HOUSING TRUST OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked him, I think last week, about maintenance contracts involving the Housing Trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member said in his question that it had been reported to him about four weeks previously that all private work in this section had been cancelled and that the services of 52 painters and six plumbers had been discontinued. He asked whether the trust had cancelled this contract work. However, the honourable member's information is no better on this occasion than it is on many others. The trust has not cancelled any contracts involving maintenance operations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether there have been any alterations in the last 12 months to the provisions or arrangements regarding the maintenance of Housing Trust houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any. I notice that in his original question the honourable member suggested that some maintenance workers had been dismissed. Last week, I obtained a run-down of day-labour employed by the department over the last four years and, from my memory of the figures, there is no significant difference at all, but I will check the matter.

CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Minister of Works, can the Premier say whether part of the Bradbury to Mount Bold road will be flooded when the new Clarendon reservoir is constructed and filled and, if it will be, what measures are being taken to construct another road? Today's *News* reports that a proposal to construct a reservoir at Clarendon is to be referred to the Public Works Committee. Some months ago, approaches concerning this

road were made to the responsible Government department, and I do not think the matter has been finalized. It is of considerable importance to Emergency Fire Services units in the area that they have easy access to this section of the hills which, being in its natural state, presents a serious fire risk to neighbouring landholders and to the forest of the Woods and Forests Department. Moreover, for the convenience of commuters and tourists using the road, it is essential that the road be replaced, perhaps at a higher level than that on which the present road now stands.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report.

PRISON INQUIRY

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Attorney-General say what action he has taken, since this House unanimously approved a motion on September 1, to set up a committee of inquiry into State prisons? The motion had been moved by me as a result of what I considered to be 15 months' delay in the setting up of this promised committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As discussions are progressing with people who I hope will be members of the committee, I expect to be able to make an announcement soon.

HOUSING TRUST FIRES

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 28 about fires in houses built by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The five houses destroyed by fire after completion were imported dwellings of timber frame construction. Three of these were burned down in 1954, two at Gilles Plains in August and one at Woodville Gardens in July. These three houses were destroyed after completion but before occupation and the loss was attributed to grass fires starting in nearby paddocks. The other two houses, one at Hectorville and one at Dover Gardens, were burned in 1958 and 1966 respectively. Both of these houses were occupied by tenants.

SECRETARIAL SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, you told me that you had a reply to the question I asked you about duplicating work being done for members in the House. I did not ask you for the reply yesterday, because it was Wednesday.

The SPEAKER: I refer to the questions relating to duplicating facilities raised by the honourable member for Mitcham on August 3. Might I say generally, before answering the honourable member's questions, that I have no desire personally to inhibit members in the nature of questions asked of me in the House, but I do think that matters of an administrative character could be dealt with more appropriately in my office rather than in the Chamber. I have issued a circular to members concerning the use of stencils and duplicating facilities; it includes directions previously given on this subject to members' steno-secretaries. The circular states, *inter alia,* that priority is to be given to members' correspondence, and stencils, where appropriate, may be cut therefor. Other stencils may be cut for work only of a strictly Parliamentary nature. On no account is electioneering work to be undertaken nor are stencils to be cut for members' speeches.

I refer now to the circumstances of March last when, without prejudice, I gave approval for the duplication of stencils cut for a speech which, I was informed, was to be delivered by the honourable member for Mitcham to the Australian Capital Territory group of the Royal Institute of Public Administration at Thredbo, in the Snowy Mountains. I considered then that the work was not of a true Parliamentary character, nor could it be construed as a "constituency duty" but, as the honourable member was leaving the State for the conference the following morning and because in fact the stencils had already been cut, I gave approval for their duplication, provided the honourable member assumed responsibility for payment of the cost of the stencils and the paper used. As far as the duties of the excellent group of members' steno-secretaries are concerned, I believe it is my obligation, as Speaker, to see that their services are made available as equitably as possible and that each member is accorded equal treatment for his Parliamentary work. If typing and duplication of speeches to be made to outside bodies by some members are to be made part of the secretaries' work, this can be done only at the expense of the legitimate Parliamentary correspondence and constituency work of other members. I consider that the honourable member had more than a "fair go" (taking into account that each secretary works for five or six members), when one considers that three drafts of the speech in question were typed, that the speech consisted of about 20 pages, that at least 25 copies of the speech were roneoed, to the temporary exclusion of other members' work, and that the charge made to him for stencils and paper was only $3.60. The honourable

member, in the explanation of his question, said that this amount "of course, was paid by the A.C.T. group to which I was giving the paper." The House of Assembly office has no record of any such payment being received.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Premier obtain for me a report on the latest development regarding effluent water from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works? I recall that some time ago experiments were carried out on the advisability, from a health point of view, of using the effluent water that presently runs to the sea, and I understand that further experiments have been carried out on this project, the idea being that some of this water, if found to be suitable, would be valuable for use for agriculture and other purposes in the nearby areas. Therefore, will the Premier ask his colleague to give me a report on the latest developments in this scheme and whether such proposal could be made to work efficiently?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I. too. have been concerned with this matter. The Agriculture Department currently is undertaking tests, and the final date for completion of those tests seems to recede each time I make a further inquiry about completion of the work and whether we can make a decision on this matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have the tests started?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, they have been going on for some time now. I have expressed dismay at the length of time that the department considers will be needed to complete the tests before it can safely certify to us that the effluent can be used, and I assure the honourable member that the Government is pressing this matter. I will get a report from the Minister about the likely date on which a decision can be made.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture whether experiments in connection with agricultural work at Virginia have already commenced? On September 1. the Minister of Agriculture said:

The Director of Agriculture reports that soil and crop investigations to assess the usefulness of the effluent from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works for irrigation in the northern Adelaide Plains will start in the near future. Applications to fill the positions created for this work closed on August 25, 1971. If suitable applicants are obtained and they are available immediately, the work should commence within four to six weeks.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly inquire about this matter, but I must confess that that was a reply I had missed and it has not come to me. I understood that the work had been commenced as a result of my requests, but I will follow up this question.

MILE POSTS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport find out whether the Highways Department will erect mile posts on the Port Lincoln to Elliston Road and the Arno Bay to Cleve Road? Both roads, as the Minister doubtless knows, are main roads and have been sealed for some time, but neither of them has the mile posts that are common on most main roads. Constituents and travellers have raised the matter with me several times, saying that it would of advantage if such posts could be provided as soon as possible. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will investigate the matter for me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will discuss this matter with the Highways Department, but I think I should make two points. First, I am not sure that we will be erecting any new mile posts on any road: rather, we will now erect kilometre posts, as I think they are called. The second point is that the amount of vandalism that takes place is regrettable. This happens even with the concrete mileage posts that have been erected. I understand that the numbers on the concrete posts are cast in brass and bolted on, but some people seem to be possibly making a profit by unscrewing these plates, which I suppose find their way to Simsmetal, Browns, or some other metal yard, and the department is left with a blank post. I understand that it occurs more in the isolated areas than in the more closely settled areas.

STURT PEA

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether he intends to take any further action to publicize the fact that Sturt pea is a protected plant in this State? In reply to a question I asked recently about this matter, the Minister said that there had been no prosecutions in this State under the relevant Act, and he went on to say:

As I will be in this area soon, I will consider whether any further action can be taken to improve the position.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think there is a need to do what we can to publicize this, particularly at the places where tourists enter the Flinders Ranges. It seems that from time to time people pick the Sturt pea and

cause considerable damage while doing so. I think in some cases it is done through ignorance of the fact that the plant is protected, and I am considering how the various resort proprietors and national park people within the Flinders Ranges can tell people visiting those areas that it is an offence to pick the Sturt pea.

CHEST CLINIC

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether the work of removing the pollution at the chest clinic, caused by pigeons, has been completed and whether the occupied part of the building is now in a satisfactory and habitable state?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

RAILWAY ACCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Treasurer obtain from the Auditor-General or the Under Treasurer an explanation of how the railway accounts work? Last year the Minister of Roads and Transport and I had a running debate about whether railway revenue had increased, and neither of us really was the victor. In explaining my question, I refer to page 10 of the Auditor-General's Report, which shows that revenue received from the railways was just over $48,100,000, whereas on page 147 of the report the revenue is shown as about $49,100,000. It has been explained before that this difference could possibly have been caused by outstanding accounts. However, I notice that the amounts for sundry debtors are more or less the same. What is the explanation for this $1,000,000 difference, and how are the accounts worked?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will see whether I can get some enlightenment for the honourable member.

CITRUS

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the absence of the Minister of Works, will the Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture whether any research work is being done at Loxton or at any other horticultural research centre into finding a specific reason why there has apparently been an increase in rough and thick-skinned oranges this harvest and the reason for the separating of the skin from the fruit? It has been suggested to me that, as a result of the salinity of the last few years, the trees have deteriorated and, as a consequence, the orchardists may have applied excessive amounts of nitrogenous fertilizer in order to restore their trees to health and vigor. It has also been suggested that, in conjunction with this, excessive water may have been applied. If there has been misguided management of this kind, in the interests of the industry I am asking whether any research has been done to establish whether this is the reason. If no research has been done, can work be done on this important matter affecting export quality?

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

OPEN-SPACE TEACHING UNITS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department has encountered any staffing difficulty in relation to open-space units because of the incompatibility of teachers? The Minister will be aware that one of the schools in the Gawler area will have an open-space unit available to it at the commencement of or early in the new school year. Concern has been expressed by some members of the teaching profession who have direct or indirect knowledge of the teaching arrangements under these conditions and by some parents that they have heard of difficulties associated with the incompatibility of staff under these teaching arrangements. This is a difficult problem, particularly when related to the fact that grade 6 and grade 7 students will be involved in the teaching facilities at the Evanston Primary School. Can the Minister say whether there has been any problem and whether there is any departmental method of solving it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The overall position is that there is no difficulty in obtaining staff who are willing and competent to teach in open-space units. I think the honourable member will appreciate, when he sees the open-space units at Evanston, why this is so. No doubt there are some teachers whose initial reaction to the idea of teaching in an open-space is one of some opposition. My experience has been that, where this kind of attitude exists, there are speedy and substantial changes in the attitude, particularly when teachers see the open unit operating and the tremendous advantages that accrue as a consequence. Apart from the individualized system of education that can be established in such a unit, one of their main advantages, which is not appreciated by many teachers when they are first confronted with this system, is the way in which the whole nature of discipline in the school is altered. I can conceive of a situation where insufficient teachers at a school might be willing initially to go into an open unit: the answer would be to

transfer teachers from other schools to that school. One or two of the teachers at Evanston who do not want to be associated with open-space teaching may have to be transferred elsewhere.

Mr. Jennings: You have in-service training, don't you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, associated with the development of these open units, and those teachers who go into them are given every possible assistance in coping with the changes that must be made. Open-space units are operating in difficult circumstances, for example, at Cowandilla and Brighton, to my direct knowledge. At some schools I have seen open units operating in converted classrooms where there was no acoustic treatment or carpet on the floors and where the noise problem was at the maximum. The teachers in these open units operating under difficult circumstances are still very much in favour of the idea. In the new open units we are constructing, the good quality carpet on the floors and the special acoustic treatment will minimize noise problems. As a consequence, it would be normal to find that a group of students talking to one another in an open unit would not cause any disturbance to another group of students working only a few feet away from them. Although some teachers may have temporary worries about the prospect of teaching in such an environment, I am sure that most of the worries will be only temporary. It is clear that not all teaching in primary and secondary schools will be done in open units, so many opportunities will always be available for those teachers who see themselves teaching only in the traditional type classroom to have appropriate opportunities. The only difficulty now is that we do not have sufficient open units.

TENDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether, when awarding contracts for work on freeways and highways, preference is given to South Australian contractors? Also, how many tenders were received from South Australian contractors for the 30-cub.yd. scrapers for work on the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know how many tenders were received, but if this information is important to the honourable member I shall be pleased to obtain it. Whether tenderers are South Australian or not, other factors are considered when awarding contracts, but basically the lowest tenderer is given the job.

VINTAGE CARS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider a form of preferential treatment for the registration of vintage cars which, although not numerous, are becoming popular in my district? In my district, as in other districts, great interest is displayed in the local vintage car club. These vehicles are used on special occasions for rallies and are then returned to the shed. I understand that the permit system operating in Victoria enables these vehicles to be driven on the road with a restricted permit. A similar system in this State would help persons who are not on the highest spoke of fortune's wheel and would help develop a community interest and assist the people who are doing much in this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

COMMUNITY WELFARE BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say when the House will have the chance to debate the changes in policy on social welfare? During the Parliamentary recess I was approached by a social worker who gave me the notes of the conference of representatives of social welfare agencies that was held on April 27, in which (and I think I am correct in saying this) the Minister personally took a part—certainly the Director-General did. Alarm was expressed to me then that many changes were being initiated without there being a chance to debate them. I took the matter up with the Minister by letter dated May 12, pointing out these facts to him. Subsequently, on May 25 the Minister stated in a letter to me that he intended to introduce a Bill, which we now know will be the Community Welfare Bill, and he said:

> In introducing this Bill, I shall give a full outline of the Government's policy regarding the future of the Social Welfare Department. This will provide a full opportunity for debate.

I was content with this statement at the time. However, I have now received a letter from another person part of which is as follows:

> 1 am concerned at the way Mr. Cox—

Mr. Cox is the Director-General of Social Welfare: I do not think my correspondent meant to criticize him personally, and I certainly do not, but that is the way the letter is written. The Minister takes the responsibility for the department. The letter is as follows:

> I am concerned at the way Mr. Cox is going ahead with the purchase of buildings for his 20 district offices with little or no

consultation with the Public Health Department or Mental Health Department, nor consideration of the possible future role of local government in community welfare.

The letter continues in the same vein. It seems not only that decisions have been taken but also that some of them have been implemented without their being discussed in this House.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In formulating the Government's policy on social welfare, the fullest consultations have taken place with voluntary agencies engaged in these activities and the views of those agencies have been fully considered. They were taken into my confidence as Minister, and into the department's confidence, in forming plans. The part that must be played by the Public Health Department and by local government in future social welfare plans in the community is very much in my mind in everything that I do. and the department does, in this matter. As I indicated to the honourable member in my letter, I will be introducing the Community Welfare Bill soon. It is now in an advanced stage of preparation and I hope that it will be introduced (although it is difficult for a time to be set, in view of the demands on the time of the Parliamentary Counsel) within the next two or three weeks. As I said in the letter to the honourable member at that time, I shall give a full outline of the plans and the intentions of the Government, and there will be full opportunity to debate them at that time.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when the new bridge at Port Augusta will be completed, and what plans his department has to remove the old bridge? I am aware that this bridge is situated in the District of Stuart but, as it will be used extensively by constituents of mine, as well as by those of the member for Flinders, they are anxious to know when they can use the new bridge and thus save much time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Both the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart have been in constant touch with me about this matter for a considerable time, particularly the member for Stuart, because the bridge is situated in his district, as the member acknowledged rather grudgingly.

Mr. Gunn: I never did that at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre asked the Minister a question and, with great respect, he would serve himself much better if he ceased interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have had considerable discussion with the member for Stuart on this matter, and he has been kept completely informed of the position, as has the corporation of Port Augusta. I do not have the details readily available at present, but I will obtain them if need be for the honourable member, although I suggest that if he asks the member for Stuart he will be able to obtain all the information that he seeks.

ABATTOIRS

Mr. VENNING: I wish to ask a question of the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Works, who represents the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture to confer with the appropriate authority at the Gepps Cross abattoir in an endeavour to have overtime worked each day rather than consistently at weekends? There is concern that, as a result of all the overtime being worked at the abattoir every weekend at this busy time of the year, insufficient maintenance work can be carried out there. Members may know of the problem of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board in obtaining a licence to export meat. It has been suggested that if overtime were worked each day it would allow maintenance work to be undertaken at weekends, and that this would help preserve the licence we have obtained. Will the Minister confer with the appropriate authority to see what can be done in this matter? I ask this question, knowing how closely the Government is at present allied with those working at the abattoirs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the question to my colleague.

LIZARDS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation appeal to the motoring public in this State to avoid the unnecessary destruction of lizards on country roads? My question is prompted by an article that appears in the *Advertiser* of October 5, headed "Concern on Reptiles", which states:

The Government plans to stop trading in harmless snakes, lizards, turtles and tortoises.

Therefore, it seems that the Government is concerned about conserving reptiles in this State. Indeed, I am concerned about the number of dead lizards seen on our country roads at this time of the year. It appears that these lizards are being deliberately run over by motorists. As the sleepy lizard, for example, is slow-moving, it is easy for a motorist to avoid it. As some motorists may be

deliberately running over these reptiles, I ask that the Minister appeal to the motoring public, emphasizing the value of these reptiles from a conservation point of view.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I agree with the sentiments expressed by the honourable member. Although I may find it difficult to have this matter publicized, I will do what I can to see that it receives publicity.

CRIMINAL LAW COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to know what is happening about the proposal for a criminal law revision committee, and—

The SPEAKER: Order! A question was asked, about the criminal courts this afternoon, while the honourable member was absent from the Chamber.

Mr. Millhouse: What's happening?

The SPEAKER: I thought the honourable member's question was a repetition of that question.

Mr. Millhouse: I think not, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member state his question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What has happened to the proposal for a criminal law revision committee? I think that is in order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. One of the matters that I think was referred to in the policy speech of the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition before the last election, was that the criminal law would be extensively overhauled and that a committee would be set up to do this independently of the Law Reform Committee, which was established during the term of the previous Government. Since this Government came into office, I have on several occasions questioned the Attorney-General about this and, so far as I am aware, the committee has not yet been set up. Some months ago (I think in the last session of Parliament) I last asked him about this matter, and he said then, to the best of my recollection (I do not have the chapter and verse), that there was some difficulty regarding the personnel (I think it involved one member of the committee whom he hoped to appoint) and that it would be a little while before he could make an announcement and set up the committee. I think that is the purport of what he told me at the time and, so far as I know, there has been no further action.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have previously indicated that the committee the Government intends to set up to consider a revision of the criminal law will also investigate the penal system and that it is intended to have the one committee to perform both tasks. I have already indicated to the member for Flinders earlier this afternoon that discussions are at present taking place with the persons who it is hoped will comprise this committee, and I hope to make an announcement soon.

MOUNT BARKER PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education ascertain when certain drainage work and work involving the levelling of an area in the centre of the Mount Barker Primary School grounds will be commenced? Further, will he ascertain what provision has been made to undertake extensions or to acquire a new school site in that area, where there will be rapid expansion in the next year or two?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member. However, if he has any information about probable future population changes in the Mount Barker area which may not be generally available to the department, I should be pleased if he would make it available.

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:

Hackham East Primary School,
Western Suburbs Water Supply Augmentation.

Ordered that reports be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. BURDON

Mr. RYAN moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Mount Gambier (Mr. A. R. Burdon) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS AND ACTS INTERPRETATION) BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend

the Administration of Acts Act, 1910, and the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1957. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is designed to facilitate the administration of Acts of Parliament. It permits the Minister to whom the administration of an Act has been committed to delegate any of his powers or functions to another Minister. Such a delegation does not however derogate from the power of the Minister primarily responsible for the administration of the legislation to act personally in any matter. Thus the Minister to whom the administration of the Act has been committed retains the overriding administrative responsibility but, for the sake of convenience, the delegated powers can be exercised, in accordance with the delegation, by another Minister. The Underground Waters Preservation Act provides a good example of a case in which the delegation of powers under the provisions of the Bill might be desirable. That Act falls generally within the administration of the Mines Department. However, certain aspects of its administration impinge upon the work of departments under the control of the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Works. A delegation of powers between Ministers could in such cases conduce to the effective administration of the Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new section in the Acts Administration Act. This section enables a Minister to whom the administration of an Act has been committed to delegate any statutory powers and functions to another Minister. Subsection (2) provides that, where the power or function is discretionary in nature, the discretion may be exercised by the Minister to whom the delegation has been made. Subsection (3) provides that the delegation of powers does not reduce the power of the Minister by whom the delegation has been made to act personally in any matter. Subsection (4) provides for the variation or revocation of a delegation of Ministerial powers. Clause 3 amends the definition of "Minister" in the Acts Interpretation Act so that it will, in relation to delegated powers, include reference to the Minister to whom those powers have been delegated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Medical Board has subjected the Medical Practitioners Act to a substantial review as several administrative problems have arisen in the past few years. This Bill seeks to remedy these problems, to correct some inconsistencies which have been revealed and to effect sundry statute law revision amendments. The principal Act presently provides that the provisions of the Act relating to the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee shall expire on June 30, 1972, and that no applications for registration will be considered by that committee after December 31, 1971. The board is satisfied that these provisions are working well and that the committee should continue to exist without any limitation on its life. Experience has shown that frequent inquiries are made each year by "foreign" practitioners about registration in this State. In order to achieve this object, it is imperative that the Bill is passed without undue delay this session.

The various other amendments sought by the Bill shall be explained as I deal with the clauses of the Bill, which are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clauses 3, 4 and 5 effect statute law revision amendments to sections 3, 9 and 16 respectively of the principal Act. Clause 6 effects two minor statute law revision amendments to section 19 of the principal Act. It also substitutes the words "qualifying for" for the word "obtaining" with respect to a degree, thus ensuring that the year as resident medical officer may commence after the date on which the person concerned qualified for his degree (that is, about December) instead of the date on which he actually receives or "obtains" the degree (about the following April or May).

Clause 7 merely tidies the language of section 20 of the principal Act; no substantive alteration has been made to the effect of the section. Clause 8 amends section 22 of the principal Act which deals with the payment of registration and annual practice fees. Paragraph (a) effects a statute law revision amendment. Paragraph (b) inserts new subsection (2b) which provides the board with a simple method of removing from the register the name of a person who has requested that his name be removed, and provides that the name of a person who has failed to pay his annual practice fee in respect of the next year remains on the register until the end of the current year (for which he has already paid) and will not be removed therefrom if he pays a restoration fee. This provision removes some existing

inconsistencies and will save the registrar some unnecessary removals and subsequent restorations. Paragraph (*c*) contains an amendment consequential on the proposed enactment of two new sections 22a and 26c. Paragraphs *(d)* and (*e*) effect statute law revision amendments.

Clause 9 enacts a new section 22a which provides that, if a person's name has actually been removed from the register for non-payment of the annual practice fee or because his whereabouts are unknown, the board has a discretion to refuse an application for restoration to the register, if he is not of good fame or character or if he has in the interval had his name removed from another medical register. Such a person is given a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. This new section covers a serious gap in the principal Act, as at the present moment a practitioner who had been off the South Australian register for perhaps a number of years and who had been guilty of misconduct in another State could be restored to the register in this State simply upon application and payment of the required fee.

Clause 10 amends section 24 of the principal Act so as to enable the President of the board to issue a provisional certificate to a person applying for limited registration (for example, a person about to do his year as a resident medical officer). At present provisional certificates may only be given in respect of full registration, and this has caused administrative difficulties. Provisional certificates are considered and confirmed or cancelled by the board at a later date.

Clause 11 amends section 24a of the principal Act which deals with limited registration. Paragraphs *(a),* (*b*), and (*c*) merely tidy up ambiguous language contained in the section. Paragraph (*d*) inserts new subsection (5a) which provides that a person on limited registration who is completing his year as a resident medical officer does not have to pay a further annual practice fee in respect of a period of not more than a month running into the next registration year. The registrar has found that, as the compulsory year of hospital residency may overlap into the next registration year, the case often arises in which the registrar must demand payment of a further full annual practice fee from a resident medical officer only in respect of the last few weeks of his compulsory year. The board wishes to have the power to exempt payment in such cases.

Clause 12 enacts new section 25a of the principal Act which enables the board to deal with practitioners who have been guilty of unethical, improper or unprofessional conduct by censuring such a person or by requiring him to give an undertaking to abstain from the particular conduct. The board can require that person to give a full explanation of the conduct, and if he fails to do so he is liable to a penalty of $50. If he fails to give an undertaking or commits a breach of an undertaking the board may suspend his registration in accordance with the other provisions of the Act relating to suspension. It must be borne in mind that there is a right of appeal against any order for suspension. This new section again covers a considerable gap in the Act, as at present the board has no express power to deal with relatively minor complaints that do not amount to "infamous conduct", which is provided for in section 26. The board wishes to have the power to ask a practitioner for a written explanation of a complaint made by a member of the public, without having to launch the full inquiry required by section 26.

Clause 13 amends section 26 of the principal Act, which deals with the cancellation or suspension of registration. Paragraphs (a) and *(b)* effect a change in the wording of the present offence of "infamous conduct in a professional respect", which the board considers to be an out-of-date expression. The new wording is "serious misconduct in any professional respect", which is based on wording chosen by the United Kingdom in a recent amendment. The substance of the offence is not in any way altered. Paragraph (*c*) empowers the Supreme Court to make a conditional order for restoration to the register in the case of cancellation of registration. It is envisaged that the carrying out of a refresher course may in some cases be necessary as a condition attaching to such an order.

Paragraph *(d)* is a consequential amendment. Paragraph (*e*) provides a sanction for the situation where a person fails to give, or commits a breach of, an undertaking that the board is already empowered to require under this section. In such a case the board may suspend his registration, or the Supreme Court may cancel his registration. Under the Act as it now stands, where a person is guilty of infamous conduct, the board may require him to give an undertaking to abstain from that conduct but cannot take any action for a failure to give the undertaking or for a breach of that undertaking.

Paragraphs (*f*), (*g*) and (*h*) contain consequential amendments. Paragraph *(i)* enables the board to serve a person personally (as well as by post) with the notice required to be given before suspension of his registration. Paragraph (*j*) contains a consequential amendment. Clause 14 effects statute law revision amendments to section 26a of the principal Act. Clause 15 enacts two new sections. New section 26b provides that, when a practitioner's registration has been suspended, (he name of that person shall be removed from the register but will automatically be restored to the register at the expiration of the suspension upon payment of the required fee. The board considers that this provision is necessary for the protection of the general public.

New section 26c provides that a person whose name has been removed from the register (excluding removal on suspension) may be required to carry out a refresher course to the satisfaction of the board, before his name is restored. Such a person shall be on limited registration during the refresher course. It is patently obvious that a person who has not practised for several years should, not only in the public interest but for his own benefit as well, undergo some type of refresher training. At present the board has no power to insist on this.

Clause 16 effects statute law revision amendments to section 27 of the principal Act. Clause 17 corrects certain ambiguities contained in section 29 of the principal Act and brings the wording of the section into line with later provisions relating to the publication and evidentiary effect of the specialist register. Clause 18 amends section 29a of the principal Act, which deals with the registration of specialists. Paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and *(d)* contain statute law revision amendments. Paragraph *(e)* inserts four new subsections, which provide for the payment of an annual specialist practice fee and for the procedure on non-payment of that fee. These provisions substantially follow those sections of the Act dealing with the payment of the ordinary practice fee. As the Act now stands, there is provision for payment of an annual specialist practice fee but not for the collection thereof, which is an obvious gap to be covered.

Clause 19 enacts three new sections. New section 29d provides that removal from the specialist register must automatically follow removal from the general register and that upon payment of the required fee restoration to the specialist register will follow restoration to the general register in those cases in which the board thinks fit. The need for these provisions is self-evident: if a person cannot practise as a general practitioner he obviously may not continue to practise as a specialist. New section 29e provides for the availability of the specialist register for public inspection. New section 29f provides for the publication and evidentiary effect of the specialist register. No fixed intervals for publication have been set as this register does not change as rapidly as the general register, which must be published annually. The evidentiary effect of a copy of the specialist register has the same effect as a copy of the general register.

Clause 20 amends section 31a of the principal Act by adding a new subsection which gives the board power to waive, reduce or defer payment of the fee which at present must be paid by all persons who apply to the board for a review of an account alleged to be excessive. The board feels that in those cases where the amount in dispute is comparatively small it is not reasonable to ask for the prescribed fee which at present is the sum of $5. The new subsection further provides that the board may extend the time within which such an application for review may be made from three months (as the Act now provides) to six months. The board has had the experience of not being able to review an apparent excessive account lodged by a migrant who did not become aware of his rights in the matter until more than three months after his receipt of the account. Clause 21 effects a statute law revision amendment to section 33 of the principal Act.

Clauses 22 and 23 increase the penalties set out in sections 35 and 36 of the principal Act to bring them into line with the penalties provided elsewhere in the Act for offences of similar gravity. Clause 24 enacts new section 37a, which provides an immunity from the provisions of the Act for a doctor from another State who may be required to perform some emergency treatment in this State. This provision was recommended by the 1968 conference of the Australian Medical Board for inclusion in the relevant Acts of all States.

Clause 25 amends the second schedule to the principal Act, which deals with the registration of foreign practitioners; that is, practitioners from places which do not recognize the qualifications of persons registered in this State. Paragraph *(a)* contains a statute law

revision amendment. Paragraph *(b)* is designed to overcome a difficulty in interpreting the meaning of the passage "any person who is or has been qualified to practise medicine or surgery in any country..." It has been thought that this could prevent a foreign doctor from applying for registration, who had the necessary medical qualifications to practise in his home country but not the legal right so to practise (for example, a person with some nationality or citizenship problem). It is hoped that the substituted passage will make clear that the board is only interested in the medical and professional qualifications of an applicant.

Paragraphs (*c*), (*e*) and (*g*) provide the board with the power to consider an application made by a foreign doctor who has resided in Australia for a period of three months or less. Such a person cannot apply for registration under the Act as it now stands, as the requirement is for a three-month period of residence in South Australia. This stringent requirement has meant that foreign doctors who have been licensed by the New South Wales Medical Board to work in base hospitals or outback regions must leave their employment and reside in this State for a full three months before they can even undergo the necessary examination by the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee. This seems unnecessary when references can easily be obtained from interstate sources. Also, foreign practitioners who have been registered in another State ought to be able to apply for registration here without any waiting period at all.

The board wishes to have a discretion in this matter and of course it anticipates that the three-month so-called "acclimatization" period should still apply to foreign doctors coming direct from overseas. Paragraphs *(d)* and (*i*) strike out those provisions which limit the life of the schedule to June 30, 1972. The board and the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee will therefore continue beyond that date to have the power to entertain and adjudicate upon applications by foreign practitioners for registration in this State, and so continue to tap a valuable source of medical talent. Paragraph (*f*) is a consequential amendment. Paragraph *(h)* is a statute law revision amendment.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1910.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I find this Bill difficult to speak on, because there is lack of real explanation of how its provisions will be implemented. I realize that it has been agreed to by the Australian Attorneys-General, and it seems to recognize the dilemma in the film industry on censorship. However, it does nothing more than that. No-one, including the Minister, has said how the Bill will be policed and how the provisions will work in relation to the motion picture industry. It is all very well to set out theoretically how the measure shall operate, and that is all set out neatly.

There are four definitions, the first three being advisory and the last being enforceable, or a restriction. This seems to allow what has not been allowed previously: namely, the showing of films that have been considered to be too "far out" in relation to sex or violence. It seems that those films may now be shown under the R classification. Indeed, the Commonwealth Minister has indicated this. I have some publicity with me in which Mr. Chipp states that he would give an R classification to the film *Percy* but that he would not allow it to be shown under the existing censorship laws of Australia. It would appear that the aim of the R film is to allow films containing a greater amount of sex and violence to be shown in South Australia. At the same time, it rather piously sets out the restriction which shall apply: no-one between the ages of six years and 18 years may view such films.

I do not really find myself in great conflict with the Attorney-General's theoretical position. It is fair to say that adults in the community should be able to please themselves as to what they do or do not want to see on the screen, unless the common law of decency is breached in the presentation. However, where the Attorney-General and I part company is in his assessment of how the Act will be administered, because I believe it is a recognition of the problem and nothing more. The Attorney-General knows that the Act cannot properly be enforced in a large area of the South Australian motion picture industry, and he has been told that by the motion picture operators. He well knows that it is impossible to detect not only the age of 18 years but the age of six years. The Act has a double difficulty: the motion picture operator must ensure that all the patrons who present themselves at the box office are either over 18 years or under

six years. Members know that that is an impossibility. No member could truthfully say that this could properly be carried out. It is a matter of commonsense appraisal of crowds, of the way the public behaves, and the commercial impact of people who present entertainment to the public.

This matter has been drawn to my attention by the South Australian Motion Picture Exhibitors Association in a letter to me from its Secretary (Mr. Gibson). I believe a similar letter has been sent to other members. A special problem exists at drive-ins, and the Attorney-General has entirely ignored the practical difficulties inherent in it. The Secretary's letter states:

We are not trying to avoid responsibility, but we stress the impracticability of the changes proposed. We ask you to imagine a line of cars awaiting admission to a drive-in. The attendant looks into the car, but cannot see one or more children hidden under a rug between the front and back seats. (And this especially applies in the case of station waggons and panel vans, the back often being cumbered up with luggage, cushions, rugs, etc., which are often used to hide youngsters in an endeavour to avoid paying for admission). He cannot very well demand that the car owner remove all coverings to see if children are concealed. This is not an exaggeration, because this is happening quite often at present: parents endeavouring to avoid paying for children by hiding them.

The only suggestion the Minister could give was that it would be a safe defence by the motion picture operator to say that it was impossible for him to detect the child who had been hidden in this fashion. It would be entirely unjust to prosecute the motion picture operator if that child had been let into a drive-in in those circumstances. The House could not sanction a prosecution against the operator. The letter continues:

Other deceptions commonly practised, mostly by teenage patrons, are for persons to be concealed in the boot of sedans, or for the driver to pay admissions and others to scale the surrounding fence, joining the car occupant inside the area.

I remind members that if these children are under the age of 16 years they cannot be touched by the law, they would be committing an offence only if between 16 and 18 years. So again it is only the motion picture operator who would be responsible if children between six and 16 years practised these methods of gaining admission to drive-ins. Would the operator be penalized if by any one of these means children of these ages obtained admission? The letter continues:

Any of the above individuals could be in the restricted age group, and, failing the inspection of all car boots, it must be admitted that responsibility for being on the premises should be that of the individual, and not the proprietor. Adequate notices could be displayed at the entrance gates advising patrons of the restrictions currently applying regarding age. Comparisons have been drawn between "persons licensed to sell liquor, to persons engaged in the business of bookmaking, and others who are required to abstain from doing business with persons under a certain age". These also, we suggest, are unrealistic. A hotel proprietor, if he decides a prospective purchaser is under age, can send him on his way, but this is impossible in the case of cars entering a drive-in theatre: in the first case, there is no crush in the entry point as would apply with a picture starting at a certain time; in the latter case, if there is a refusal to admit a car, it must cause insoluble traffic difficulties because of the queue line-up. Bottle departments supply liquor to a carload of under-age persons, provided the purchaser is over age. Juveniles bet by having an adult bet for them. Both cases present no problem for the proprietor, and are practised with impunity.

All people conversant with the way young people surmount difficulties placed in their way understand that these practices go on with impunity. The letter continues:

Hotel lounges and T.A.B. agencies are illuminated, and a refusal to serve anyone does not cause concern to any other person. Failure to detect this under-age patron involves management in prosecution, if legislation is patterned on oversea regulations. These have already been proved impractical.

Obviously, the onus cannot effectively be placed on theatre proprietors to police the Act. The letter concludes:

These are only some of the problems of the theatre managements which are glaringly evident in any attempt to substitute the responsibility of an R classification to the exhibitor for the "Not suitable for children" or "Suitable for adults only" classifications, which at present place the responsibility of entry fairly and squarely and properly upon parents of would-be "under-age" patrons.

Perhaps this is the most important aspect of the Bill: it takes away from parents the responsibility of knowing what films their children are viewing and passes it on entirely to the theatre proprietor. Persons between the ages of 16 years and 18 years can be prosecuted for contravening the Act. In fact, the Government is stating that these films are too hard to show, but if proprietors are prosecuted they will not show them to South Australian audiences. This is one view that can be taken by those involved in the industry and this would be their ultimate safeguard concerning the law, or that the Minister and the Government is allowing

into South Australia a standard of film that has never previously been allowed. In both courses the Attorney would be admitting that prosecutions could not properly be launched and that films would be shown with impunity.

I believe that that is the Government's attitude and that it would not, in the practical sense, restrict theatres from showing R classification films, because a public demand will develop for them that will be officially recognized by this Bill. Having established the demand, the Government will have the responsibility of prosecuting in impossible circumstances for the proprietors, or in not prosecuting and recognizing that, in thousands of cases each year, children who should be prohibited will be allowed entry to the theatre. There will be no effective supervision of the provision of this Act. It cannot work and there will develop in South Australia a wide-open situation concerning R classification films. Any person in the Government sphere in Australia who interprets this in any other way has his head in the clouds and is not considering the practical administration of this legislation.

I know that the situation is difficult and I am not saying that the Minister is taking the easy way out and is creating a problem: the problem is there, and no doubt the Minister recognizes the problem of censorship. I readily admit that all Ministers responsible for censorship have a problem. Public standards of acceptance are altering each year, but I am sure that a reasonable standard cannot be abandoned entirely. It is the setting of this standard and the recognizing of the maturity of adults that is the ultimate problem of censorship. I criticize the Bill because it is hypocritical. The Minister should detail what will happen in the circumstances, and should admit that the provisions of the Bill will not work. I believe that the responsibility should remain with parents of children: there is no other sensible way of handling this matter, and one should not create the unfair situation for proprietors that has been created by this legislation.

Members realize how difficult it is to know whether a child is aged four years or eight years or whether he is aged 15 years or 18 years. A practical means of definition can only be solved by prosecution or by the production of a birth certificate and, when one has a legitimate doubt and confronts a seemingly innocent child, the solution to that problem is abhorrent in a free society. It is difficult when a motor vehicle, containing six people, is entering a drive-in theatre for the proprietor to gauge whether a child is 14 years old or an adult is over 18 years old, particularly in a dimly lit motor vehicle. I wish that the Bill was more honest in recognizing the problem that is admitted by everyone. It is an ineffective Bill, and it seems that those responsible in Australia have admitted that they cannot cope with the problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Leader, because the difficulty about this matter is the question of supervision. There may well be other difficulties about adopting an R classification. I think the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation (certainly when replying to a question I asked 12 months ago) that the matter has been discussed for a long time and before he came into office. I was aware of the broad proposals when I was in office, although in my time no conference was held on this matter. I know that not only were people in the industry dissatisfied but also there was much reluctance, even on the part of the public servant who would be responsible and who was experienced in this matter in South Australia, to recommend the adoption of this system of classification. I cannot remember the details, but cogent arguments against this classification were put to me when I was in office, although the matter did not come up for decision at that time.

I think South Australia is the only State that has retained legislative power to censor films, and once in a while Sir Lyell McEwin, when Chief Secretary, used the powers to prevent the showing of a film: that happened many years ago. Generally, the matter was organized pretty well by informal negotiation between the officer concerned and the motion picture exhibitors. Like the Leader, I base my reservations in respect of the Bill not on the broad matters to which I have referred but on the difficulty of policing its provisions. It seems that these are unanswerable and that the Attorney knows that and has admitted it, because, when replying to my question of October 22 last year, he said:

> I am not unappreciative of the difficulties they will face.—

that is, the exhibitors—

> There will be problems for them, but I think, and it is the Government's view, that the public interest in a matter of this kind must prevail. It is of paramount importance to ensure that, where films are exhibited that deal with adult themes in an adult way, they should not be exhibited to the immature, who might conceivably take harm from them.

Then, he goes on to draw the comparison with hotels, and so on. A week later, on October 29, he said much the same thing namely:

The determining of age always presents difficulties but the honourable member must realize (and I put this to the motion picture exhibitors) that, if a person chooses freely to exhibit films bearing a restricted classification, it is not too much to ask him to assume responsibility for excluding the immature. If he does not have the resources to exclude the immature, he should not show the film.

That, I think, is what will happen. Either there will be a widespread ignoring of the law, or motion picture exhibitors simply will not exhibit the R classification films. That may not necessarily be a bad thing: some of these films are pretty hot, I know; but it is rather strange that the Attorney-General, with his "enlightened" views on censorship, and so on, should bring in a Bill which will have the effect of preventing the showing of these things and which, therefore, will be a form of censorship and will have the effect of preventing the showing of these things by those who strictly want to comply with the law. That is the effect of this Bill; it is a form of censorship which the Attorney-General has said many times (and his Leader has said it far more strongly, more frequently and, I suspect, with more enthusiasm) is against the policy of the Government.

The Leader has pointed to the difficulties particularly at drive-in theatres, which will be in a more difficult position than will hard-tops, as they are called in the trade. Nevertheless, the difficulty will involve both of them. I point out that it is especially hard on drive-in theatres at this time, because they have already in the last few weeks suffered, or are about to suffer, another blow through the introduction of daylight saving. I supported the introduction of daylight saving in South Australia, and, for doing that, I make no apologies (even to my wife, who does not agree with it). However, it is indisputable that one of the forms of activity that will be affected by daylight saving is the drive-in theatre, because the films just will not be able to start for another hour by the clock, and drive-in theatres will lose some patronage because of it. We are now putting another burden on them which seems to me to be literally impossible to bear.

Either, as I have said, the law will be flouted or these films will not be shown at drive-in theatres. As I have said, the same is true (but not quite so seriously) of hard-tops; I think it will be a little easier in this respect, but it will still be extremely difficult to police these provisions. The result will be as I have said, and I think there is no need to say any more about it than that. However, I should like the Attorney-General to say what steps the Government intends to take to see that this law is enforced. Does it intend to employ inspectors to go around and to check on people's age? Does it propose some other way of checking to see that the law is being obeyed, both at drive-in theatres and at hard-tops? Or does it intend to take no specific action to see that this law is obeyed?

I do not oppose the Bill; it is an attempt to achieve some uniformity in a field where 1 think uniformity is probably not a bad thing. Certainly, in view of some of the remarks I have made on other matters, I cannot suggest that I am against all forms of censorship. I believe there is a line to be drawn and, beyond that line, things should not be seen or heard. Therefore, it would be hypocritical of me to do otherwise than to support the Bill, but I underline the difficulties, to which the Leader has referred, for the motion picture industry through adopting this classification, and I also point broadly to the resistance to the idea of which I was aware when in office.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): This Bill has apparently been introduced because the Commonwealth Government will enact similar legislation and, as the Attorney-General said, the Bill is introduced to enable this State to declare by proclamation the date on which the measure will be enacted. The Commonwealth Government has introduced the classification of films along the lines set out in the Bill and, as a result, if South Australians are to see the films in respect of which there will be an R certificate, this Bill is necessary. Although I support the Bill, I do so with reservations. My main reservations about the measure are those referred to by the Leader and Deputy Leader, namely, that this legislation will be extremely difficult to police adequately. I am sure that the Attorney-General will agree that a law that is difficult to police is often not policed at all. All members would have received from the South Australian Motion Picture Exhibitors Association, almost a year ago when this subject was first mooted, a letter setting out its members' opposition to this measure. Referring to the difficulty in policing this matter, the letter states:

In both England and New Zealand the laws prohibiting the admission of young persons under a certain age to view certain films are more honoured in the breach than in the observance. We are informed from reliable sources that theatre managers in England cannot recall any prosecutions having taken place for breaches of such laws and that in New Zealand no such prosecutions have taken place for at least five years.

Although I have not checked the accuracy of that statement, I have no reason whatever to doubt it. If that is a fact, it seems to me that this law is not serving the purpose for which it was designed. Clause 6 causes me much concern. This clause throws the onus on a proprietor in a way that I believe could lead to unjust prosecutions. Those who support the Bill have drawn comparisons between film operators and people licensed to sell liquor, people engaged in bookmaking and other people who are restrained from doing business with people under a certain age. However, the position is not so clear in the case of the motion picture operators.

If a hotel proprietor has any doubt about a person's age, he can send that person away, but it would be virtually impossible for the proprietor of a drive-in theatre, for example, to do that. I believe drive-in theatres are undoubtedly the source of the greatest difficulty in this respect. Difficulty will also arise in the case of the normal cinema or the hardtop theatre, as I believe it is called. As members know, most people arrive to see a motion picture within five minutes of the start. As there is a great rush of people at that time, the ticket seller is extremely busy, with her head down passing out tickets and taking money; she would not have time to study people and decide whether or not they are over 18 years or under six years. Similarly, an usherette at the door would be busy getting people to their seats. She would be more concerned with taking tickets, looking at their numbers and directing patrons to their seats, than in checking their age. If an usherette did have some doubt whether a person was over 18 years, she would be forced to question the person about his age. In most cases an argument would ensue that could take some time, with a crush of people behind trying to get to their seats. Without doubt, the drive-in theatre presents the greatest problem, because here we have the situation of a darkened car with several occupants. If the ticket seller directed his torch on to all the occupants of the car and decided that the age of one or more persons was doubtful, again an argument could ensue and, in this case, a line of cars would bank up behind. If he decided that the person was under 18 years and forced him to leave, purely mechanical difficulties would arise in getting that car out of the line and away. Clause 6 (2) provides:

It shall be a defence to a prosecution under subsection (1) of this section that—

(*a*) the defendant took reasonable precautions designed to ensure that any such persons were not admitted to the exhibition of the film; and

(*b*) the defendant, or a person to whom the responsibility of admitting persons to the exhibition of the film was entrusted, believed on reasonable grounds that the child to whom the charge relates had not attained the age of six years, or had attained the age of eighteen years.

I should like from the Attorney-General an assurance about what would constitute reasonable grounds of defence. Will it be reasonable for the ticket seller at a drive-in theatre to say that he did not shine his torch on a car-load of patrons to enable him to estimate their age, and that he let them in? That situation will certainly apply in every case. With regard to comparing the drive-in theatre operator with the person licensed to sell liquor, it is legal for a car full of young people to go to a drive-in bottle department, provided that the person who asks for and buys liquor is over 18 years. In that case, it does not matter whether the rest of the occupants of the car are 10 years old: it is still legal. However, with regard to the drive-in theatre, the situation is different. The question arises whether, if a car-load of patrons goes to a drive-in theatre and it is subsequently found that one person is under the age of 18 years, the other occupants of the car, especially the driver, are liable in any way as being accessories to committing this offence. I should like some assurance from the Attorney-General on that matter. This gets back to the fact that experience overseas seems to show that this type of law is not policed as it was meant to be policed. I believe that any law which is not policed is not a good law.

In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said that often sex and violence were introduced into films simply because at present this was the fashionable thing in films. He said that this did not add in any way to the plot or artistic merit of the film. I imagine all members have seen films of that type where either sex or violence has appeared to be dragged in for no apparent good purpose. Those films go virtually to the edge

of the law in whatever country they are shown. The Attorney-General also said:

There are, however, undoubtedly many cases in which adult themes are presented with honesty and integrity and in which the explicit treatment of sex and sometimes violence is important to the proper treatment of the subject.

I entirely agree with the Attorney that this does apply in many cases. Moreover, I believe that, within reason, adults should be able to see fairly well what they want to see. because in this regard opinions differ as to what is offensive either morally or aesthetically. Therefore. it should be left to an individual to decide for himself what he wants to see. However, I hope that this liberalizing of films to be shown in Australia will not lead to a flood of deviationist films. I realize that it is not up to the Attorney or this State really to be concerned with this matter, because the classification will be made by the Commonwealth Government. As I have said, this law is simply to police what the Commonwealth has already decided on. In this regard, I can see that the Attorney is in a difficult position, for he will have to enforce the law based on decisions made by another law-making body. As I do not believe there is any great demand for this legislation, I wonder why the whole business has been started. The South Australian Motion Picture Exhibitors Association has provided information about the figures, which states:

(i) The all-States public opinion polls conducted in September, 1969, and January, 1970, revealed that 60 per cent of those interviewed either wanted censorship of films increased or left unchanged, and that 32 per cent wanted decreased censorship or none at all.

(ii) The June, 1970, Victorian public opinion poll produced corresponding figures of 58 per cent and 34 per cent respectively.

The percentage of those who wanted more censorship (or wanted the position left as it was) dropped, and a poll taken now may show that many people favour the introduction of the R classification, but there has certainly been no large public outcry for this sort of legislation. I do not like this Bill. Policing it adequately will be impossible. The measure could result in a flood into the country of films that apparently have not been asked for by many people, and the Bill places on a theatre operator responsibility that rightly belongs to parents. Parents should make the ultimate decision on whether their children see a certain form of entertainment.

1 think the Government has the responsibility of telling parents what type of film a certain film is, and this has been done for many years, but the ultimate responsibility for where children go and what they see should rest with the parents. Unfortunately, this has not proved to be so and the State is consequently making this a legally enforceable requirement. I deplore the need to do this and I consider that, in this connection, parents are failing in their responsibility.

One could not speak at any great length on this Bill. I believe in the principle contained in it and the way the measure is framed. Further, I cannot see any better way of framing it, but I warn the Attorney-General that this law will be extremely difficult to enforce. I support the second reading.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): Obviously the Government has introduced this Bill to try to do something—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. I cannot hear what the honourable member is saying.

Mrs. STEELE: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has introduced the Bill in a genuine attempt to do something to so classify films as to protect young and immature people. However, I do not believe that the Bill will achieve what the Government has set out to do. Many people in the community have considered that there is a need for some kind of classification, but the real problem about the classification of films is to see that the classifications are policed properly.

The Commonwealth Government, as well as the States, has been concerned about this matter for a long time, and meetings have been held to try to reach agreement on how films should be classified. We all know that many films exhibited in our cinemas are full of sex and violence. This is not peculiar to South Australia or to Australia: many other countries have the same problem. We do not have the problem only in our theatres, because some films shown on television are bad for viewing by young people. In this regard, I remember speaking when I was overseas to many people who were convinced that the violence and high incidence of sex depicted in films shown at picture theatres and drive-ins and on television was one of the basic causes of the corruption of the morals of young people at present.

In the main, parents were concerned about this problem of the kind of film being produced. Of course, a film may not be as bad as its title seems to indicate, because often the title is devised to make the film provocative, with the idea of attracting impressionable young people to see it. Such a film is often

innocuous. On the other hand, I remember, when I drove down the main street of Austin, Texas, being shattered to see, in blazing lights across the front of the theatre, the film title *Carnal Knowledge,* and I wondered how lax censorship could get to permit that sort of thing and how the civic authorities would permit a theatre to indulge in that type of thing.

Mr. Ryan: What was the film about?

Mrs. STEELE: I did not go to see it. Some of the films presented are beautifully done. The subject of sex is aesthetically and touchingly presented, and I am sure members have seen films of that kind, but I am certain that many people in the community are concerned about the high incidence of the type of film being presented at present. As I see it, the difficulty is (and other members have referred to this) how to police the restrictive classification.

I have much sympathy with the film exhibitors. on whom the onus is placed to exclude these young people from picture theatres, because how are the exhibitors to determine the age of a young person? How does one determine the age of a child at either end of the scale, as has been specified in this Bill? I defy anyone to accurately estimate the age of girls who are in their teens. It is one thing to see girls in school uniforms and to say that they are in the teenage group, but at weekends these girls quickly get out of their school clothes, and they do not normally go to pictures, anyway, in school uniforms, except to see educational or cultural films.

When one sees girls at the weekend, made up and looking most attractive, one finds it difficult to estimate their age, as I am sure most members agree. In the last three or four months, particularly in America, I have found that it is almost impossible at times to distinguish to which sex young people belong. However, my point here is that it is difficult to estimate the age of young women. Some young girls like to make themselves look older than they are, and some of them are most sophisticated looking. I shall be surprised if some of them do not deliberately do themselves up in order to pass as older and so get in to see some of these films.

Mr. Ryan: They don't only make themselves look older; sometimes they make themselves look younger.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. A great difficulty facing exhibitors or anyone else associated with picture theatres is distinguishing the age of young people. For instance, in the rush hour, with queues forming to get into the various sessions, the task of deciding the age of a person falls on the ticket seller or the usher. What do they do—ask the person's age? If they are observant they will see that the person is under the necessary age to enter the theatre. Where do they go then? Do they pursue the question, call a policeman or say "Sit in the office" until verification of age is obtained? They will be in as much of a dilemma as is a hotel licensee over the age problem. What is the solution? Short of asking for a birth certificate, how can the Act be policed? In common with the member for Flinders, I believe that it is primarily the parents' function to decide whether or not a film is suitable.

With these classifications of restricted film, it is the parents' duty, if they have their children's welfare at heart, to ensure that the children do not see such films. There are still many parents in the community who are sufficiently interested to take this step. Although I realize that the Government, probably with sincere intentions, has introduced the Bill to do what it can to keep young people from seeing undesirable films, I still maintain that there are no teeth in the Bill (teeth that anyone could use with certainty to ensure that under-age people do not attend restricted screenings). I do not know what the fate of the Bill will be or whether it will be amended to give the authorities a greater chance of policing the legislation. However, I am not altogether happy with the Bill, and I shall be interested to see what amendments, if any, are moved in Committee.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): At first glance, the Bill appears to be a straightforward one, but what will it involve in the long term? The first substantial provision is that there will be four classifications of film: those for general exhibition, those not recommended for children, those for mature audiences, and those that are restricted. At present, there are two major classifications of film, and the system seems to have worked satisfactorily for many years. The two current classifications are "For general exhibition" and "Not for general exhibition". However, the Bill provides wider classifications.

The classification which I query and which could lead to difficulty is the R classification,

because it is not clear what policy will be adopted. The Bill clearly sets out the divisions to be made. Subclause 7 (2) provides:

The Minister may in any particular case, by direction in writing under his hand, exempt any film from the operation of this Act to the extent specified in the direction and the operation of this Act in relation to that film shall be modified accordingly.

If the Minister takes a fancy to some film, he might let it through, irrespective of whether or not it falls into one of the four classifications. The Minister reserves this right to himself. The R classification is the one about which queries will no doubt be raised. There is nothing in the Bill to indicate how censorship, as such, will operate in the film industry. Does it mean that, if a film is given an R classification, *carte blanche* will be given for the film to be shown in the State? The provisions to safeguard the showing of R classification films will not be workable. People under 18 years would not have been allowed to see *Oh! Calcutta!* but that was a simpler proviso than the one contained in the Bill. The safeguards in the Bill will be completely unworkable, as it is difficult to ascertain the age of people who attend cinemas: it is even more difficult to detect breaches at drive-ins.

Does the Bill contemplate the showing of R classification films without any check being placed on the type of film shown? If this is the case, I have some reservations about the operation of the legislation. It is all right to say, "We will limit the performances to certain sections of a community," but it would be difficult to achieve this aim. The Premier's views and the Attorney-General's views are well known, and they have had wide publicity in the sphere of censorship and whether there is such a thing as a public code of morality. The Premier and the Attorney-General have stated from time to time that they believe that the individual should be able to choose for himself what he shall see.

In the light of what they have said, restrictions should not be placed on people who wish to see this type of material, but I disagree with that view. Fortunately, some members of the Judiciary disagreed with this view in a recent court case. Any reservations I have about the operation of this Bill are concerned with films that will be included in the restricted classification. I do not agree with the Premier's view that the individual should be allowed free access to this material and be able to choose whether he sees it or not. I do not believe that the safeguards enunciated concerning *Oh! Calcutta!* (that only certain sections of the community would be permitted to attend it) would have worked, nor do I think that the prohibitions in this Bill will apply to those sections of the community to which the Government thinks it should apply. It is with mixed feelings that I have considered this measure. The penalties are straightforward, but it is the philosophy behind the Bill with which I am not happy. Perhaps we should have uniformity in the States in this matter, but I wonder where we are heading in South Australia in showing a type of film that is not generally acceptable to the public of this State. I hope these points will be clarified as the debate progresses, but it is with considerable reservation that I support the second reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I, too, support the second reading with some misgivings, because I think it will be impossible to police its provisions. The attitude shown by this Bill is not consistent with that adopted by this House several years ago when I moved an amendment to the Licensing Act making it illegal for people under 18 years of age to be present in bars. The House rejected that motion because of the difficulty of judging the ages of those persons. The only way that the provisions of this Bill would be practicable would be for everyone to have an identification card showing a photograph and including a signature, and this card would have to be presented before a person was admitted to a theatre. Perhaps some members would have misgivings about that system, too.

The addition of a photograph to a driving licence may be a satisfactory solution, but there would be long delays before people could gain admittance to a drive-in theatre. If this legislation leads to the showing of "blue" pictures, I do not think it is a step in the right direction. Since there has been a sex symbol for moving pictures the industry has deteriorated, and few good films are produced now. Perhaps there may be a swing back to more artistic types of film, as from newspaper reports we learn that actresses are refusing to act in a certain kind of film. I know from my experiences during my recent oversea trip that one can get sick of a certain type of show and, eventually, one hopes that the artists will be more adequately covered so that there will be an element of surprise in the entertainment. After a while one becomes bored from watching certain types of entertainment.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear what the honourable member is saying, because

of the audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. McANANEY: It is not obvious to me how the provisions of this Bill can be policed adequately. It is useless to enact a law which, because people think is silly, is always being broken. I voted for the introduction of the Totalizator Agency Board system of betting because I thought that it would be impossible to suppress S.P. betting, and that it was better to have legal off-course facilities available for the people. If a law cannot be policed, the only satisfactory course to take is to withdraw it or amend it, and I believe that the provisions of this Bill will be impossible to police. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, at 2 p.m.