HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 22, 1972

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

DEATH OF MRS. COUMBE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of Mrs. Coumbe, wife of the member for Torrens, and that, as a mark of respect, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I am sure that every member of this House would wish to express his sympathy to the member for Torrens on his sad and grievous loss. Every member here has reason to know, far more than any member of the public can know, of the strain placed on the wives of members because of their service and duties to the public and in this place. Over the years, the member for Torrens has been one of us in this situation and has already suffered tragic loss in his own family with the prior accidental death of his son. Every one of us must feel for the honourable member on this occasion, and I am sure that the sympathies not only of members of this House but also of the whole State go to him and to the members of his family in their sad loss.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): We on this side support the motion. We were both saddened and regretful when the news of Mrs. Coumbe's death was conveyed to us this morning. I am certain that John Coumbe has the deepest sympathy of all members on both sides. His wife contributed considerably to community affairs: right until the time of her death she was involved in the activities of the Red Cross Society and the St. John organization, as well as being a stalwart member of St. Cuthbert Church of England, Prospect. Mrs. Coumbe had also been instrumental in helping her husband in connection with the organizational wing of this Party. We on this side accept and appreciate the motion, which allows us formally to express our sympathy to the member for Torrens in his sad loss.

The SPEAKER: I endorse the remarks of the honourable Premier and of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I ask honourable members to carry the motion by standing and observing one minute's silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.5 *to* 2.15 *p.m.]*

PETITION: CRAFERS LAND

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 52 residents of Crafers who stated:

(1) that the area of Highways Department land that lay between Atkinson Road and the South-Eastern Freeway on the ramp at Crafers had not been beautified since the opening of the Crafers to Verdun section of the freeway;

(2) that they had sighted surveyors working in the area recently, and were concerned that the land might be sold on the open market, allowing developers to create housing;

(3) that there was a need for new tennis courts in this district, and the local branch of the camellia society was keen to use at least part of this area to develop as a camellia garden; and

(4) that the environment had been affected by the freeway complex, and the residents would raise strong objection to any houses being constructed on this area.

These residents therefore asked the Minister of Roads and Transport to have his department make this land available to the local community as some form of part reimbursement for the losses suffered by the encroachment of the freeway into their previously peaceful environment.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: POLLUTION

Mr. HOPGOOD presented a petition signed by 1,394 electors stating that the Port Stanvac oil refinery was a prime cause of atmospheric pollution in the O'Sullivan Beach and Christies Beach areas and that the deleterious effects of this pollution were evidenced by the emission of dark smoke and noxious smells and the death of garden foliage. The petitioners were aware of negotiations to extend the capacity of the refinery, and trusted that in any such move due regard would be had for the protection of the local environment. They further noted the consistently high pollution readings measured by the Health Department's local monitoring stations, and prayed that the House of Assembly would take necessary action to control all industrial emissions, particularly those associated with the refining of crude oil.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

WHYALLA DISPUTE

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he was trying to embarrass James North (Australia) Proprietary Limited by releasing misleading information to union representatives at Whyalla, or,

alternatively, simply being naive in giving credence to baseless rumour by claiming that all 25 women retrenched on Friday last would be reinstated at least until Christmas? In this morning's press appears a statement attributed to the Miscellaneous Workers Union representative (Mr. B. F. J. Cavanagh) that this was the context of information given to union officials in Whyalla by the Minister last evening in telephone contact with those officials. Although the General Manager of James North (Mr. R. H. Millar) has acknowledged that his company is prepared to discuss terms for a union take-over of the Whyalla factory, he has today denied that the retrenched women will be reinstated. The midday news bulletin on 5DN reported as follows:

The General Manager of James North (Australia) Proprietary Limited (Mr. Millar) today denied that the retrenched women would be reinstated. He said from Sydney that his company had not yet agreed to anything, in any shape or form. He said the quotes attributed to Mr. McKee were a lot of nonsense, and that the company had made no commitment at this stage to re-open the Whyalla factory, now or ever.

This is a direct negation of the information given by the Minister. Such a situation obviously can do nothing to help the industrial image of this State or the industrial harmony in Whyalla, and I eagerly await the Minister's explanation of his extremely inept action.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: In talking about helping the situation, the Leader has, by going off halfcocked and by taking notice of press statements, got his facts entirely wrong. Commissioner Lean went to Whyalla this morning with Mr. Gibson, a Sydney official of the company. Mr. Gibson called on the Premier and me at the House late yesterday afternoon, ringing me back later to say that he would go to Whyalla this morning and that he desired that we send an industrial commissioner with him. He said there were some terms that could possibly be used in the negotiations: the terms were that the factory would probably resume work on Thursday, that work would be provided until the normal Christmas close-down, that these were the terms for negotiation, and that the union would agree to a shutdown or to subsequent sanctions. This means that if any other viable proposition is open to keep the company at Whyalla in an economic situation, it will be considered.

Dr. Eastick: What about—

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I suggest to the Leader that, if he wants to aggravate the situation further, this is just what he is doing, because the stoppage is now being negotiated. Only half an hour ago I spoke to Commissioner Lean by telephone, and I understand that progress is being made at Whyalla. If the Leader wishes to undo the progress that is being made, I suggest that he continue to do as he is doing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say what assistance, financial or otherwise, the Government is willing to give, either to James North (Australia) Proprietary Limited or to any successor of that company, concerning the reopening of the factory at Whyalla? Last week in this House the Leader raised the matter of the Government's having had supplied to it, I think, on tender some of the cheaper imported gloves from Hong Kong.

Dr. Eastick: Both leather and P.V.C.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Of course, the competition from these cheaper imported products has caused the problem for James North (Australia) Proprietary Limited at Whyalla and, I understand, for the other glove manufacturers. I wonder whether the Government is willing to do anything to help regarding contracts and supplies. A report in today's *News,* which refers to a denial of the statement which was attributed to the Minister earlier, raises the question of the damage that was done to the premises at Whyalla during the incidents earlier this week. I understand the police took note and said it was an industrial matter—

Mr. Jennings: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amount of assistance that will be given to the industry was taken up with the Government yesterday, at the Government's suggestion, with Mr. Gibson and Mr. Horton Williams, who is representing the company in Adelaide. The company has been told that we will examine the situation to see whether we can help it in any way. The amount of assistance that could be given by way of purchases by the Government would be fairly limited because we do not have a large requirement for gloves. We are examining the matter and I discussed it with Mr. Williams, through my staff, only about five minutes before the House resumed. We are certainly looking to see what help we can give. This factory was originally established in Whyalla as a result of negotiations with the then Labor Government in 1967 and very marked—

Mr. Millhouse: Police protection will be given?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All matters relating to the dispute with the unions in Whyalla are currently the subject of negotiation

and no suggestion of police action in the area has been raised by the company.

Mr. Millhouse: I've raised it now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has authority to speak for the company, perhaps he will tell me where he got it from.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't answer like that!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants the police to take action in circumstances such as those that arose at Whyalla—

Mr. Millhouse: In order to protect property.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —in order to be provocative, which would be against the advice given to the Government by the inspector on the spot, perhaps he will tell us that is the way he would go about it. The advice given to us by the police officers was that the matter should be handled exactly as they have handled it.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the Premier but I think this might be an appropriate time—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Ross Smith called "Question".

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you know? He has not given it yet. You have not even listened to it. How do you know that there is no point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham should know that he must keep quiet. The honourable member for Ross Smith did call "Question" when the honourable member for Mitcham was on his feet. If the honourable member for Bragg wanted to take a point of order on that, it should have been done at the time the incident arose.

Dr. Tonkin: I'm only trying to be helpful.

The SPEAKER: I have to conduct the House in accordance with Standing Orders and there is no point of order on that issue.

ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Education say what is the position concerning the overall finance available for adult education classes in the current year? Rumours have been circulating about the lack of finance available this year and the effect that it will have on classes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position applying in respect of adult education classes conducted by the Further Education Department is that the finance available throughout the State for the financial year 1972-73 is $1,200,000 as against the expenditure in the financial year 1971-72 of $1,034,000, so the effective increase in the Budget allocation for adult education classes is 16 per cent. The basis of any rumours that may have circulated has been, as far as I can judge, first, the department's view that its adult education work should be adult work and, secondly, that each adult education centre has been asked for the first time to prepare a budget. The process of preparing a budget has apparently, in some cases, proved somewhat difficult and has led to conflicting ideas about what was intended.

Mr. Evans: When was it asked that the budget be produced?

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

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that initially it was asked that the budget be produced about two months ago.

Mr. Evans: It was March this year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That may be so. Nevertheless, budget adjustments have been involved and, as I have said, the budget provision for the Adult Education Department for further education classes is up by 16 per cent on the provision for the previous financial year, so provision has been made for the continuation and expansion of adult education.

Mr. Evans: How much did the recent teachers' salary increase cost?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member will wait, I shall expand on my reply. We hope to put adult education centres on a budget basis so that they will know something about priorities and the sum that they are involved in spending. It is correct to say that there has been a change of between 9 per cent and 10 per cent in the hourly rates applicable to adult education teachers. However, even taking that into account, there is still a healthy margin for expansion in real terms and in the effort put into adult education. Certainly, there are cases where sensible economies can be made. For example, there are cases where two small classes can be combined into a larger class and there are other cases where consideration has had to be given to classes for primary children in particular that have been undertaken in some places, such as at Onkaparinga, as the member for Fisher would know. I think all members agree that this aspect should not be a feature of adult

education work conducted by the Further Education Department. However, the budget provision is sufficient to ensure the continuation of adult education classes and a significant expansion in real terms. That has been the case all along and any rumours that have been circulated in the community have no basis in fact.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister say why certain existing adult education leisure-time classes have been curtailed, and when they will be reinstated? Many members of the community derive much pleasure from acquiring skills in activities such as upholstery, woodworking, and gemstone cutting, but I have been told that several of these classes have been cancelled. As there is no lack of people wishing to enrol, as instructors have been found for classes, and as school premises are available, why are these classes being cancelled?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Has the honourable member information about which centre is involved?

Dr. Tonkin: Goodwood.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In that case the only reply I can give him is that the officer in charge of that centre has made a mistake in relation to the budget task he was expected to carry out. I will check this matter, but the position is, as I have said (and it has been for a long time), that additional provision has been made for adult education.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say whether he has given an assurance that there will be no reduction in adult education classes in the Onkaparinga area? I have been informed that some teachers in the area have been told that next year they cannot have as many classes consisting mainly of adults as they have had this year. In his reply to the member for Mitchell, the Minister more or less said that there would be no reduction in these classes. Will he now give such an assurance?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If I did not do so, I should make clear that there will be circumstances in which sensible economy or rationalization can take place. For example, it may be possible to run a class for 20 students instead of running two classes each of 10 students. In several situations, that kind of rationalization is possible, and funds can clearly be conserved in that way. No doubt this situation exists at Onkaparinga. In addition, there are inevitably occasional instances where the kind of programme being run in an area has to be reviewed in the interests of developing the purpose of adult education. Clearly, that kind of situation can occur anywhere, and a review can be required at any time. Moreover, inevitably some classes will disappear from year to year as a consequence of fewer people wanting to take a certain subject. This may also lead to a change in the subjects given. Overall, there will be an expansion in our adult education effort. As the honourable member has written to me about the position in the Onkaparinga area, I shall reply to him in detail in due course about that. However, I think that the exceptions that apply to the general statement that adult education will be expanding next year need to be instanced.

TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of November 8 concerning the intersection of Hancock Road and Milne Road, Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The intersection of Hancock Road and Milne Road is already under investigation by the Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully in collaboration with the Highways Department and the Road Traffic Board. A decision on the treatment to be adopted has not yet been reached. Design is being carried out by the council and efforts are being made to expedite the matter.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT RENT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government has made a decision about rents for Kangaroo Island soldier settlers? At a meeting at Parndana last Saturday week, I attended when the Premier met the Gosse settlers committee. The Premier was told that the Commonwealth and State Governments were being asked to agree to a 75 per cent retrospective reduction of rents across the board on Kangaroo Island. At the time, the Premier said that the Government would consider the proposal and that, if it was agreed to, the matter would be referred to the Commonwealth Government. Will the Premier say whether the Government has finished considering this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having asked for an urgent report from the Lands Department on this matter, I discussed it with the Minister of Lands immediately I returned from Kangaroo Island. However, I point out that the basis on which the negotiations were concluded in relation to zone 5 was not an all-round reduction flat across the board of the kind that is proposed in relation to Kangaroo

Island. Cases are being examined in detail by the department so that a comprehensive report and recommendation may be made to me, and I have asked for this urgently.

QUARRY TRUCKS

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take steps to see that the regulations governing the loading of quarry trucks are enforced? Living in an area where several quarries are situated, I travel on roads that are traversed by quarry trucks. There is no doubt about the danger resulting from the metal that spills from these vehicles as they take corners and travel at speeds greater than the speed at which they should travel. This is not only a hazard to nearby pedestrians: because metal is spilt on the roads, it also represents a hazard to vehicles subsequently traversing them. Although I know that regulations are in force concerning a certain amount of what I think is called free-board, it seems to me that at present those regulations are largely being ignored. I should be pleased if the Minister would do something about this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are regulations regarding the spilling of loads, but regrettably they are the only regulations, other than those concerning weights of axle loads, that apply to the loading of any commercial vehicle. In fact, the member for Bragg is now touching on the very point I have stressed in this House for a long time, that is, the urgent need to have regulations or legislation to require—

Mrs. Steele: You mean the member for Davenport instead of the member for Bragg, don't you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not had much support from the member for Bragg. On a previous occasion he merely wanted to increase speed limits without going any further, allowing vehicles to carry any weights whatsoever, irrespective of the purpose for which they were built.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are trying to achieve the objective of implementing legislation or regulations requiring all commercial vehicles to carry weights in accordance with the specifications of the maker of the vehicle who, after all, ought to have a reasonable idea of what a vehicle is capable of safely carrying, and we desire to implement also legislation or regulations regarding the braking of vehicles, the increased speeds of commercial vehicles, and the hours of driving. I think that all of these four factors are involved in the question. The specific point raised by the honourable member can be tackled only on the basis of any spillage that is occurring from these vehicles and, if that is occurring and if the honourable member can give me details of it, I shall be happy to refer the matter to the Chief Secretary because, after all, the matter requires policing.

SMOKE BOMB

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 31 about the possibility of permanent ill effects resulting from the smoke bomb recently discharged in the House of Assembly?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A chemical analysis report indicates that the mixture used in the manufacture of the smoke bomb was of an ammonium chloride composition. Medical opinion is that ammonium chloride is an upper-respiratory tract irritant and has no permanent effect. Hydrochloric acid fumes can cause corrosion of the lining of the bronchial tree but a high concentration would be required to cause scarring or permanent damage. The fumes are very soluble and would not reach the more delicate tissues of the lungs. Symptoms would be limited to the trachea and bronchi.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take action to provide a bicycle track on Brighton Road? The widening of the road is now in hand, and the Minister will be aware that many hundreds of students use Brighton Road as they go to and from school on their bicycles. There are about eight schools on or near Brighton Road. Those actually on Brighton Road are Glenelg Primary and Infants Schools, Sacred Heart College, Brighton High School, Brighton Primary and Infants Schools, and Seacliff Primary and Infants Schools. Only a few yards from Brighton Road are Paringa Park Primary and Infants Schools and St. Teresa's Primary and Infants Schools. With the addition of the students who travel to Woodlands Church of England Girls Grammar School, Glengowrie High School, Seacombe High School and Dover Gardens Girls Technical School, many hundreds of children are involved. The benefit accruing from the provision of a bicycle track on this road is obvious and, as this track is needed and as work is at present in progress on widening the road, now seems to be the proper time to undertake the work.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure where the honourable member was yesterday when Questions on Notice were being handled. I know that one or two members opposite were making all sorts of loud noise protesting that those questions should not be dealt with at that time. Perhaps the honourable member was protesting and did not hear the reply I gave the member for Bragg. I suggest that if he looks at that reply he will find an answer to the question he is asking today.

GRAIN SUPPLIES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, indicate whether the Government has taken any steps to ensure that, in addition to sufficient grain being available for home consumption within the State, sufficient grain is available for stock feed? We are experiencing a bad year from the point of view of the harvest and, although I understand that it was estimated that the Australian harvest would amount to about 400,000,000 bush., a much smaller area was seeded than was expected. As the spring season has been extremely dry, with the result that we are facing a record low production, it is important that adequate stocks be provided not only for home consumption but also for stock feed. I shall be pleased if the Minister of Works will discuss this matter with his colleague with a view to ensuring that adequate reserves are on hand to maintain the livestock of this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the matter to my colleague. I think that in two replies given to the member for Murray only last week I outlined the intention of the various boards involved in providing grain for stock feed, as well as for local consumption. If the honourable member cares to look at those replies he will see that adequate provision has been made to cater for the situation he has outlined. However, I will refer his question to my colleague, and if there is anything further to add to what has been said in the House recently I will obtain the necessary information.

WILMINGTON POLICE STATION

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked about a fortnight ago about the old Wilmington police station building that has been closed down and about people in the area requiring it for residential purposes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Lands Department is dealing with the disposal of the property and proposes to circularize all departments soon to ascertain whether it is required for any other Government purpose. This is normal practice. Action will be taken by the Lands Department to advertise the property for sale early next year if it is not required by Government departments. The Public Buildings Department has not called tenders for the disposal of the police station.

YABBIE FISHING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about yabbie fishing in the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that the Fisheries Department has foreseen the possibility raised by the honourable member and is not permitting any increase in the maximum number of yabbie pots which may be used by commercial fishermen in the Murray River lakes. The Director of Fisheries will be in a better position 12 months hence to assess the effect of existing fishing effort in the area, and will then decide whether the permitted number of pots should be varied.

GUMERACHA SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about siteworks at Gumeracha Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Siteworks at Gumeracha Primary School were included in a group scheme, tenders for which were called on three different occasions earlier this year without satisfactory response. Alternative measures have been under consideration. However, in view of the recent satisfactory response to the calling of public tenders for similar types of project, it is now intended to call public tenders again for the Gumeracha group scheme. Tenders will close on December 8, 1972, and subject to satisfactory response a contract will be let as soon as possible.

HAIRCUTS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the price of haircuts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suggested rates for men's and boys' basic haircuts were last increased on January 5, 1971, to $1 for men and 75c for boys. Cost increases have been incurred since then, including a new award of $9 a week ratified by the Industrial Court on November 10, 1972, and operative

from Monday, November 13. The Master Hairdressers Association has placed before the branch its proposals for new rates to cover increased costs incurred since January, 1971, and to take into account current trends in the industry.

PROBATE

Mr. FERGUSON: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Treasurer investigate the possibility of making payments, before probate is granted, to living partners of a deceased estate? It is well known that payments to a deceased estate are bonded until probate is granted. In cases where two or three living partners in an estate are engaged in primary production, payments are necessary for their work throughout the year but, when the State is involved, there could be payments on a yearly basis. Therefore, these living partners are hard-pressed to find enough finance to carry on their operation. Although they may be able to get funds from banks, the rate of interest is 7 per cent or 8 per cent. I know of one or two partnerships in deceased estates where the primary producers concerned are finding it difficult in these circumstances to carry on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several decisions have already been made about early payment of certain sums under the Succession Duties Act. However, I will refer the matter to the Commissioner of Succession Duties for discussion.

DRINK CANS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the prices paid in South Australia for metal cans?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Current prices for uncrushed cans in the metropolitan area range from 4c a pound ($89.60 a ton) to 8c a pound ($179.20 a ton). The one company which offers 8c a pound for uncrushed cans also pays 10c a pound ($224.00 a ton) for crushed cans. The extra 2c a pound paid for crushed cans facilitates handling and also ensures that steel cans which are not readily crushed are not mixed with the non-ferrous cans. Generally, scrap merchants paying the lower prices for uncrushed cans resell to the company which pays the higher prices and has its own smelting facilities in another State.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about rural unemployment relief funds being used in connection with the Lucindale golf course?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Just because these people showed a bit of initiative everyone is crooked on them. The District Council of Lucindale is undertaking preliminary works in connection with the establishment of a residential golf course, and the source of funds is the Commonwealth Rural Unemployment Relief Scheme. Good luck to the council! During the first six months of the scheme (January to June this year), a grant of $22,700 was made available for this purpose, and during the present six-month period a further $18,300 has been made available. This has meant that the course is not far from completion, with irrigation piping laid, fairways seeded, greens and tees prepared and a significant start made on a clubhouse. The establishment of the course has been possible only because of the unexpected availability of funds from the Commonwealth on a short-term basis. However, the unemployment is entirely the result of the financial policies of the present Commonwealth Government, which caused the unemployment problem to occur.

The council took advantage of the opportunity, thereby creating much needed employment in the area. I understand that the maintenance of the course will be the responsibility of the club members, as is normally the case. Although no other golf courses have been established under the scheme, several much-needed extensions and upgrading of sporting and recreation facilities have been undertaken by local government authorities. Provided that the unemployment situation was sufficiently serious in an area to attract a grant substantial enough to perform such work, similar propositions would be favourably considered. Generally speaking, provided that a project is of lasting benefit and is labour intensive in nature, the selection of works priority and programming within grants is left to the discretion of the council. I think I pointed this out to the honourable member when he first asked this question. I think he must realize, as other members must realize, that the people of the South-East have great initiative.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation give an assurance that the help and co-operation of people employed at Belair Recreation Park will be available for fire fighting and control, on the same basis as their services have been available in the past? I have received a letter which was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture and a copy of which the Mitcham Hills Emergency Fire

Service has been kind enough to send me, asking for my assistance. The letter states:

There have been 10 fires of some consequence in the Belair park from February, 1970, to April, 1972, of which all were attended by the Mitcham Hills E.F.S., which supplied three fire units and an average of 43 men a fire. During these fires, about 839 acres of trees, scrub and grassland has been burnt. The number of man hours spent by the Mitcham Hills E.F.S. in the above period on park fires amounted to 2,279. Nearly as much time was spent patrolling these fires after they were controlled.

This necessary patrolling work on fires after they had been controlled was done by people who worked at the Belair park. The Mitcham Hills E.F.S. understands that changes are to be made in the park that may upset these arrangements with regard to patrolling fires after they have been contained. The letter also states:

We are also concerned about telephone communication with the park ranger. Invariably fires in the park are spotted from within the Belair and Blackwood areas, and it is vital that the staff in the park are informed as soon as possible. For the last 12 to 15 years, the national park office has stood in as a radio control centre when we have had insufficient personnel to man our own radio control room. This has been by means of a land line to our transceiver and has proved invaluable over the years during fires in the park and elsewhere in the Mitcham hills area.

Many homes have been built in the wooded areas surrounding the park and, if a major fire escaped from the park, we would regret that day. It is important that we do not decrease the amount of control, protection, and labour that we have available to fight these fires. As one who is genuinely concerned, I ask the Minister for an assurance that the fire control available from employees of the national park is not decreased in any way.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know of no proposal that may alter the existing fire-fighting control within Belair National Park. The honourable member has not made clear whether the information has been given to him or to the council indicating that a change is contemplated, and I am at a loss to understand the context of his question. However, I will examine the position in order to ascertain whether any changes are likely to develop in the present situation and give the honourable member a reply.

WHEAT QUOTA COMMITTEE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of November 16 about the appointment of the Chairman of the Wheat Quota Review Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that an appointment is being considered, and it is expected that the position will be filled soon.

PINNAROO DEPOT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works say what has happened to the proposals he outlined to me in reply to my question, during the debate on the 1971-72 Estimates, concerning the upgrading or rebuilding of the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot at Pinnaroo? During that debate I asked the Minister how the $26,000 (I think it was) that had been allocated was to be spent, His reply indicated that $8,000 would be used to construct or drill a new bore (and that has been done) and that the balance would be spent on upgrading or rebuilding the depot. I have been asked by the council to ascertain what has happened to the plans for such rebuilding, and I shall be pleased if the Minister will inquire about this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would realize that I cannot reply offhand to this question. In the last couple of days I think I saw something about Pinnaroo and the Engineering and Water Supply Department: maybe this work is on the way. Plans, designs, approvals, and other matters have to be considered, but I will inquire and let the honourable member know the result.

FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what caused the failure of his negotiations that he publicized in September, 1970, concerning the proposed establishment of a film industry in South Australia, particularly as to the negotiations then in progress with the Sydney group Neary Limb Tinkler and with the Fuji group in Japan? The Premier would recall that at that time he said there was a prospect of establishing in this State a $10,000,000 film industry, based on the negotiations he was conducting. In refreshing his memory concerning these predictions, I ask him what caused the failure of the negotiations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member has taken a great interest in this matter since, as Premier, he announced that he was negotiating with an American entertainer and entrepreneur to establish a film industry in South Australia. It became something of a music hall joke. The Neary Limb organization has been asked to wait for its

undertaking in South Australia until the completion of a feasibility study, which we undertook, and for the South Australian Film Corporation to be created.

Mr. Hall: This is two years ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The feasibility study took some time. When it was presented, we introduced a Bill and it was passed. The film corporation having been set up, the Director took up his duties on November 20 this year.

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

Mr. Hall: That's two years later.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At least we happen to have a film corporation which has far more money, support and flexibility than any other such Government unit anywhere else in Australia and which is praised throughout the film industry of this country.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We did something; we didn't just talk about it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Gouger cannot expect the production of a film in two days. If he does expect that, it shows how little he knows about the film industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member says he had a film produced when he was in office. However, I can tell him that our agents and the Agent-General told us that the film was not suitable for use.

Mr. Hall: That film was accepted all over Australia, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not. It has not proved a satisfactory film for promotion. The Neary Limb organization has been informed of the basis on which assistance can be given by the new film corporation and Mr. Limb and Mr. Neary are interested in film production in South Australia. In the meantime there have been other productions in respect of which this Government has assisted. Fauna Productions was helped and the Bonaparte series was filmed in South Australia with the help of the South Australian Government. Regarding negotiations with the Fuji corporation, an examination was made of the establishment, in South Australia, of film-processing laboratories by the corporation, but a feasibility study indicated that at this stage there was insufficient economic demand to justify a capital investment by the corporation and that in order to achieve the establishment of film laboratories of that kind there would have to be a build-up of film activity over a period. The feasibility study has outlined the way that should be done. The film corporation has been established and in due season I believe we will have processing laboratories here. However, we have to create the necessary demand for those laboratories and, in the meantime, films will be processed in Sydney.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport, in the absence of the Attorney-General, a reply to my recent question on under-age drinking?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are well-known and understood difficulties in enforcing the law relating to the sale of liquor to juveniles and the purchase of liquor by juveniles, and also in relation to the law prohibiting the consumption of liquor by juveniles on licensed premises. Excessive crowding at hotels and dimmed lighting at discotheques has at times made the detection of offences difficult. The practice of selling bottled liquor to the occupants of motor vehicles at drive-in bottle departments has intensified the difficulty of licensees and their employees in checking the ages of purchasers. Further, 121 persons (88 in the metropolitan area and 33 in the country) were convicted of drinking on licensed premises for the 12 months ended June 30, 1972. The Attorney-General has under consideration the question whether a law similar to section 118 of the Victorian Liquor Control Act would be helpful in South Australia.

INSURANCE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question of November 15 concerning insurance for vehicles of the Emergency Fire Services organization?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission has reported that third party bodily injury premiums are set by the Premiums Committee based on statistical information. The commission must observe the premiums set by the committee and as a result is not in a position to issue a blanket third party cover for all vehicles in the Emergency Fire Services organization.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on November 14 regarding a questionnaire? Regarding the explanation I gave to that question, reference to *Hansard*

will reveal that the question I asked related to a questionnaire, even though the notification of reply is headed "Public Service Questionnaire" and the original question is headed in that manner. The use of the term "Public Service" was not included in the original question. Although the reply the Premier now has may indicate that this is so, I point out that it was not part of the original question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The questionnaire to which the Leader referred relates to private study undertaken by an officer employed in the Department of the Premier and of Development. The officer has informed me that he is doing this research as part of a requirement for a Politics IIA course at Adelaide University. The research is being done in his private time. The student's lecturer and tutor, who is a Councillor of the Royal Institute of Public Administration, has assisted him by arranging the institute's support for the project which, if successful, may assist the institute by providing a guideline for further research by the institute in other areas. The purpose of the exercise, apart from fulfilling examination requirements is aimed at establishing a collective portrait of the social characteristics of senior executives in public administration.

The request for completion of the questionnaire explained that the information was to be used as fact requirement for an Arts degree and did not in any way imply that completion of it was either compulsory or in any way associated officially with the Department of the Premier and of Development. The follow-up notice was a routine action in an exercise of this nature. Furthermore, the completed answers have been destroyed after tabulation so that no permanent file exists. Although the project is a private one the officer concerned informed the permanent head of his department and the Public Service Board of his intention to undertake the exercise.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Roads and transport, in the absence of the Attorney-General, a reply to my recent question regarding the availability of certain drugs without a prescription?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Chief Secretary reports that officers of the Public Health Department are aware that there have been some cases of abuse of the sedative drug methyprylone. Experience with this and other drugs has again illustrated the fact that the restriction of a drug to prescription does not generally reduce the incidence of drug abuse in that persons abusing drugs readily turn to whatever is available, be it another drug or alcohol. The poison regulations are at present being rewritten to include the uniform poisons schedules, which will classify methyprylone as a prescription drug, and to also include the uniform standards for containers and labelling. It is expected that these regulations will be recommended for adoption early in 1973.

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister a reply to another question I asked recently about certain types of tablet?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Minister of Health reports that, as stated by the honourable member, the tablets referred to contain the drugs ephedrine, caffeine and phenolphthalein. Phenolphthalein is a common laxative used in many proprietary medicines; its sale is not restricted. Caffeine is a mild stimulant which occurs naturally in tea, coffee and the kola drinks; its sale is not restricted. Ephedrine is commonly used as a bronchodilator in respiratory complaints and in proprietary preparations for the relief of asthma and hay fever; it is a mild stimulant. This drug and its preparations are schedule 3 poisons in all States. Sale is not restricted to prescription, but all schedule 3 poisons require the personal presence of the pharmacist when sold. The product referred to is correctly labelled. This schedule classification has, to date, been considered by the Poisons Schedule Subcommittee of the National Health and Medical Research Council to be sufficient restriction on such products. That committee and also the National Therapeutic Goods Committee is reviewing the advertising of schedule 3 poisons. It is expected that recommendations for uniform control will shortly be made.

If, as the honourable member suggests, advertising of the product has been accepted for radio, this would imply acceptance by the Commonwealth Director-General of Health for the purposes of the Broadcasting and Television Act. and that such advertising is in accordance with the Guide to the Advertising of Proprietary Medicines for the National Health and Medical Research Council. It is a fact that with the restriction to prescription of drugs previously used for appetite suppression manufacturers of over-the-counter products have resorted to other drugs not so restricted to meet what is apparently a lucrative market. Restriction of ephedrine to prescription would not eliminate the promotion of similar products for use in weight reduction courses.

PORT LINCOLN MEATWORKS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on November 16 concerning the installation, at Port Lincoln, of cattle scales for live-weight selling?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that it is not intended to install scales for live-weight selling of cattle at Port Lincoln. Weekly markets at the Port Lincoln works are conducted by the Eyre Peninsula Stock Marketing Company, which leases departmental land for this purpose and all improvements on the land are owned by the company. The company is seeking a new area of departmental land to reconstruct and increase its marketing facilities and the General Manager of the Government Produce Department is of opinion that it would be prepared to consider the installation of suitable scales if producers and stock agents so desired.

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister a reply to another question I asked on November 16 concerning the project to upgrade the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln and the installation of more boning room facilities for lease to private operators?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports that the current upgrading programme at the Port Lincoln works of the Government Produce Department is designed to rectify defects in the general standard of the abattoir to bring it up to the requirements for an export meatworks, and the Government has no plans at present for the provision of additional boning room facilities for lease to private exporters. The Minister points out that an additional boning room with the necessary equipment could cost up to $80,000, and an expenditure of this magnitude could not be justified when the present facilities are not being used to their full capacity. Although the department enters the export boneless mutton field when the operation becomes unprofitable for exporters, it does so merely to maintain a reasonable throughput and so retain the services of valuable knifemen which would be irretrievably lost if they were retrenched.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the clearing of the Ridgehaven High School site?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The land for the proposed Ridgehaven High School to which the honourable member has referred is at present leased, and it is the responsibility of the lessee to keep the land in good order and condition. The weeds and high grass are of a particularly obnoxious type and have proved to be extremely difficult to eradicate in the past. However, the lessee has undertaken to remedy the position as soon as possible.

MOBILE POLICE PATROLS

Mr. ALLEN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question about the use of mobile police patrols?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Chief Secretary states that, in the light of recent experiences, arrangements will be made for an additional mobile patrol to be based at Hawker over the Easter period, and the long weekend which includes the Monday public holiday in October.

WHEELCHAIRS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Municipal Tramways Trust does not allow the carriage of fold-up wheelchairs on buses and whether, if it does not, he will take action to have the rule altered? It has been brought to my notice that the mother of a child attending the Somerton Crippled Children's Home waited with her invalid child to board an M.T.T. bus and, when the bus arrived, the driver refused to allow them to board it, saying that he was not allowed to take wheelchairs on the bus. Although the folding wheelchair was small, the lady was still refused permission to take it on the bus. The irate mother then telephoned M.T.T. headquarters and was told that it was against the rules of the M.T.T. to allow wheelchairs to be taken on buses. She had a clinic appointment for her child at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and eventually had to go there by taxi.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are restrictions, of course, on the type of vehicle, if I may use the term, that can be carried on buses: a line must be drawn somewhere. Obviously, large or normal size wheelchairs, perambulators, and things like that, just cannot be put on buses, because there is not sufficient room for them.

Mr. Becker: It would be fairly hard on a one-man bus.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Possibly. The honourable member has stated that in this case the wheelchair was a small one. I cannot say whether it could have been accommodated but, if the honourable member gives me the

name of the lady concerned and her address, I shall be pleased to have an officer of the trust contact her to find out whether we can do anything to assist her. I think the honourable member must realize that we do not achieve much if, by putting on one wheelchair, we are forced to tell about 10 passengers that there is not sufficient room for them to get on the bus. If the honourable member gives me the details, I shall be pleased to examine the matter to see whether the problem can be solved.

PORT KENNY POLICE STATION

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about work being carried out at the Port Kenny police station?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The wiring for a 240-volt system at the Port Kenny police station was undertaken by the Public Buildings Department, in conjunction with similar work at the school. Before the work was undertaken, the matter was referred to the Commissioner of Police, who confirmed that the installation should proceed. It has been decided to retain the premises against the possibility of future developments. It is understood that, for the present, arrangements will be made to lease the residence.

PARK RANGERS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what is the real reason why assistant rangers in Cleland, Para Wirra, and Belair Recreation Parks have been demoted from the status of assistant rangers to general labourers or maintenance workers? Many employees in these three parks, particularly Belair Recreation Park, have been employed by the national park authorities for many years. I understand that the maximum period of service is about 22 years. Until about 12 months ago these employees were members of the Australian Workers Union. Since then they have become members of the Public Service Association. Now they have been told that they cannot be represented by the Public Service Association, and they may have to join the Miscellaneous Workers Union. They have also been told that their salaries now are higher than they should be and that they will receive no increases until the rate under the general maintenance award exceeds their present salary. They have been told that they will no longer be assistant rangers, helping in the care and control of the park, but will carry out only maintenance work generally. In the past these persons have been employed at the weekend to help police the actions of visitors to the parks, and it seems unbelievable that, when we should be providing greater protection in our parks, we are setting out to downgrade the status of many employees who, until now, have been dedicated and enthusiastic in maintaining our parks in a presentable state—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher has sought leave to explain his question and he is going beyond the realms of an explanation.

Mr. EVANS: I conclude by saying that the men concerned are afraid of their present situation and they, like many other people, consider that a retrograde step has been taken.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to proceed further.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As a result of the change-over of employees from the former National Parks Commission to the Environment and Conservation Department, the Public Service Board has examined the total staffing for the National Parks and Wildlife Service in this State, and additional staff members have been employed. The employment of further staff is being considered at present, and the board has considered a general rationalization of the duties of staff. True, it has been suggested that some employees who were classified as rangers when employed by the National Parks Commission have been reclassified, but I have been told that no-one will lose any salary as a result of this.

Mr. Evans: They will lose status.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not sure what the honourable member means by that exactly.

Mr. Evans: There is no chance of promotion.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not sure that that will be the situation either. These decisions of the Public Service Board began to crystallize only within the last week. I will keep the honourable member informed of the results of the Public Service Board recommendations.

SPORTING SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education consider giving boarding allowances or scholarships to country students with excellent academic records and outstanding sporting ability? Over a period of years the *Advertiser,* in conjunction with outstanding sportsmen, has covered a vast area of this State coaching youngsters in many types of sport. During this time several students have shown outstanding ability but through lack of further coaching and strong competition they have been lost to the State. I am sure help in the

right direction would be of assistance to sport in the future.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the matter raised by the honourable member to see whether anything can be done about it. If such a student comes from a remote area, where no secondary education is available, he wou'd be eligible automatically for a rural secondary scholarship. Apart from that, I think we would run into difficulties in country towns if the best young students with sporting prowess were transferred to the city so that the stimulus that very able sportsmen could give to a school or community was lost to the country area. Keeping that in mind, I shall be pleased to look into the matter.

BOOKMAKERS' LICENCES

Mr. BECKER: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning bookmakers' licences?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Section 47 of the Lottery and Gaming Act provides for the cancellation of a bookmaker's, clerk's or agent's licence if the holder is convicted of any offence against Part IV of that Act, or if the Betting Control Board is satisfied that he has been guilty of any conduct which, in the opinion of the board, renders him unfit to hold a licence. It is therefore incumbent upon the board to license only reputable persons, and the board would be subject to criticism if it were to license a person of known bad character. Amongst other things, new applicants for licences are required to admit to the board particulars of their convictions for any offences. Since its inception in December, 1933, the board has checked with the Police Department as to the accuracy of these admissions. Following a direction of the Government regarding the release by the Police Department of details of convictions since January, 1971, the board has had to obtain the consent of each applicant for a licence before it can check his admissions as to offences with the Police Department. Prior to January, 1971, the board, by arrangement with the Police Department, was enabled to obtain the desired information without the consent of the applicant. The only change has been that consent of the applicant is now required.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier a rep'y to my recent question about drought relief?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Application forms have recently been distributed to local government authorities and officers of the Lands Department in the Murray Lands and Murray Plains districts. To date, no completed applications have been received. This information was originally sent to the department about four or five days ago.

LOXTON COMMUNITY HALL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education say whether he knows what progress has been made in the planning and financial arrangements between the council, the Education Department and the parents association of the Loxton High School for the erection of a community hall?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The preliminary sketch planning for the hall, which is to be built in the Loxton High School grounds and which is to be shared by the Loxton High School and the Loxton council, has been completed and an estimate prepared. The matter is now being considered by the Education Department and, when that has been done, the project will be referred to the local school committee. The department is keen to push ahead with the project as quickly as possible.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether tenders have been called or a contract has been let for top-dressing and surfacing the playing area of the new Clare High School? The playing area covers about 14 acres, the grassing of which is a fairly large project. Much work has been done to prepare the oval, and I am told that unless top-dressing and surfacing work can be undertaken soon the area, which could be and will be an excellent playing area, will be spoiled.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member was not kind enough to let me know that he was going to ask this question, I am not able to give him the reply today, but I will inquire and let him know as soon as possible.

AFRICAN DAISY

Mr. McANANEY: Like Robert Bruce, I am still trying to get a reply to a question I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture as to what the latter intended to do about the African daisy growing on private land in the Burnside and the Mitcham council areas.

Mr. Nankivell: What did he do?

Mr. McANANEY: He tried and tried again. African daisy is flourishing in those council areas and, although the seed will blow over the

hills on to Crown land, nothing is being done about it. I make my third request for a reply.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be delighted to take up the matter with my colleague and ask him what he is going to do about it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of November 1 about Government assistance to the Gumeracha council in its efforts to control African daisy?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Minister of Agriculture states that it has been the policy of the Woods and Forests Department for many years to co-operate with district councils in their programmes for noxious weed control, and specific discussions have been held by departmental officers with the Gumeracha council's weed control officer on occurrences of African daisy on forestry land that needed urgent attention. As a result of these discussions, it was agreed to concentrate on treating a buffer area to control this weed. This has been done, and last month a strip about one chain wide of all the forest boundary adjacent to the buffer zone proposed by council has been treated either by spraying or hand pulling. In addition, and in co-operation with the Agriculture Department, a series of trails using various chemicals have been laid down in the district to test the best means of control.

SOUTH TERRACE BUILDING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the continued absence of the member for Adelaide, I ask—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come off it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I have been waiting for him to come back. He is here now: good. Will the honourable member say what action, if any, he intends to take in support of the prayer in the petition relating to 142, South Terrace, that he presented last Thursday? You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that last Thursday the member for Adelaide presented two petitions, one from three residents of the adjoining property, and another from, I think, over 1,800 of his electors concerning the property at 142, South Terrace, Adelaide, praying this House to hold an inquiry into all the circumstances of the permission that had been given for remodelling these premises and, if necessary, to change the law so that justice could be done. Naturally, as the honourable member has presented the petitions, I and others desire to know whether he intends to take any action in support of them.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Adelaide desire to reply?

Mr. WRIGHT: I have no objection. The matter concerning those petitions is between the petitioners and me. I have made a close study in the last few days of what has happened as a result of other petitions presented in this House, and whatever happens in respect of those petitions will determine the action I take to conclude the matter involved in the petitions I presented. However, the member for Mitcham will be the last to know when I decide.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport report to the House any progress on the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and the existing standard gauge line extending from Port Pirie to Sydney? As it must be at least a month since I last asked the Minister whether he could report any progress on this matter, one would have expected the Minister to come forward with some information long ere this, stating what was the next stage of standardization to take place in this State. Can the Minister now give me information on this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If I remember correctly, the last time the honourable member asked a question about this matter I told him that the present Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Hon. Peter Nixon) and I had had a discussion in Canberra and finality had been reached on the points of policy and principle involved. The Commonwealth Government insisted that the matter be referred to the consultants Maunsell and Partners, and that a working committee be established that was representative of the Commonwealth Minister and his department, the South Australian Railways and me as Minister, as well as, I think, the Commonwealth Railways. This committee was to liaise with Maunsell and Partners, which was required to prepare the detailed planning operation and then present it for final acceptance by the Commonwealth Minister and me. Following that, the necessary agreement would be drafted and signed by presumably the present Prime Minister and by the Premier of this State. It is now clear that neither the present Prime Minister will have the opportunity to sign this document nor will the present Minister for Shipping and Transport have the opportunity to deal with the final stages of the matter, because the committee

and consultants on whose services the Commonwealth Government insisted have not completed their work.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the present Premier? Do you give him a chance?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The present Premier will most certainly sign that agreement and, if the member for Mitcham cares to put a dollar on it, I have a dollar to cover it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No further information can be provided, and the whole matter is virtually at a standstill until the plan has been finalized.

DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the absence of the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, I ask the Minister of Education whether he will obtain a report on whether or not it is intended to use the already established dental clinics and the dental therapists employed by the Government in those clinics to attend to the dental requirements of secondary schoolchildren and possibly also of pensioners. There is a rumour in Loxton that the dental clinic may be used to provide a free dental service for the children attending the high school there. Although the dental therapists are excellent operators and well trained to attend to the teeth of primary schoolchildren, it is not considered that they are competently trained to do such work on secondary schoolchildren.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: On whose authority do you say that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister asks me on whose authority—

The SPEAKER: The Minister is out of order interjecting.

Mr. NANKIVELL. I should like to know whether the Minister will tell me what is intended, and then we will see who are the authorities to consult on this subject. There is a suggestion that the dental therapists may work on pensioners' teeth. Although we have a good dental clinic in Loxton, as in many other towns in the State, together with competent dental therapists, those people in the country who practise dentistry are interested in this matter, and it is also of interest to people who are looking for Government dental services to be provided. Will the Minister of Education obtain from the Chief Secretary a report on whether or not it is intended that dental therapists at the various clinics should do this sort of work? Further, to satisfy his curiosity and mine, will the Minister obtain a report on the competence of dental therapists to attend to the requirements of children other than primary schoolchildren?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to get the latest drill on this matter for the honourable member. I understand that some pensioners (this may be on Kangaroo Island) are being treated at a school dental clinic—

Mr. Nankivell: By the dental therapists?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes; they are capable of handling some aspects of the work, but they are not capable of handling other aspects, where they are required to work under the supervision of a qualified dentist. Obviously, a qualified dentist would be necessary to do some of the work involved. On the face of it, I cannot see that, just because a child goes to secondary school, he or she then passes out of the category involving treatment by a dental therapist. I shall be surprised if a school dental service, in its planning, does not intend to ensure that the primary school students who are being treated in school dental clinics shall have their dental care followed up once they reach secondary level. I shall be surprised indeed if several secondary school students at the Cummins Area School, for example, are not already being treated. However, I will get full information for the honourable member.

HOLDEN HILL SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: In the Loan Estimates, under the heading "Major works to be commenced during 1972-73", a major addition is listed to be built in brick construction at Holden Hill Primary School at an estimated cost of $150,000. Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made in relation to this project, and when this building, which I expect will be the infants school, will be completed and ready for occupation? I have received correspondence from the school committee seeking this information. I am informed that the present enrolment at the school is 709, and it is expected that 765 children will attend at the beginning of 1973. Therefore, one additional classroom will be necessary. If the new building is not ready in time for the mid-June intake, a further portable classroom will be required.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report.

FISHING

Mr. GUNN: As spokesman for the Government, can the Premier say what action has been

taken in considering and implementing the submissions made to the Minister of Agriculture earlier this year by the South Australian fishing industry? There are three main submissions, as follows:

(1) That South Australia's fisheries be raised to the status of a Ministerial portfolio.

(2) That the South Australian Government provide modern fisheries research facilities in keeping with the value, the greatly increased size, and the obvious potential of the fishing industry.

(3) That the South Australian Government provide funds for the Fisheries Department in this State so that the department can function at a level at least comparable with similar departments in other States.

I point out that in my district, and in the Flinders District, during the past few years deep-sea fishing has expanded tremendously. Only last year, 1,500 tons of tuna was taken over the Streaky Bay jetty, and this has not happened in the past. Will the Premier and the Government urgently consider this important industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Far more has been done by this Government than by any previous Government m relation to legislation and administration in the fishing industry.

Mr. Millhouse: Really.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is obviously completely ignorant even of what has taken place before his eyes in this House. The first submission to which the honourable member referred is that we should provide a separate Ministry of fisheries.

Mr. Gunn: To upgrade it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture is already the Minister in charge of fisheries. With regard to the department, already the Public Service Board is investigating the separation of the fauna conservation section (to move that section to the control of the Environment and Conservation Department) and the reorganization of the Fisheries Department with a Director of Fisheries. Cabinet has approved that process. In relation to the provision of research moneys, far more has been provided by this Government, as a result of fisheries regulations and payment to a research fund, than has been provided in the previous history of the State. We have arranged with the Fisheries Council for the allotment of overall fisheries research projects throughout Australia, and we are receiving our proportion of them and paying our part of the costs. In relation to fisheries, this Government has undertaken entirely new work that has not been undertaken by any Liberal Government, and we have tried in these ways to meet the requests of the fishermen of this State.

PUBLIC SERVICE LIST

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier a reply to my question of November 9 about academic qualifications of public servants being omitted from the Public Service list?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Public Service Board has reported that academic qualifications of public servants have not been included in the Public Service list since 1966. With the increase in the Public Service and the substantial growth in the number of qualified staff, the Public Service Board considered that the cost of checking to ensure a current and accurate record of qualifications for printing in the list could not be justified by the minimum use made of the information.

RUN-OFFS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of November 9 about the Government's attitude to creating run-offs on highways in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is believed that the Leader is referring to that section of road between the Warren reservoir and Williamstown, and where there is a hill known locally as the Kangaroo Gully hill. The District Council of Barossa wrote to the Highways Department early this year suggesting that run-offs be constructed on the road between the Warren reservoir and Williamstown. The length of road involved is only 1½ miles, with an average gradient of 4 per cent to 5 per cent, and the department considered that it could be safely negotiated by reasonably loaded vehicles in reasonable mechanical condition. For this reason the council was informed that the provision of run-offs was not warranted. On November 6, the council again wrote to the Highways Department with additional information. and the position is now being investigated further. I should stress to the Leader that there has never been a denial by the Highways Department to consider this matter.

UCOLTA RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about providing flashing lights at the Ucolta railway crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The installation of flashing lights at this railway crossing on the

Broken Hill road, between Peterborough and Oodla Wirra (a place well known to you, Sir) will commence before Christmas, 1972.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

NORTH HAVEN DEVELOPMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the North Haven Development Bill, 1972, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its investigation your committee held four meetings and inspected the area involved in the proposed legislation.
2. Advertisements were inserted in both the *Advertiser* and the *News* inviting interested persons to submit evidence to the committee. As a result of these advertisements, witnesses appeared before the committee. In addition, several written submissions were received and have been incorporated in the evidence of the committee.
3. A full list of persons who made submissions to the committee, either by means of oral evidence or by written submission, is set out in the schedule at the end of this report.
4. In addition to considering the Bill referred to it, your committee also included within the scope of its inquiry the detailed terms of both the indenture and the general arrangement document relating to the proposed development set out in the Bill.
5. In his evidence, Mr. Klingberg, on behalf of the Australian Mutual Provident Society (the main developers of the scheme) stated that "the Bill and the indenture fairly set out the intent of the Government and the society in respect of the development" and further indicated that the society was "very anxious to ensure that this is a model development".
6. As the other developer under the proposed scheme, the South Australian Housing Trust, through its General Manager (Mr. Ramsay) also expressed satisfaction with the proposals contained in the Bill and indenture.
7. The proposed development at North Haven lies wholly within the boundaries of the Port Adelaide council, and in evidence representatives of that council stated that the indenture had been before the council and "generally it was reasonably happy with the conditions". However, the council expressed concern that clause 18 (1) (*a*) did not state whether the width of 7.5 m set out in the clause for roadways within the area was the paved width or the width from kerb to kerb. In considering the views of the council, the committee was of the opinion that there could be a doubt as to the exact requirements of the clause and, accordingly, proposes that the clause be amended to clearly express what was intended when the Bill was prepared.

   The proposed amendment has been submitted to the society, and in evidence Mr. Klingberg indicated that the amendment was acceptable to the society.
8. The officers of the Government departments involved in the development plan were familiar with the indenture as it affected their various departments and, in evidence, reported favourably upon the proposals contained in both the Bill and the indenture.
9. Evidence was placed before the committee, both orally and by written submission, that of the area proposed to be developed a portion should be retained in its natural state as an area for ecological study and to enable the natural fauna and flora to be conserved. This portion is known locally as "the Forty Acres", and in its inspection of the area your committee paid particular attention to this portion of the area.

   While appreciating the sincerity of the submissions made to it, the committee nevertheless considers, both on evidence placed before it and on its own observations, that it would be impracticable to retain this portion of land in its natural state and to develop, as envisaged, the surrounding area. The committee considered that the development itself would defeat the purpose for which it was proposed that the land be left.

   The committee also is aware that the development includes a considerable amount of open space and recreational facilities and will, as well, provide new picnic beaches inside the proposed harbour.
10. In addition to the amendment mentioned in paragraph 7 of this report, an amendment is also recommended to clause 4. In the preparation of the indenture an error was made in a metric measurement. Amendment has been made to the indenture to correct this error, and it is considered desirable to amend the Bill as a consequence of the alteration to the indenture.
11. After consideration of the evidence placed before it, your committee is of opinion that the proposed development set out in the Bill and the indenture will be of great benefit to the community, and is an extremely important and desirable development for the State.
12. Your committee recommends that the Bill be passed but with the following amendments:

    Clause 4, page 3, line 2—After "agreement" insert made on or after the commencement of this Act,".

Clause 18, page 9, after line 33 insert—"but nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting, restricting or otherwise affecting, any obligation or duty of the Society to comply with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, as amended, or any other Act or law, relating to the forming and construction of water tables, channels, kerbs or footpaths of any proposed road or street within North Haven".

SCHEDULE

Witnesses:
P. R. Cook, Student, of Largs Bay.
N. C. Cox, Mains Extension Engineer, Engineering and Water Supply Department, Adelaide.
G. E. Cresswell, Acting Registrar-General, Adelaide.
L. Dodd, Acting Director-General of Education, Adelaide.
R. J. Daugherty, Parliamentary Counsel, Adelaide.
H. F. W. Ehmann, President of Herpetology Group, Field Naturalists Society, Prospect.
R. F. Elleway, Project Officer, South Australian Housing Trust, Adelaide.
R. J. Fitch, Railways Commissioner, South Australian Railways, Adelaide.
B. M. Harris, Journalist, of Grange.
V. E. (Mrs.) Harrison, Secretary-Treasurer of the Junior Naturalists Club, Pennington.
P. M. Harrison, Retired, of Pennington.
W. G. Inglis, Director of Environment and Conservation, Adelaide.
A. K. Johinke, Commissioner of Highways, Walkerville.
M. H. Klingberg, South Australian Manager, Australian Mutual Provident Society, Adelaide.
J. Leyland, City Engineer, Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.
W. S. McDonald, Retired, of Semaphore Park.
H. C. R. Marten, Mayor of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.
A. M. Ramsay, General Manager, South Australian Housing Trust, Adelaide.
A. L. Read, Project Engineer, Kent Town.
D. H. M. Roeger, Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.
H. E. Roeger, Deputy Commissioner of Highways, Walkerville.
J. R. Sainsbury, Director of Marine and Harbors, Adelaide
I. E. (Mrs.) Stevens, Assistant Crown Solicitor, Adelaide.
G. A. and M. B. Thompson, Students, of Tranmere.
R. P. Wilson, Traffic Manager, Municipal Tramways Trust, Hackney.

Written Submissions:
J. (Mrs.) Cook, Society for Growing Australian Plants Inc. (Le Fevre Peninsula Branch).
P. R. Cullen, of St. Peters.
C. R. Neilson, Headmaster of Taperoo Primary School.
B. J. Samuels, of Largs Bay.
C. J. Winn, Hon. Secretary, Society for Growing Australian Plants, S. A. Region Inc.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the report be noted.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am concerned about one or two aspects of this move; first, the amount of time that has been allowed in order to further consider this report, and the chance for people who may be concerned about the ecology of the area and of the State to carry out a detailed survey of this area. I have not seen many previous reports about this area, although other members have told me that the area has been considered for different forms of development for several years. The benefit to the area as a result of house building will be considerable: many people in the area want better quality homes and an excellent environment in which to live that would be close to their houses, with excellent adjacent seaside recreational facilities. Submissions were made by the Taperoo Primary School and the Society for Growing Australian Plants, and these submissions required more time to consider than the committee had available.

After being a member of the committee, I appreciate the situation in which the Government is placed concerning the time aspects, and particularly the situation of the Premier as Minister in charge of this project. I also appreciate the society's position, because it also has to consider the question of costs and time. After hearing the evidence of Mr. Ramsay (of the Housing Trust) and representatives of the society, one must realize that it will be to the advantage of the society if the project progresses at a fairly rapid rate. If it is slowed down, there will be one of two results as a consequence: either the society will obtain little profit or the cost of the allotments will become too high.

The problem associated with noting the report and then continuing with the debate is that other members who were not members of the Select Committee will not have the time to consider the evidence given to the committee. Perhaps this matter could be adjourned and considered later today in order to allow any member the chance to consider the evidence. If this action is not taken, we may be subject to much criticism, and for Parliament's sake I believe there would be nothing undesirable in making such a move. I ask for leave to continue my remarks in order

to allow the Premier to permit the debate to be continued on motion.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How long do you want? This has to go through this place and be sent to another place today.

Mr. EVANS: This matter could be discussed immediately after the dinner adjournment, and that would give members a chance to look at the evidence. Also, justice will be done. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

Mr. EVANS: I thank the Premier for allowing members the opportunity to read the evidence given on this matter to the Select Committee. The Director of Environment and Conservation (Dr. Inglis) and his officers believe that there is no better way of approaching this project than the way proposed under the Bill, although the Director realizes that the environment of the area in question will be changed and that there may be some merit in trying to retain part of the area in its natural state. It was stated that once a small area was surrounded by houses it would be virtually impossible to retain that area in its natural state unless a 25ft. fence were erected around the area and people were excluded from it entirely.

Evidence was given to the Select Committee that children should be allowed to venture into the area and to dig in the sand and play amongst and climb the trees, but I am convinced that even this would lead to the total denuding of the area, the trees in which are stunted anyway, reaching a maximum height of only about 15ft. As much as I am concerned about conservation, and as much as I respect the opinions expressed in evidence, I believe it will be impossible to retain any part of the area entirely in its natural state. Although an effort will be made to retain 15 acres in its natural state, I think that eventually it will have to be developed as a recreation area, providing ovals and other playing areas.

Indeed, parents of children in the area will desire this, arguing that there is a risk in allowing children to play in the area in its present state, where two species of reptile are to be found, one of those species being harmful. Debris and rubbish are to be found among the sandhills, as members of the committee found when they visited the area, and it is a pity that people interested in the ecology of the area have not really tried to clean it up. I believe that a voluntary effort in future by various interested organizations would encourage members of the community to try to protect the environment. However, the area in question is so small that it may be impossible to preserve it in the long term.

Under the Bill, we shall be providing a respectable type of housing for a group of citizens who need it and whose names are at present on a waiting list that involves a delay of up to several years before houses can be obtained. I am sure that in future many people will be keen to live at North Haven, a project of which those concerned will be justly proud and which will generally benefit the State. Finally, I support the recommendations of the Select Committee.

Mr. RYAN (Price): Although on this occasion I agree with some of the remarks made by the member for Fisher, who was a member of the Select Committee that considered this matter, I disagree with other of his remarks.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. The honourable member for Price.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Fisher criticized the haste in which this legislation was being considered, but I totally disagree with that remark. In the case of a normal second reading debate, members can seek information from interested parties in respect of a measure and, in the case of a Select Committee, members of the committee have the right to investigate a matter fully and to seek any information on it. Normally, when the committee reports to Parliament, its recommendations are readily accepted without being altered by Parliament, and I think that members generally have great confidence in Select Committees. On this occasion, the committee did its job, and anyone who wanted to appear before it could do so. Except in about three cases, people personally appeared before the committee and gave evidence, which the committee considered.

Those who could not attend personally submitted written evidence, which received the same consideration as though the person concerned had appeared in person. The discussions held on this matter between the Government and the company concerned lasted nearly two years and the only haste in respect of this matter is the fact that the indenture must be ratified before this Parliament prorogues, probably tomorrow.

Mr. Hall: You rushed the West Lakes project through at 24 hours notice.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Gouger needs to be sure of his facts, because on each occasion Parliament considered that project it was referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. Hall: It was revised, and you know it.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Gouger should get his facts straight.

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

Mr. RYAN: If the honourable member wants to get some publicity from the type of interjection he is making, he should get his facts right. He knows that what he is saying is rubbish and is not true. In this case, we are dealing with an indenture with the Australian Mutual Provident Society, which should be congratulated on combining with the Government to make this the first venture of its kind in Australia. This scheme will be of great benefit to the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is speaking to the motion "That the report be noted." Honourable members must confine their remarks to the report. There has been a Select Committee, to which general submissions should have been made. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the report.

Mr. RYAN: The report, which was the only report we could have brought down, is that we recommend the scheme to Parliament. I have no hesitation in saying that this is a good scheme that should receive the unanimous support of the Parliament.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the findings of the Select Committee. I am pleased to see that the A.M.P. Society has seen fit to spend much money in developing what I hope will be a showcase development in South Australia. However, I am concerned about the lack of natural open space provided. As I fly in and out of Adelaide, I am concerned about the lack of open space in metropolitan Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just warned the honourable member for Price to confine his remarks to the report. Honourable members had an opportunity to express general views to the Select Committee. The honourable member for Eyre did not avail himself of that opportunity. I cannot allow him now to continue to follow the line he is following.

Mr. GUNN: Part of the report refers directly to the submissions made to the committee by organizations that are concerned about the erosion of natural areas. I was not meaning to transgress Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was expressing his views, and not speaking about the report.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned that only 40 acres of open space is provided in this project, although there will be open space along the beachfront.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Plus the golf course.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. I hope the submissions of the natural plant society, that at least a section of LeFevre Peninsula should be reserved in its natural state, were considered. I understand that the country in this area has some unique features. As I have said, I am greatly concerned at the lack of open space in the metropolitan area.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Although I have not had time to study the report, I see that no submissions were made by the Coast Protection Board, which I should have thought would be the first organization to be approached about this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg must not cast reflections on the Select Committee, which advertised, in accordance with the decision of the House. The onus is on an organization that wishes to give evidence to answer that advertisement.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Coast Protection Board, which is a Government organization, is responsible for an area 300 m from the high-water mark and 300 m inland. Therefore, I should have thought this matter came directly within its auspices and that the Government would call it to give evidence, especially as the plan provides for two groynes to be erected. Mr. Culver, who is the foremost authority in South Australia (perhaps in Australia) on the matter of beach protection and whose opinions are borne out by experiments at the university, has said many times that the worst thing we can do to the coast of South Australia is to erect groynes. Yet here two groynes are to be erected. From my short perusal of the evidence, I see that Mr. Sainsbury has said (and I speak from memory) that about 200,000 tons of sand is expected to pile up at this groyne erection, and that this will be removed from time to time to Marino and places farther south. The problem that could be caused by these groynes is serious. I am amazed that the Government has not seen fit to take evidence from the board on this matter. At Glenelg the result of the erection of groynes can be seen.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): After studying the committee's report, I support its general contention that the Bill should proceed and that the proposed subdivision should proceed. It is evident from the comments by representatives of the Australian Mutual Provident Society that it is anxious to ensure that this shall be a model development, and these comments are reassuring coming from the society, which has declared that it intends to make this project a show place. We can be sure that it will carry out its part of the indenture because of its reputation, and it has immense funds to invest in Australia. The society has reached a stage of having to invest $1,000,000 on every working day on behalf of its policy holders. Such institutions are having difficulty in Australia to find the proper rewarding investment of their funds. It is encouraging that a mutual society with this high reputation should be involved in such a project in this State. However, I find a hint of trouble in paragraph 10 of the Select Committee's report, in which is indicated that a metric measurement was found to be incorrect. I take it that the error has been corrected, but it draws to one's attention a previous development in which the Government rushed through the preparation of the indenture with indecent haste.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gouger cannot discuss a matter that has been disposed of by this House or refer to a previous decision of the House. His remarks must be confined to the Select Committee's report.

Mr. HALL: Surely the Government's record and the Premier's record in a previous similar operation are important in considering this report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motion before the House is that the report of the Select Committee be noted, and the remarks of the honourable member must be strictly confined to that report.

The SPEAKER: Order! I agree, and uphold the Premier's point of order. Members are trying to get away from the report, and the tenor in which the member for Gouger is speaking is not within the requirements of Standing Orders. The honourable member must confine his remarks to the report of the Select Committee.

Mr. HALL: Surely, this is destroying the usefulness of this committee's report. I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I am ruling that the honourable member must confine his remarks to the report of the Select Committee in this discussion.

Mr. HALL: I take the point of order, Sir, that I wish to discuss the value of this document.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What's your point of order?

The SPEAKER: It is difficult to hear because of interjections.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What's the point of order?

Mr. Millhouse: Do be quiet, Des!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gouger must write out his point of order and I will examine it.

Mr. HALL: All right, Mr. Speaker, I will write it out.

The SPEAKER: The member for Gouger has raised the point of order that he should be allowed to discuss the relative worth of the Select Committee's report on the basis that the Premier's ability and the Government's ability have been shown to be deficient to prepare an indenture on which this report is based. Standing Order 303 (3) clearly provides—

Mr. Mathwin: It seems—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take exception to the member for Glenelg's rudeness.

Mr. Mathwin: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member interrupts me while I am on my feet I will name him. Standing Order 303 (3) states:

To permit debate relevant to the report a motion shall be moved (no amendment thereto being allowed)—That the report be noted.

The debate must be confined to the relevance of the report. Therefore, I cannot uphold the honourable member's point of order.

Mr HALL: It is a bit late in the session to have a row about a point of order, and I accept your decision, Mr. Speaker. This report, because of the haste in which it has been prepared, could prove deficient after it has been examined at length at a time later than this. If that proves to be so, the public interest may not be safeguarded by an indenture covering the fulfilment of this contract. Previous experience has shown that this type of incident has occurred before, and a previous indenture had to be redrafted. It is on that basis, and because I was involved, that I raise the point about this indenture, and that is an entirely relevant matter. I suspect that this indenture, for reasons that you, Sir,

will not allow me to develop, may be deficient. I am not saying that capriciously.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Give us the reasons why.

Mr. HALL: Because I am not allowed to give the answer, the Minister will have to take my reasons in good faith.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker will judge the relevance of the honourable member's reasons, not the Minister. I ask the honourable member for Gouger to desist from taking that line of argument.

Mr. HALL: To be specific, the Select Committee has made no substantial reference that I can find regarding the ratio of reserves to the total area of development. The parent Act provides that the society shall not be required to abide by the Planning and Development Act. The committee has said that aquatic reserves and amenities will be established, so that one can enjoy the beach and look out over the sea and, if one is wealthy enough, one can own a boat, and that will give one the recreational area in addition to the 10 per cent, which I believe the indenture requires, from the subdivision area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: This seems strange to me, because I clearly remember the history of the attempt to raise the percentage of land to be provided for recreational purposes in new subdivisions from 10 per cent to 121 per cent. I introduced a private member's Bill a long time ago seeking to raise the area to be provided from 10 per cent to 15 per cent, and those members opposite who were here at the time refused to support that Bill. The Premier, in introducing his planning Bill in 1967, included 10 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gouger has pursued that line long enough.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I am determined that you and I will not have a disagreement of any magnitude. What I am saying is terribly relevant. I am disappointed that the Select Committee did not go into the history of the development of recreational land that must be provided in new subdivisions, and point out that the society has been let off in this respect. True, the society has obligations regarding the building of amenities, but it is getting the land at a price that indicates that it must do something else other than just subdivide it. It would be a gift if it were not for the equating factor of development in the aquatic area. No-one has said whether the low price of the land is balanced by including the aquatic constructions in the price.

I see no reason why the society can step outside the provisions that other subdividers in the community must meet. It need not provide as recreational land 121 per cent of the total area, although the public is crying out for it. The Treasurer is taxing the people of South Australia heavily from land tax collections of this State so that such space may be provided. This seems to be a theoretical turnabout for the Treasurer. He should remember the days when he introduced in the Planning and Development Act a provision to include only 10 per cent—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the honourable member has been called to order on several occasions for not speaking to the report of the committee. He is persistently ignoring the rulings of the Chair.

The SPEAKER: I am most anxious that the honourable member for Gouger confine his remarks to the report of the committee and not deal with irrelevant matters. The honourable member for Gouger.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I have finished.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I was a member of the Select Committee responsible for bringing down this report, and I assure the House that members of that committee considered the whole aspect of the indenture and the development. The committee called 26 witnesses and I assure the House that, after considering all relevant matters, the committee did its work in the way members would want the committee to do it. The development proposed by the A.M.P. Society gives the average man the chance to purchase land and build a house at a fair and reasonable cost. Why should members criticize that? Reserves are provided, and additional beach reserves are set aside. Members have had since 5 o'clock this afternoon, when the debate was adjourned, to examine this matter in depth. Many important features of the proposal, especially in regard to the groynes, will be subject to further examination by the Engineering Department at the Adelaide University.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amending agreements to be approved by Act."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

In subclause (1). after "agreement", to insert ", made on or after the commencement of this Act,".

This amendment has been recommended by the Select Committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Society's road making responsibilities limited."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1), after paragraph (c), to insert:

but nothing in this subsection shall be construed as limiting, restricting or otherwise affecting, any obligation or duty of the society to comply with the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, as amended, or any other Act or law, relating to the forming and construction of water tables, channels, kerbs or footpaths of any proposed road or street within North Haven.

As pointed out by the Select Committee, the Port Adelaide council has raised the matter of the width of roads, excluding the water table, and in order to clarify the position it is recommended that this Committee make whatever provisions there are in the indenture and the Bill subject to the provisions of the Planning and Development Act and the rulings of the planning appeal tribunal.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (19 to 27) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 3178.)

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I could say that I support the Bill and sit down, but on this occasion I will not do that. This is probably the last time that I will take part in a debate in this House, and I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, will be tolerant with me if I get off the straight and narrow on this occasion. I support the Bill because, even though it only extends the machinery of the Barley Marketing Act for another five years, it is nonetheless an important measure for the industry.

It is rather a coincidence that today I am debating this Bill when, before the barley marketing scheme was introduced in this House, I was a member of the committee preparing legislation to be approved by this Parliament. One of the members of that committee was the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson. Recently, when moving house, I found the original minutes of the meeting on the establishment of the Barley Marketing Board. This Bill is important to the industry, and the Barley Marketing Act as it stands has done much for the barley industry of South Australia. However, that is not to say that many improvements could not be made to it. Members of the Barley Board are elected at the same time and go out of office at the same time, and I believe it would be an improvement for the Act to be amended so that some members came into office and went out of office at a different time from that of other members on the board, thereby, removing the retirement of all board members at the same time.

Mr. Nankivell: That includes the Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON: True. I hope that future Parliaments will attend to this matter and that not only will the Barley Marketing Act be extended for the next five years but also that it will continue to operate for at least as many years in the future as it has operated in the past. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I endorse the remarks of the member for Goyder, especially those regarding the extension of the life of the board. This Bill simply extends the life of the board for five years. I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that people in the industry are concerned about the way appointments are made to the board. As the member for Goyder has said, the electoral system applying to the board provides for a completely new board to be appointed once every three years. Although this may be good in politics, it is not necessarily good when applied to a barley marketing board. It is considered important to have continuity of membership on the board. The Chairman is a nominated member of the board and must be renominated every three years. Although this administrative procedure has so far not presented any problems, the lack of continuity of membership of the board is of importance to those concerned with the future of the board.

This Bill is necessary, and I am pleased to see its introduction because I understand that, as soon as complementary legislation is passed in Victoria (and I hope it will be passed), it will enable the Australian Barley Board as we presently know it (and it functions only in South Australia and Victoria) to be the principal authority for the two main growers of malting barley in Australia. I hope that, with the passing of the complementary

Victorian legislation, this board will continue in its pre ent form. The passage of this Bill is essential so that, when the House is in recess, it will be possible to approve the continuation of this board once the Victorian legislation is passed, which is expected in the autumn session of that Parliament. I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with my colleagues in supporting the Bill. I believe in the orderly marketing of our primary products. I have the pleasure of representing a district in which the production of barley is expanding as a result of many of my constituents turning to barley because of the application of wheat quotas in recent years.

Barley has recently been shipped for the first time through the terminal port at Thevenard. Unfortunately, however, there have been one or two anomalies, because some growers have been charged additional freight. The people in this area have not been accorded the same rights as those enjoyed by growers at other terminal ports from which barley is shipped. I hope that Thevenard will be made a f ee port so that growers will not have to pay freight even when they deliver their barley to the terminal port.

Mr. Venning: What about the bulk handling co-operative?

Mr. GUNN: I am happy to praise the bulk handling co-operative and the contribution made by the member for Rocky River to that organization. The people of South Australia can be proud of that organization and its representation on the board, especially that of the member for Rocky River. The member for Mallee referred to the composition of the Barley Board, and I endorse his remarks entirely. I believe there should be two grower representatives from Eyre Peninsula on the Barley Board. This suggestion is no reflection on the present member, because Eyre Peninsula is a large area, including the District of Flinders and the District of Eyre, and the bulk handling co-operative and the growers feel it is necessary to have two grower members from Eyre Peninsula. I, too, believe that there should be two grower members from that area on the Barley Board.

Mr. McAnaney: How much is produced there?

Mr. GUNN: Production figures are difficult to ascertain because barley has been transported to Port Lincoln in the past. People at Thevenard and in the area north of Poochera have not been able to take advantage of this for economic reasons, because most of their first advance was taken up in freight to Port Lincoln. Now, however, they have the opportunity to ship the barley to Thevenard and, although they have not achieved the same rights as have people elsewhere on the peninsula, I hope that this matter will be rectified soon. I am sure Eyre Peninsula will become the main source of barley production in South Australia, although the State is experiencing a lean period this year.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill. This legislation must be re-enacted every five years in South Australia and complementary legislation must be passed in Victoria so that the board can operate satisfactorily. Although we speak of the board as the Australian Barley Board, it is a two-State board. The objective is to have eventually an Australian Barley Board covering the whole of Australia, similar to the Wheat Board.

I need not speak of the success that has been achieved in wheat and I support the comments that have been made about the Australian Barley Board. However, I am disappointed that production in South Australia has not been pushed as much as it should have been. I recall hearing a statement by a board member, when opening a zone conference of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated at Gladstone a few months ago, in which he tried to discourage the growing of barley in the North of the State.

South Australia at one time grew more barley than the production of the other States combined. Those other States have now improved their production and Western Australia's production is now about equal to South Australia's production. In fact, last year Western Australia surpassed us. The Barley Board has done a good job. It has made arrangements that have helped in classifying barley. The quantity of barley suitable for malting seems to have decreased because of the kind of season and the high protein.

Generally speaking, the growers are satisfied with the position and the board can sell all the barley that is produced. The prices for deliveries this year show that the first advance price for malting barley is 84c, less freight. The prices for No. 3, No. 4 and No. 5 malting barley, less freight, are 76c, 71c and 67c respectively. For six-row barley the prices are 67c, 62c and 57c. These prices are higher than the prices last year. We expected the first advance to be higher this year than it was last year because grain prices throughout

the world have increased considerably. I support the legislation and wish the Australian Barley Board all the best in its next five years of operation in Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill, and I emphasize that the Australian Barley Board is controlled by the growers. I have spoken previously against the various boards established by this Government that have not grower control. When a commodity board comprises a majority of growers, the board is able to have experts making the marketing arrangements. The barley industry has not a guaranteed price, but it is sheltered by a world wheat agreement that gives a reasonable price. I congratulate the farmers in the industry and the members of the board on doing a good job. I am pleased that the legislation is being extended for another five years.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PORT ADELAIDE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3251.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier has explained that the introduction of this Bill has been hurried because of a decision made by the Port Adelaide council last Monday. The Bill seeks to alter the provisions regarding the acquisition of land. In fact, it places on the Government a responsibility to take action that may be to the disadvantage of a council—in this case, the Port Adelaide council. Opportunity now exists to permit such action to be taken by a council in its own right but I am told that the decision reached in the request to the Government to make this alteration was so that some of the onus could be taken from the shoulders of the local government body if that was desired. There is provision for a decision to purchase to be reached by consideration of the parties around the table, a decision which is satisfactory to both, or all, as the case may be. In the absence of a decision that is mutually agreeable to the parties, the Government may take over. This situation is not unusual, and I support it.

Questions have been asked in the House during recent weeks about this subject. The Premier indicated that the Government would not give special preference to any one developer. Are we going to have a developer or a group of developers receiving special treatment that would necessitate State expenditure? If taxpayers' money is to be used in acquiring this Port Adelaide area (which is a possibility within the framework of the alteration being considered) we could find taxpayers' money being used for the benefit of one developer. I am not suggesting that will occur, but it is a possibility. This argument arose over the action taken by the Port Adelaide council to approve the Queenstown development that was planned by the Myer organization. On the eve of final agreement being reached between the council and the Myer organization, a special meeting of Executive Council was held and a decision was made against the organization, requiring that all parties (the Myer organization, the Port Adelaide traders, the Port Adelaide council, the Woodville council and the Government) undertake discussions on the matter. Are the people involved in these discussions the same people who were involved in the earlier discussions? Who comprises Port Adelaide Plaza Limited? Are any of these people involved with the Myer organization or the West Lakes scheme? Are any of these people now united with one purpose or are only some of them involved in the discussions? I would like the Premier or the Minister Assisting the Premier to tell us during the second reading debate.

Redevelopment of the Port Adelaide area will make the Port Adelaide shopping centre, along with cultural and Government activities, the hub of that district. If the Port Adelaide development went ahead as well as the Queenstown complex and the West Lakes scheme, there would be three potential hubs. It has been suggested that a centre at Port Adelaide and one at West Lakes are all that are necessary in the district and that is why the development of the Queenstown site was opposed. In explaining the Bill, the Premier has indicated (this statement has been made repeatedly when replying to questions in this House) that a final decision regarding Queenstown has not been made. When referring to the Myer organization's proposal for Queenstown, which is 1½ miles from the Port Adelaide redevelopment, the Premier said, "Its future still remains undetermined pending an official application under the planning regulations." When will such an application be made? Is that project being denied consideration? No reference is made to the application to develop the Queenstown site, apart from the brief and scanty comment made by the Premier.

Will the Port Adelaide council really benefit as a result of development of that city? The plan is for the redevelopment of an area which is already returning a fair proportion of the

rate revenue of the city because it is the commercial centre. The Myer development would have involved an expenditure of $15,000,000. Would not both the Queenstown complex and the Port Adelaide commercial complex bring about increased rate revenue for the council? Although the Premier and the committee discussing the development have no doubt looked into this aspect, no indication has been given to the House that the action being taken would specifically benefit or disadvantage, in the long term, the people of Port Adelaide if the Queenstown development were allowed to go ahead. Two commercial centres in close proximity would create problems, but I believe that the type of development planned for Queenstown would be supplementary and complementary to the existing Port Adelaide development, although it is accepted that some features of the existing Port Adelaide development would probably need to be phased out because of the greater advantages and the better presentation that would be available in the new complex at Queenstown.

Will the action being taken by the Government completely deny the people of the Port Adelaide and Queenstown areas the opportunity of having the development which they voted for so convincingly? Although it is agreed that the poll conducted was not an official poll, it was conducted by a competent group of people who provide a service to the community, namely, Jaycees. I am led to believe that the result of that poll was in the ratio of two to one in favour of the scheme. A petition signed by many people and organized by a group of interested ratepayers in the Queenstown area showed that there was a considerable demand by the people in that area for the Queenstown development to proceed.

I think we can accept the fact that the type of development visualized would have led to a series of further improvements on the fringes of that development which would benefit everyone in the area. I do not intend to oppose the Bill, because I believe it adequately covers the situation it is designed to cover. However, I think the House has a right to know the reply to certain questions. The Premier previously referred to the problem in the Port Adelaide area and to the magnitude of the difficulties being experienced by the Port Adelaide and Woodville councils, as well as by the three groups concerned, namely, West Lakes Limited, the Myer organization and the Port Adelaide traders.

He said there were to be discussions, at which the Government was willing to be present, and that the legislation would have to be amended if certain results were to be achieved. However, we on this side have been denied an opportunity to take part in any of the discussions held. Any information we have received has been the result of continual probing and questioning. The House should have the replies to the questions asked on this occasion.

Mr. RYAN (Price): I support the Bill, which really represents the fulfilment of a promise made some time ago by the Premier when he said publicly several times that, if certain people could get together and discuss their problems and decide what should be done to expedite this matter, he would readily agree to introduce legislation in order to meet their wishes. I will not take the same attitude as Opposition members have taken regarding certain legislation introduced this session and complaining about the haste with which it has been considered in this House.

Mr. Gunn: You know that much of what we have said is correct.

Mr. RYAN: This Bill is a glaring example where haste is the essence of good legislation. If the honourable member studies the Bill, he will see why. The Premier has said many times that, provided the people concerned can agree among themselves on the legislation required, that legislation will be introduced.

Mr. McAnaney: That wouldn't apply to the Education Bill, though.

Mr. RYAN: I am dealing with this Bill. In fact, I think the Leader wandered far away from this measure. If he studies the Bill, he will see that authority may, with the approval—

Mr. Gunn: Speak up! I can't hear.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Eyre would be better off and would be better representing his constituents if he went to sleep. He apparently has no interest in matters concerning city people; he is interested only in rural production and in matters affecting his own constituents. The Bill provides that the authority "may, with the approval of the Minister, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire land within the Port Adelaide district business zone for the purpose of redevelopment". That is the essence of the Bill. The Leader wandered from—

Dr. Eastick: I did not.

Mr. RYAN: I have stated the purpose of the Bill.

Dr. Eastick: Are you suggesting that the Premier also wandered? I used the terms he used.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: I am going to deal with the terms used—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Address the Chair!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price.

Mr. RYAN: It is a pity that the member for Alexandra does not sit up and take notice sometimes of what is being said. The Leader said that he was concerned that Government money might be used on this occasion and that, if it was, it would be favouring one section of the community against another.

Dr. Eastick: One developer.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. That may be so, and one can never tell until the final result whether it will be so. Under clause 5, it is not intended that much Government money will be spent, for this clause provides that "all moneys derived from the sale or disposal of land . . . shall be paid into the fund". One can only assume that, in accordance with this Bill, the State Planning Authority will do the buying and the selling, and one would not expect that it would sell land to the developer at a price less than the sum paid for it. So that everyone concerned will be aware of the details of the financial transactions involved, a separate account will be established, and that will reveal the true financial position.

Dr. Eastick: There can be no guarantee.

Mr. RYAN: There may be no guarantee until the final result is known. One of the reasons for inserting clause 5 is that in future we will know the financial details. One can only assume that the authority will be fair in its dealings, selling land to the developer, as I say, at about the price that was paid for that land. If that is the case, there will be no great cost to the State, except for administrative purposes. The Leader has asked whether this will be to the advantage of people in the district. All I can say is that, unless someone is willing to do something quickly, Port Adelaide will die. No-one would want to see one of the oldest established districts in the metropolitan area die out for want of some redevelopment. As everyone would agree, this is an old area, but this legislation will provide the means of injecting new life into it. Having regard to the alteration in the rating system in Port Adelaide, I point out that any further upgrading and redevelopment must be to the financial advantage of the council. Any increase in rate revenue by the council will naturally be to the benefit of people in the area.

Dr. Eastick: Are they on land values or annual rentals?

Mr. RYAN: On annual rental values, compared to the unimproved values that applied before changes in the council, following the poll taken about 18 months ago. Amenities to be provided by the council for people in the area are most important. If the area is redeveloped, as the intention has always been, as a business, commercial and shopping centre, this will naturally increase the value of all properties near the area and will also provide an amenity to the people concerned.

I listened with much interest to what the Leader said about another project for the area and about the reason for this legislation. I am pleased that the people involved in the Queenstown project have at least been willing to sit in, with the other parties involved, at a conference to discuss the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. From the statements made by the Premier, it appears to me that the request for this legislation has been made unanimously by all concerned, including Myers.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Myers has said it is willing to involve itself.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, and not only in this project but in other projects as well. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said that the future of the other project still remained undetermined, pending an official application under the planning regulations. I want to make my position clear. Up until now, I have not had anything to say in this argument. Since I have been a member, I have taken the attitude that council affairs should be determined by the council concerned. While a council runs its affairs in a normal way, it should not be interfered with by the member for the district. I have never interfered with the activities of the council in respect of the Myers situation. However, I want to say publicly that the council has never as yet officially approved the Myers project. The prerogative of approval is vested in the council. Until the council approves the Myers project, no-one else can or should interfere.

Mr. Mathwin: It approved in principle.

Mr. RYAN: That is not final approval, as the honourable member should know.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a moral responsibility.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member is talking out of the back of his head. He should know that preliminary approval is not any more than approval to conduct further negotiations and to undertake planning for the area.

Mr. Mathwin: It is morally bound.

Mr. RYAN: God help the Glenelg area if the honourable member ever has anything to do with a shopping programme there, because it will be a failure before it starts, as is the case with the honourable member. The council asked me to give my opinion about the Myers project. It said publicly that you, Mr. Speaker, and I had been written to for our opinions about this. Amazingly, the reply we gave has never been made public. I wrote back to the council that, as the law existed, the area concerned was a residential area. I said that this could be altered by legal processes, which involved a supplementary development plan. If the council and Myers are willing to abide by the law as it now stands with regard to a supplementary development plan for the alteration of the area, I will give them my wholehearted support, but I can do no more than that.

In the meantime, I fully support this legislation. It was always intended that Port Adelaide should be a business, commerce and shopping centre. Unfortunately, over the years it has deteriorated until it has reached the stage where, unless it gets a shot in the arm, it will die. The trend among people today is to divorce themselves from the central sphere of commercial and business transactions. Years ago, people who wanted to do shopping or business always went to the city. However, now people prefer to go to smaller centres in the suburbs. As one of the oldest districts in the State, Port Adelaide should be assisted to redevelop. Rate revenue from the district has dropped considerably, but it could be greatly improved.

To upgrade this centre is beyond the physical and financial capacity of an individual, so the only way this can be achieved is by the efforts of a major consortium. The solution to the problem for people in the area is to do as the Premier has requested and form an unofficial advisory consortium. I support this scheme. Although it will not totally solve the problem, it will get something under way, and this is extremely desirable. Later, we can consider other proposals. As I have said, provided that all concerned agree to submit a supplementary development plan for the area, I will support it completely, as I have supported this legislation.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill, because I am concerned with the redevelopment of specific areas of metropolitan Adelaide. As I have the opportunity of flying over this area at least once, and possibly twice, a week, I am fully aware of the need for some means of examining this problem. I fully support properly designed redevelopment. I want to reject totally the allegation of the member for Price that I am interested only in people who live in rural areas. That is completely untrue, the honourable member having no logical basis on which to make those accusations. As a member of Parliament, I am concerned with matters affecting all the people in the State. I will not adopt a narrow or one-sided point of view. I wish to see a properly developed economy, with matters affecting the rural community and people living in the metropolitan area being considered, because these groups are inter-related. I wish to correct the statements made by the member for Price in his inaccurate and scandalous attack on me; he has no reason to make such an attack, and he cannot substantiate what he said. Such an attack does the institution of Parliament little good, and I strongly reject it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Port Adelaide Plaza Limited has purchased property in the central business zone, and has been a moving spirit in this project. It is financed largely by the Development Finance Corporation. The Myer organization has indicated that it will be involved and will develop a Target store in the area.

Dr. Eastick: Is Myers part of Port Adelaide Plaza Limited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is part of a working committee that includes Port Adelaide Plaza Limited, the Myer organization, and Port Adelaide traders. In addition, the Coles organization indicated that it intended to redevelop within the area: although it has acquired all the land it needs, it will fit into the overall pattern, but it does not need assistance for its development, as it has acquired all the land it needs for its major development in the area. The parties on the committee are the Port Adelaide traders, Port Adelaide Plaza Limited, Myers, the council, and the Government. The Government will be directly involved in redevelopment in the area, because there are proposals for a considerable Government office complex to be developed in the central area.

Dr. Eastick: Who is Port Adelaide Plaza Limited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Managing Director is Mr. Curtis, who is also the General Manager of the West Lakes organization. It is a consortium that has been largely put together by the Development Finance Corporation, and it involves the same people as are concerned with West Lakes. They are

interested in seeing that central development in Port Adelaide goes ahead, and they have co-operated fully since we set up the working committee. All parties concerned have requested that this measure be passed through Parliament.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Redevelopment of the Port Adelaide District Business Zone."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It is possible that the defined Port Adelaide District Business Zone can be increased in size, and intrude on other developments. Can the Premier say whether its creation requires it to be a potential commercial zone, as opposed to being a spreading octopus?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The extension of this zone will require further supplementary development plans, which would have to be exposed to public consideration, and be subject to objection and to a reference to the State Planning Authority. It would be technically possible to spread, but, factually, it would be extremely improbable.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3251.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): When this Bill was introduced, the Premier said that it was consequential on the passing of the Education Bill, as it gave female teachers who were contributing to the Superannuation Fund, and who wished to continue after the age of 60 years, the chance to receive a lump sum on retirement. This is a commonsense provision that perhaps should have been introduced some years ago. With the proposed alteration to the Commonwealth means test, many women may desire to continue teaching after reaching the age of 60 years, and they would appreciate receiving a lump sum on retirement, because that is one of the most satisfactory superannuation systems. I support the Bill.

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

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3252.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In the temporary absence of the member for Mitcham, I indicate that the Opposition intends to support this Bill. However, one or two matters will receive closer scrutiny during its later stages. This Bill brings into a more workable form a situation the House tried recently to create. The endeavours on that occasion proved not to be as beneficial as it was hoped, and this Bill is to correct that situation. I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill. It is an example of hasty legislation when not sufficient time has been allowed for the probable effects of its introduction to be appreciated by people outside the House. An amending Bill was passed earlier this year (I cannot remember whether it was in this session or in the last session) on the recommendation of the Law Reform Committee, and that legislation had an unexpected result. I heard about that result up the street soon after it was realized what the effect was likely to be, and we now have this amending Bill introduced.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What was hasty about the original Bill?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I bet we find that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot turn this Chamber into a casino.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What about his interjection, Mr. Speaker? You always reprove me and never reprove the people on the other side who cause the trouble.

Mr. Clark: He reproved you for offering a wager in the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wonder why he did not reprove the Minister of Roads and Transport for making the same offer this afternoon.

Mr. Clark: You'll have to ask him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the honourable member should be quiet or else he will embarrass his colleagues.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that through the Premier's interjection enough attention has been drawn to this point anyway. He has now drawn far more attention to it than I could have done had I been speaking without his interjection. The matter had to be put right as a matter of convenience. There are one or two matters in the Bill regarding drafting, and I draw the Premier's attention to them.

Clause 4 (*g*) inserts new subsections (5) and (6) in section 55a. New subsection (5) provides:

This section applies to a mortgage of land (whether or not the land has been brought under the provisions of the Real Property Act) under which the mortgagor is a natural person except a mortgage of land appropriated to commercial purposes.

That is all right, so long as the definition of "commercial purposes" is all right. New subsection (6) provides:

For the purposes of this section, land is appropriated to commercial purposes where the mortgagor has made a statutory declaration that no part of the land is to be used as a place of dwelling for his own personal occupation, and, in the case of land exceeding two hectares in area . . .

I will not worry about the latter part. I ask (and perhaps the Premier will clear this up when he replies, with or without advice) for how long this intention lasts. For how long would it be acceptable for the place not to be used as a place of dwelling? It may be that a person could make a statutory declaration. Incidentally, I heard a whisper that statutory declarations were on the way out, that they were likely to be abandoned, because so many people are taking them so lightly these days.

Mr. Ryan: What about—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Price or Port Adelaide or wherever he comes from is supporting me, and I am glad to know that he is doing this. For how long has this intention to be held? I could go along and make a statutory declaration—

Mr. Clark: Why—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member will listen he will find out that the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should speak to the Bill and not engage in debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Elizabeth was interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member was not interjecting.

Mr. Clark: Interjecting on you is too easy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heard him, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member does not continue to speak to the Bill he will have to resume his seat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, I will go on with the point. For how long does one have to hold the intention if it is genuinely held at the time the statutory declaration is made? I could make a statutory declaration today and perhaps be genuine, but within a fortnight circumstances might have changed and my intention might have altered, too. That is one point: there is no temporal element in this provision. The second point concerns a person's own personal occupation. I suppose what is contemplated is that a man buying a house for himself and his family will be using it for his own personal occupation, but even that can alter. He may desire to use the house for his estranged wife and children or some other similar purpose. These are just some of the matters I raise regarding drafting in this provision. I wonder whether this definition of "commercial purposes", which is entirely artificial but which is perhaps an acceptable device in drafting, is a satisfactory definition.

Those are the only points I raise. I hope that the Premier, acting as Attorney-General, can satisfy the House on this matter in the Committee stage if he does not do it in reply to the second reading debate. I have no comment to make about the attestation of deeds or about the other matters contained in the Bill, because they appear to be formalities and appear to be in order. However, on what is the guts of the Bill I ask for clarification, and I point out that it may be necessary for an amendment, at least regarding the temporal element.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Regarding the matter raised by the honourable member, there probably is a defect. I will examine the time element and the effect of a statutory declaration. It may be useful for us to consider that matter in Committee. Therefore, when we get to that stage, I will ask that progress be reported.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Clause 4—"Enforcement of rights against mortgagor."

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

In new subsection (6), after "used" wherever occurring, to insert "during the currency of the mortgage".

This amendment is designed to meet the point made earlier by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the Attorney-General has taken note of what I said this afternoon. I must confess that this is not a branch of the law with which I am very familiar. Although I have not had much chance to look at the Bill, I hope that the provision is now in a satisfactory and

workable form. However, I have spoken to one of my friends in the Upper House who has undertaken to have a good look at it to ensure that we have not made any mistakes.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill makes three changes of great importance in the application of the principal Act, the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act, to growers of wheat in this State. They may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) provisions are proposed to be inserted to deal with the cases where excessively large amounts of wheat are being carried forward from season to season by way of short-falls;

(*b*) a provision relating to this season's abnormally low harvest is proposed and is intended to ensure that all grain delivered this season, together with over-quota wheat of previous seasons, will be taken up as quota wheat; and

(*c*) a provision relating to special hard wheat allocations is proposed to be inserted.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 repeals the preamble to the principal Act, which is now somewhat out of date. Clauses 4 and 5 make minor drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 6 amends section 49 of the principal Act, which deals with the carrying forward from one season to the next of short-falls; that is, the difference between the amount of wheat actually delivered from a production unit and the amount represented by the quota allocated to the production unit. It has come to the attention of the advisory committee that in some cases these short-falls are accumulating from year to year at an alarming rate.

Instances occurred here where no wheat has ever been planted on production units in respect of which quotas were allocated, since quotas were first allocated. In relation to these properties, short-falls equivalent to years of production have accumulated. In other cases, the accumulation of short-falls has resulted in quotas being attached to production units for a particular season that are far beyond the productive capacity of the unit, so here further short-falls are inevitable. Accordingly, it is proposed that in the cases mentioned above the advisory committee will be given the right to review the amount to be carried forward by way of short-fall for three or more consecutive years and, if necessary, reduce it or direct that in a particular season no amount will be carried forward.

Any decision of the advisory committee in this area may, of course, be appealed against to the review committee. Clause 7 inserts two new sections in the principal Act. New section 54a provides that, where the sum of the amount of wheat that can be delivered in this State and the amount of over-quota wheat from a previous season is less than the amount of wheat comprised in the State quota and the Minister feels that it is justified, then all wheat delivered may be taken up as quota wheat. Honourable members will, no doubt, be aware that this situation will probably occur during the current delivery season. Due to adverse seasonal conditions, the amount of wheat available for delivery as quota wheat of this season will fall far short of the State quota. It is felt that a provision of the nature proposed will be of considerable benefit to those farmers who do have wheat to deliver and will accordingly be able to take advantage of the guaranteed minimum price arrangement.

New section 54b arises from successful representations that have been made for a special "hard wheat" quota for this State. Depending on total deliveries of "hard wheat" this year, those producers who have delivered "hard wheat" will by operation of this section have their wheat delivery quotas increased by up to 50 per cent of the amount of "hard wheat" delivered.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3253.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill. Several of the amendments being made really do not call for special comment, but I refer to clause 19, which deals with how-to-vote cards. I have a suggestion to make about this, and I hope that it does not fall on deaf ears. In, I think, 1968, when we were in office, we introduced extensive amendments to the Electoral Act. One proposal that we

did not accept was similar to the provisions of this clause and it was a proposal that we should insert a provision that how-to-vote cards be exhibited in polling booths. I was keen that this should be done.

The matter has been debated at many annual meetings of the Liberal and Country League, to which I belong, and always the major feeling has been that this is desirable. The reason why we did not go on with it (and I shall now point out the defect) was that it was all right to provide that we could put these cards up in the booths: they might be there at 8 a.m., but how would we provide that they would stay there until 8 p.m.? As I understand the provision, the cards will be placed in the polling booth proper, where a person goes to mark the ballot paper.

It may be said that Parliament is gallantly making it an offence to remove or deface the cards, a person who does so being liable to a penalty not exceeding $200. However, it will be almost impossible to detect defacement or removal because, if we are to have people doing that detecting, we endanger the secrecy of the ballot. It will be impossible for the person in charge of the booth and his assistants to watch to see that the cards are not taken down. I can think of many people (not necessarily in this place) who would go in with the express objective of pulling down their opponents' how-to-vote cards after casting their own votes.

Mr. Clark: What about putting up big ones, 6ft. by 4ft.?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not what is provided in the Bill. As I understand it, the Bill provides that cards of the ordinary size that political Parties have been in the habit of putting up will be put up in the polling place. If there are nine cubby holes, there will be cards in each. If this is to be workable at all, we will have to provide that the scrutineers for the various candidates are empowered to go around from time to time to check that the cards are still in position and. if they are not (as they will not be in many cases), to give them power to replace the cards. Although superficially it is an attractive provision, it could work unfairly against those candidates whose cards are taken down. When we are in Committee, I wish to provide that scrutineers for the candidates have the power to inspect the how-to-vote cards and to replace those that have been defaced or removed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Have you your amendment ready?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I hope that it will not take long. At the first opportunity I have had since the Bill was introduced, I indicated in the House today that I would give contingent notice, and I hope that the Government will bear that in mind when it comes to a vote. My Party has, as its policy, voluntary voting at all elections: we do not think that elections for this place should be compulsory. We therefore desire to take the opportunity to repeal section 118a of the Electoral Act which, in effect, provides for compulsory voting at State elections.

Australia is one of the few places in the world where voting at elections is compulsory; it is no doubt in theory (I believe in practice also) an infringement of the liberty of persons to make up their minds whether or not they desire to support a candidate or to cast a vote at elections. I hope that we will have the opportunity to insert this amendment in the Electoral Act, along with the other amendments proposed in this Bill. I hope the Government will be indulgent, both on that matter (we have worked as quickly as we can, but the Bill was introduced only yesterday) and on giving me time to have my excellent amendment to clause 19 prepared.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to compulsory voting for the House of Assembly.

I understand that this is the proper way in which to couch the motion. As members will have seen from the amendment circulated on this matter, we aim to repeal section 118a of the principal Act which provides for compulsory voting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can speak only to the motion and not say what he intends to do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have done that, Sir, and I now desire to speak more specifically to the motion. However, obviously I could not do that without telling people what was the object. Whether or not members agree with compulsory or voluntary voting, I am sure everyone will acknowledge that it is a matter of controversy, if only because Australia is, I think, alone in having compulsory voting at most of its elections. It is therefore a matter which I believe should be debated in this Chamber.

Mr. Langley: It's been debated many times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, and it will be debated again if I can do it.

Mr. Langley: You'll lose, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Unley is arrogant today regarding the numbers he is able to whip up. That is hardly the spirit of fair play which one expects from him and which other members opposite would claim for themselves. It is an arrogant assertion of the right and might of numbers.

Mr. Langley: It's not arrogant.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is only proper that there should be an opportunity to debate this matter in the House, because it is a matter of controversy in the community, and we on this side strongly believe in the principle of voluntary voting. After a vote is taken I suppose it is certain that we shall be defeated, as members opposite, because of what they regard as their own Party's interest, are against voluntary voting; but surely to goodness the member for Unley, the member for Elizabeth and others will not deny the rights of members in this House to debate the matter. Why should there not be a debate on this matter of controversy? We on this side will continue to raise the matter until there is a change in the law so that the freedom of the individual to decide whether or not he wants to vote is upheld. I venture to say that in the next session of Parliament we will succeed in that regard. Certainly, if Government members exhibit the same arrogance and denial of the rights of individuals as we have just seen from the member for Unley, they will lose the next election. I hope the House will support the motion and allow this matter to be debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I regret that I cannot accede to the honourable member's request. It is the practice of the Government to allow instructions to the Committee to be carried when there is some matter which has not already been debated previously and which is germane to the general principles of the Bill. However, this Parliament has had an opportunity to debate the principle of voluntary voting, and there is no connection between that principle and the contents of this Bill. At this stage of the session, the Government does not intend to initiate another debate on a subject that has already been dealt with this session.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. King.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Nomination."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is obviously meant to help by letting candidates know immediately if their nomination is not in order. Presumably the returning officer will now have the authority to point out what is wrong with a nomination.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"How-to-vote cards."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new subsection:

(3a) Where a how-to-vote card affixed under this section has been removed or defaced, the presiding officer or a scrutineer may replace that card with a how-to-vote card in identical form.

It will not cause inconvenience, and will avoid what could be unfairness.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3254.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is a rotten little Bill, which I do not like at all but which I am obliged to support. It was hanging around when I was Attorney-General, but we did not have the chance to introduce it. I suppose we would have done so if we had gone for a third session. My successor has certainly not hurried to introduce this Bill, and he could not have waited much longer if he hoped to have it passed through both Houses this session. It is a bit of gobbledegook, which has as its object an acknowledgement of the further weakening of the links between this country and the United Kingdom

and other countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Instead of being British subjects we are now to have the status of British subjects. If anyone can tell me that this is a simplification of the situation, I shall be amazed, because it seems to me to be a complication.

I accept the Attorney's explanation that we are the last State to introduce such a Bill, but I believe it was a hangover from the time when the Premier was Attorney-General. We have to accept this Bill, but I do not like the situation, because I am of the old school. I am extremely conservative, and I do not like to see our situation change. Perhaps it is a coincidence that on this day in the mother of Parliaments the same question is being debated: that is, the status of Australian citizens in the United Kingdom. The Bill will not do anyone any good and, in my opinion, will make the law more complex. I support the second reading.

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

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3256.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill. I think all members are aware, or should be aware, of the circumstances that have led to the introduction of this Bill and another Bill. I believe there is a real need at this stage to legislate for the registration of psychologists, because this is an area where the public can be very much imposed on by people who are not adequately qualified, either regarding acceptable qualifications for a University course or regarding their length of time in practice.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What will happen to hypnotherapists?

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that they will still be able to practise hypnotherapy provided that they are licensed or allowed to practise by the Minister. The connection with the Scientology cult, the so-called Church of the New Faith, must inevitably be brought out, and this fact is made clear in clause 4 (d), under which "psychological practice" can mean the following:

> the use of a galvanometer, any device commonly known as an "E meter" or any other instrument or device of a similar kind for the purpose or purported purpose of detecting, measuring or otherwise providing evidence of any emotional reaction or state of mind of a person.

I believe that the original legislation, which will be repealed by another measure, was probably not the best means of dealing with the situation that was allowed to arise a short time ago. I refer to a report, in the *British Medical Journal,* of the British Medical Association's consideration of Sir John Foster's report from his Inquiry into the Practice and Effect of Scientology. The association directed its comments to the question raised in a letter sent to the association's Secretary from the Department of Health and Social Security on January 6, 1972.

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

Dr. TONKIN: The comments on the letter state:

> (1) The association agrees with Sir John Foster's contentions (paragraph 249) that, while it can do much to relieve suffering, psychotherapy can also do harm if its techniques are used inappropriately or unskilfully, or are abused.
>
> (2) Harm may be done in various ways. Unskilful or inappropriate use of the techniques of psychotherapy may make the patient's condition worse, particularly when no adequate diagnosis has been made.

It is extremely easy to treat or try to help a patient without going into the details of what exactly is wrong. This is where psychotherapy, in unskilled hands, can be disastrous. There are cases on record of people inadequately trained having tried to treat, by psychotherapy, cases of brain disease or even brain tumour, and the time that has been lost sometimes has proved fatal. The report continues:

> Inappropriate use may lead to delay in applying other more effective methods of treatment, whether physical in nature, or other forms of psychotherapy. The association attaches particular importance to the dangers, referred to by Sir John in paragraphs 250, 251 and 252, which arise because of the tendency of some patients to become emotionally dependent on the psychotherapist. This dependency may even be exploited, either deliberately, or perhaps more often because an inexpert psychotherapist fails to recognize what is happening or lacks ability to handle it.

This was the crux of the whole problem as it arose in the practice of Scientology, because undoubtedly the tendency for a patient to become emotionally dependent on the psychotherapist or the operator was exploited. I do not know whether this was done deliberately. However, there is every reason to suppose that it could have been. The report continues:

> (3) Harm is more likely to be done when psychotherapy is instituted by a person who lacks the necessary experience or fails to seek advice from someone more experienced to make an adequate diagnosis.
>
> (4) Harm is less likely to be done when the psychotherapist practices in conjunction with a medically qualified person.

That is fairly obvious, because the medically qualified person is often the person who must make the diagnosis of organic disease or must ensure that organic disease is not present. The report also states:

(5) The association regards it as important that those who practice psychotherapy should have undergone appropriate training and should be required to conform to an ethical code. The association would not wish to identify particular bodies or organizations whose members are liable to do harm through the unskilful use or abuse of techniques of psychotherapy.

It was not the association's place to identify any particular group involved. The report then states:

(6) Would the institution of a registration council serve to encourage the existing healthy development of professional psychotherapy and thus raise the standards of practice? The association's carefully considered view is that the practice of psychotherapy has now reached a sufficiently advanced stage of development to make registration advantageous.

Paragraph *(9)* is at variance with the Anderson report. The Foster report was considered by the British Medical Association, which made this statement:

(9) The association does not think it practicable, nor does it believe it desirable, to restrict by law the practice of psychotherapy to the registered whether or not for fee or reward. There are strong traditions, even in highly developed countries, for the public to resort for the treatment of illnesses, complaints or problems to unorthodox practitioners. The association thinks it would be impossible to give a definition of psychotherapy which would exclude unambiguously many well established "folk" methods, and religious methods of treatment.

This is true and, because of this difficulty, the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee. I thoroughly approve of that course of action. It is necessary to protect people working in legitimate and desirable fields of psychotherapy. I refer to the occupational therapists, social workers, mental health visitors, marriage guidance counsellors, and ministers of religion whose religion is an accepted one. We must consider all these people and their needs and consider the extent to which they practise as, or could be defined as, psychotherapists.

Many people, without understanding that that is what they are doing, when giving counsel, even among friends, are practising psychotherapy in a superficial way. As I have said, this is at variance with the Anderson report in Victoria, which recommended, in effect, that psychotherapy should be controlled by a council to control the activities of qualified psychologists and, as a corollary, the improper and unskilled practice of psychology should be proscribed. I consider that the Bill will provide for the registration of psychologists and that this will be more than adequate to prevent the abuse of the techniques of psychotherapy. Paragraph (10) of the report states:

The question of fee or reward has no place in the definition of psychotherapy. The association has been advised legally that it is extremely difficult to define fee or reward and would not wish to make this a criterion for restriction of psychotherapy.

This is another extremely important feature. It is difficult to define what is fee or reward. If a person becomes emotionally dependent on a psychotherapist, he may be influenced to sign over amounts of money, property, and other things. We know that that has happened. The report continues:

The association would not want the question of fee or reward to play any part in deciding the conditions under which psychotherapy is practised. However, considerable dangers are envisaged in the exploitation of people financially. The association strongly disapproves of claims to be able to relieve all difficulties by psychotherapy but a clear way of controlling such claims is difficult to find. Any person not on the psychotherapy register who lets it be known that he is registered should be subject to penalty.

I thoroughly approve of what is being done to protect members of the community who normally practice psychotherapy or use psychotherapy techniques in their services, but individuals in the community must be considered and I am sure that the psychotherapists will continue to be given every opportunity to do the good that they undoubtedly do. The public must be protected from the methods used by the unscrupulous in our society who deliberately set out to make people emotionally dependent to the extent that they may be exploited financially and in other ways.

Mr. RYAN (Price): This Bill contains many clauses and its main objective is the registration of psychologists. Legislation that provides for the registration of groups of people also provides for the cancellation of the licence of persons who infringe against the legislation. In the case of this Bill, this is a safeguard against the operation of psychologists generally. When Parliament considered this matter previously, one objection raised was that these people were operating without any control being exercised over their activities.

In addition to giving the right to licensed persons to practise, the Bill gives the board power to cancel a licence. When a Bill is referred to a Select Committee there is far more

opportunity to study the measure and its effects on those concerned. A Select Committee has an opportunity to collect more evidence than members individually can collect, and it then reports to Parliament on all aspects. As that is intended here, I do not intend to prolong a debate on an issue that may be affected greatly by the report of the Select Committee. In order that this matter may be further considered by members of the Select Committee to be appointed, I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading of the Bill which, of course, is a complete sham. The Bill will not go on: it is to be referred to a Select Committee, and the Government knows that that means that the Bill cannot go through. It is ironical that last evening, when the Opposition moved to refer another Bill to a Select Committee, the opposition of the Government was as follows: "Well, if we do that, it cannot go through this session." Now, we have a Bill which the Government itself is referring to a Select Committee. Although I have not even looked at the details of the Bill (I know that that is a complete waste of time), I support the scheme of it. I said in this House in 1968, when the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill was being considered, that I regarded that as in the nature of emergency legislation and that a far more satisfactory way of dealing with the problem would be to introduce a Bill to license psychologists or psychological practices.

The only problem was that we just did not have time to prepare the necessary legislation. If we had gone for the third session we might well have done that. It is strange that the present Government Party vigorously opposed the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill in this House until a certain document was circulated and then the opposition became merely formal. But the then Opposition said all along that it would repeal the Scientology (Prohibition) Act. We now have, on the second-to-last day of the last session of this Parliament, a Bill introduced for that purpose and made contingent on the passing of the Bill that we are now debating. No wonder the scientologists themselves feel let down! They pinned their faith on the Labor Party.

I happened to find amongst my papers a little while ago a paper, which does not have a date on it, called *Freedom—Scientology,* and there is a heading "South Australian Attorney-General Publicly Promises Appeal" (I think it means "repeal"). The paper slates the Victorians, who have an Act that is similar to this Bill, and the scientologists hate that more than a bagful of scorpions because it is an effective piece of legislation. The publication I have has a most repellant cartoon or strip about Sir Henry Bolte and other Ministers.

The Hon. L. J. King: Didn't I get a mention?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the Attorney-General gets an honorable mention. The strip is headed "Boltman and Dirty Dickie in Victorian Capers with Andy Dandy" (Andy Dandy being Anderson, the man who brought in the report in Victoria). Most of the publication is occupied with slating the Victorians, but this is what it says about South Australia:

There is a more than marked difference in the respective attitudes of South Australia and Victoria to the field of human rights. In Victoria the full force of political machinery and a corrupt application of that machinery failed to dispatch the sincere, friendly group of scientologists, who stayed to defy repressive legislation and sought through the law to redeem wrongs in the courts. South Australia followed the Victorian example after the Darwin Health Ministers' Conference in 1968. Vance Dickie (the Victorian Health Minister) attended and made a speech reminiscent of Himmler's final solution speech from the Berlin Chancellory—

and the Attorney-General will agree with this next bit—

but South Australian voters and politicians had no stomach for the repression of any minority, and in 1971 the Attorney-General to the recently-elected State Government publicly undertook to repeal the anti-scientology legislation during the life of the present Parliament. The public statement and the circumstance in which it was made at the 1971 State Labor Party conference do credit to South Australia and the basically tolerant, friendly nature of its people. A mistake was made. A responsible public figure undertook to put the matter right.

I do not think the scientologists have the same opinion of the Attorney-General now as they had when this piece of paper was written.

Mr. Mathwin: He's done a back flip.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and so has the Government, because the undertaking has been given repeatedly in this House and elsewhere that the Act would be repealed and replaced by psychological practices legislation. The Attorney-General has said as much to me in the House in reply to questions. But now the Government does something that is tantamount to dishonesty; at the end of a session, and by making sure that it cannot go through, the Government introduces a Bill that must be referred to a Select Committee. As members know, Select Committees cannot exist after the session in which they are appointed comes to an end, let alone the

Parliament coming to an end. The Bill has to be referred to a Select Committee and the other Bill (the repeal) is made dependent on the enactment of this Bill.

That is dishonest and, to that extent, scientologists have reason to complain. I, too, complain, because I should have liked to see a Bill, modelled on this model, operating and, therefore, the repeal of the Scientology (Prohibition) Act. Let us face it: that Act has not been an effective piece of legislation under the administration of the present Government. I understand that the Attorney-General returned to the scientologists most of the documents that were seized during my term of office. However, those things are by the way.

The Hon. L. J. King: You understand?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The Attorney-General can deny it if he likes; I hope he can, but I do not believe he will, because that is my information. I only make the point that this Bill is a sham and it will not go through. The Government knows it cannot go through, and I regret that it will not.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I only wish to speak briefly in reply to the debate because I understand that this measure has met no opposition. I, too, would have wished that the Bill could be passed into law during the life of the present Parliament. It was subject to most extensive examination by a committee appointed by the Chief Secretary, the deliberations of that committee occupying a much longer time than was expected. Extensive submissions were received, amongst them being submissions from the scientologists' organization. When it came to the preparation of the Bill, it was apparent that various interests could be affected in a way that no-one had previously expected.

Therefore, I think it necessary that this Bill be subjected to an examination by a Select Committee of this House. I do not agree that the fact that a Select Committee dies when the Parliament dies necessarily makes this a futile exercise. This committee can meet before Parliament is prorogued. It can advertise for submissions, and people minded to make submissions can consider those submissions and send them in. In the new Parliament, the whole matter can be revived. I think that is a practicable and sensible course. The suggestion has been made that there has been some change of attitude, but I forbear to use the more vulgar expression used by the member for Mitcham and repeated by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Millhouse: It was the other way around.

The Hon. L. I. KING: Well, both members used it. What happened was simply that the Government took the attitude, which it has taken from the beginning, that the repeal of the Scientology (Prohibition) Act should coincide with some general rules designed to protect the public against the provision of psychological services for fee or reward by unqualified people. This was said by the then Leader of the Opposition (the Premier) during the course of the debate on the original Bill, which was sponsored by the then Attorney-General (the member for Mitcham). This has been the consistent attitude of the Labor Party ever since. Since I assumed office in May, 1970, I have taken that attitude consistently. I regret that these general rules cannot be implemented during the life time of this Parliament. However, we have achieved what we have been able to achieve. The important thing is that a Select Committee can now scrutinize the matter and, in the new Parliament, a satisfactory Psychological Practices Bill can be passed. The member for Mitcham used some strong language in his speech, referring, I think, to hypocrisy, or something of that sort.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think I said that; I referred to dishonesty.

The Hon. L. I. KING: Yes, the honourable member said that the Government was guilty of dishonesty in taking this course. It is odd for the honourable member to say that for, in saying it, he said that he wished that this legislation could be passed in this Parliament. Presumably (and I think he said this) he also wished that the Scientology (Prohibition) Act could also be repealed. I point out that the honourable member, as Attorney-General, introduced this legislation for the outright prohibition of the practice of Scientology. If anyone has been dishonest in this matter it may be thought that it has been the member for Mitcham, who now pretends that he does not believe in the prohibition of scientology and that he wants to see the Psychological Practices Bill passed and the Scientology (Prohibition) Act repealed.

If the honourable member is honest in making that statement, I am surprised. One could think that, when he was in a position to take this course himself, he might have taken it. Perhaps there is a shade of dishonesty, if not hypocrisy, in what the honourable member now says. I believe that the course we are now taking is proper. There will be an opportunity for submissions to be made to the Select Committee before the next Parliament meets.

When that Parliament meets, it will be possible to enact an appropriate Psychological Practices Bill in the light of all the submissions and argument submitted in the meantime.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. L. J. King, and Messrs. Eastick, Langley, Ryan, and Tonkin; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers, and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on January 16. 1972.

NARCOTIC AND PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments that this Bill makes to the South-Eastern Drainage Act are for two principal purposes. First, the Bill introduces amendments that are consequential on the Valuation of Land Act. This Act came into operation on June 1, 1972, and, consequently, the amendments made by the Bill are retrospective to that date. The amendments in this connection are nearly identical to the amendments made to other rating and taxing Acts by the Statutes Amendment (Valuation of Land) Bill earlier in this session.

Secondly, the Bill modifies the provisions of the principal Act dealing with the powers of the appeal board. When the previous amendment was considered by Parliament in 1971, it was recognized that the appeal board's function would be a very important one and that the provisions that were then proposed might very well require modification in view of actual experience in the operation and effect of its provisions. Modification has in fact proved desirable.

The Government considers it unjust that a landholder, whose property has been benefited by the drains and drainage works only in a relatively small area, should be ratable as if the whole of the property had received a benefit from the drainage works. Consequently, the Bill provides that the appeal board may declare sections, part-sections, or blocks comprised within a landholding not to be ratable for the purposes of the principal Act. If non-ratable land does not constitute a separate section, part-section, or block, the appeal board is empowered to declare a proportionate rebate on the rates payable in respect of that land. This proportionate rebate is the proportion of the rates that would otherwise be payable on the land that the unimproved value of the non-ratable part of the holding bears to the unimproved value of the whole of the holding.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 inserts a definition in the principal Act that is required for the purpose of the new provisions. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 49 of the principal Act. The new section contains the necessary consequential amendments to the Valuation of Land Act and provides, in the definition of "ratable land", that it does not include land declared by the appeal board not to be ratable for the purposes of the principal Act. The new section also provides that in calculating rates the amount of any proportionate rebate declared on the subject land should be subtracted from the amount of the rates calculated on the basis of unimproved value.

Clause 5 inserts new provisions in section 53 of the principal Act. Under the new provisions the appeal board is empowered to declare either that the whole of the landholding is not ratable, or that a separate part, part-section, or block is not ratable. Where the non-ratable land does not constitute a complete part, part-section, or block, the appeal board declares a proportionate rebate in the manner that I have previously described.

Where ratable land to which a proportionate rebate applies is subdivided and becomes subject to separate tenure, the South-Eastern Drainage Board is empowered to apportion the rebate to the separate parts of the land in such manner as it considers just. Where new drainage works are constructed and it is just, in the opinion of the board, that a rebate should be varied or revoked because of the benefit that the land receives from the new drainage works, the board may revoke or vary a determination of the appeal board. In that event the landholder is given a fresh right of appeal to the appeal board.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) ACT, 1968, REPEAL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3257.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill, and what I said about the Psychological

Practices Bill applies in this case, too. This Bill cannot operate, under its terms, until the Psychological Practices Bill is operating. However, I wish to reply to some of the remarks made a few moments ago by the Attorney-General. I want to put him right in relation to a few things he said about the passing of the original Scientology (Prohibition) Bill. First. I would like him to know that that Bill was not, in fact, my Bill when it was introduced in 1968. At that time, it was introduced in another place by, as I remember it, the then Chief Secretary (Hon. R. C. DeGaris). When it came to this Chamber, it was introduced by the then Premier (Mr. Hall). I simply spoke during the debate. I would like to remind members who were here then (and the Attorney-General was not) and other members of what I said about this, and then the Attorney-General will know that what he has said is entirely inaccurate. In the second reading debate on this matter on December 11, 1968 (and I was having trouble with interjections from the then member for Glenelg, who is now the Minister of Education), I said (*Hansard,* page 3234):

We are not keen on banning anything, but if the Opposition is seeking a political advantage, this is the line to take because it is not difficult for them to do so. However, we have not been able to find any other way to do it, nor has anyone else. The member for Glenelg suggested (and I think there is some substance in what he said) that the way to do it was to license psychologists. The Victorian legislation links the licensing of psychologists with the prohibition of Scientology, and I know that psychologists hate being linked with the banning of Scientology.

The *Hansard* report continues:

Mr. Clark: You could hardly blame them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Precisely, and that is why we have not done it here. We think that it will take some time to work out with the psychology profession a system of licensing, or whatever it may be, that will be acceptable to them.

Mr. Hudson: But you ban Scientology first?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, because we regard that as an urgent matter. The Chief Secretary is discussing with psychologists the question of their registration: I do not know whether this would be a sufficient safeguard against Scientology but it may be sufficient, once it is introduced.

Mr. Hudson: Why not try it first?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because it is not—

Mr. Hudson: You love power.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Don't be silly—

I hope that that extract will show the Attorney-General that from the beginning we had in mind to do what this Government has taken another four years to do. It has had the advantage of a clear majority in this place and the advantage of the idea, but a Bill has been introduced contrary to a straight-out undertaking that the Attorney-General gave that the Act would be repealed during the life of this Parliament. I ask the Attorney to reply to this question: did he or did he not give a public undertaking to scientologists that the Act would be repealed during the life of this Parliament? I believe that he did and that he will have to reply to the question that he did. No doubt he will make excuses, as he did with the other Bill, about why he has not been able to do it. If this Bill is not a sham and dishonest, I do not know what is. Although this Bill may pass, it is a dead letter because it will not operate until the other one operates.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. When the previous Bill on this matter was debated I supported the legislation, not because I had no sympathy for scientologists, because as individuals I have had no complaints about them. However, when that previous Bill was being debated a poster was distributed to members of this Parliament, and it was a disgrace for any organization to distribute such a poster. That action finally decided me to change my mind and support the 1968 legislation. I do not know how much evidence given against scientologists in written statements is factual, but they have been accused of many things in the past, such as blackmail. However, I do not know of any case in which a person belonging to this organization has been charged with blackmail and found guilty. Blackmail is illegal and I believe that other practices of which scientologists are accused are also illegal, but to my knowledge no-one has submitted evidence as a result of which a conviction has been obtained.

I do not know whether it is an evil and bad organization, but I cannot accept its thoughts and ideals in any circumstances. I believe I should have the right to join an organization that can genuinely prove that it has not acted illegally, but if proof is shown that it has acted illegally that will change the circumstances. I cannot agree to this legislation remaining on the Statute Book. Scientologists claim to be a Church of the New Faith, but I do not think that that is a genuine approach. That church has been registered at the office of the Attorney-General, but I should imagine that the average person would not consider it to be a religious organization, although that is not for me to decide.

Dr. Tonkin: Wearing a clerical collar doesn't necessarily mean a person is a minister.

The Hon. L. J. King: Putting on a white coat doesn't necessarily mean a person is a doctor.

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps some of the people who wear that collar in our community may not be true Christians, either. It seems to me that, until I am shown direct proof that this organization has carried out the actions considered to be blackmail or to be otherwise illegal (apart from those in the last couple of years), I cannot support legislation that debars this cult from operating in our community. I support the complete repeal of the legislation, until someone can prove that accusations against this organization have real foundations. We detest and object to rumours and insinuations against our families and our political Parties and we say there is no basis for them and that they cannot be proven. We know the sorts of accusation made against Parliamentarians and against their political Party at various times by opponents and sometimes supposed opponents. I know that in all the cases brought to my knowledge such accusations have been without foundation. When I consider that, I wonder how much fact lies in the accusations levelled against an organization such as scientology.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I support the Bill for perhaps somewhat different reasons from those just advanced by the member for Fisher. I believe that this is a matter on which members should not cast a silent vote. Either we are or we are not going to allow an organization to continue, and I believe that we should state the reason for our vote. In supporting this Bill I do not say that I support in any way scientologists or their practices. All members who intend to speak in this debate should read the Anderson report, which is the basis for legislation on scientology. It was the basis of legislation introduced previously and it is the basis, ultimately, for this Bill. Apart from the Anderson report, any person interested in this matter must have read "*Kangaroo Court—An investigation into the conduct of the Board of Inquiry into Scientology"*. I should like to quote one passage of the Anderson report, as follows:

> Scientology is evil; its techniques evil; its practice a serious threat to the community, medically, morally and socially; and its adherents sadly deluded and often mentally ill.

Those are strong words and I am sure that the Anderson committee did not say them lightly. The publication *Kangaroo Court* represented the scientologists' view of the Anderson report and findings. I should like to quote further from the Anderson report as it is recorded in *Hansard,* (page 3134, December 10, 1968) as follows:

> Expert psychiatric evidence was to the effect that the Hubbard writings—

Hubbard is the world leader in scientology—

> are the product of an unsound mind. This opinion emerged from a combination of the qualities observable in his writings, which contain great histrionics and hysterical, incontinent outbursts which, by the very nature of their language, indicate their author to be mentally abnormal. They abound in self-glorification, and grandiosity: Hubbard claims that he is always right, that he has all knowledge on all subjects and that he has had supreme experiences, including visits to the Van Allen Belt, Venus and Heaven; he claims equality with Einstein, Freud, Sir James Jeans and others, and immeasurable superiority to all leaders in learning past and present whose teachings do not agree with or support his propositions; he has had instituted his own calendar, his own dynasty and he grants amnesties as would a potentate.

This gentleman appears to have taken a lot on himself. Further, he appears to exercise complete control over the scientological practices throughout the world. I understand that people practising scientology are even encouraged, and indeed commanded, to reveal their innermost thoughts and fantasies. These are recorded on an instrument described as an E-meter, which I understand to be a galvanometer, being virtually a lie detector, although I do not know the extent of its use in Australia.

Mr. Payne: It simply measures emotional responses through sweat.

Mr. CARNIE: As the honourable member says, it is simply a machine that measures emotional responses through sweat. That in itself is a quack sort of instrument. Before considering what the recording of one's innermost thoughts can do, I should like to refer to Hubbard's writings in his official journal *Communication,* also reported in *Hansard* (page 3135, December 10, 1968) as follows:

> We are slowly and carefully teaching the unholy a lesson. It is as follows: "We are not a law enforcement agency. But we will become interested in the crimes of people who seek to stop us. If you oppose scientology we will probably look you up—and will find and expose your crimes. If you leave us alone we will leave you alone."

I wonder what action will be taken against those of us who are speaking this evening against the practice of scientology. The frightening point here is that, if a person does see the light and he wants to get out of scientology,

he is faced with the threat of blackmail by the leader of the organization. I refer to the situation of a person who wants to break away from the organization (and I stress that I call it an organization, because I cannot call it a religion). He knows that he has laid bare his innermost secrets, that they have been recorded, and that the leader of the organization has made statements similar to those to which I have just referred. This would prevent a sensitive person from leaving the organization and revealing all he knows about it.

This organization is based on fear. People who have allowed themselves to be subjected to it are placed in the frightening position of complete moral subjection. I support the Bill only because of the inclusion of clause 2 (2), which provides:

A proclamation under subsection (1) of this section shall not be made unless the Governor is satisfied that there has been enacted an Act to provide for the registration of psychologists, the protection of the public from unqualified persons and certain harmful practices and for other purposes and that Act is in operation.

But for that subclause I would not support the Bill. I wish now to comment on the Attorney-General's statement this evening that this legislation could not operate until the Psychological Practices Bill became law. The Attorney also said that this Bill would not become law during the life of this Parliament, that the Select Committee could not complete its deliberations and report to this Parliament, and that the Bill to control psychological practices would have to lapse and could not be revived until the next Parliament.

As the Attorney knew this, why did he not introduce the Psychological Practices Bill next session and leave this Bill until next session? Why has he introduced these Bills together? There seems to be a certain amount of window dressing. The effect is probably the same but this seems a peculiar way to do it. It is only because of the inclusion of the subclause to which I have referred that I support the Bill, which will control the operations of an organization that I consider to be a blot on our community.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I do not want to cast a silent vote, because I took a strong part in the matter in 1968. When the Bill was before this House at that time, this group did much soul-searching and hard thinking. In my association with the leaders of the group over several months, a change of attitude was obvious in regard to the result of many of their actions in the community. After discussion with these people, I am satisfied that they have taken a fresh and different attitude to many previous practices, habits and convictions. The group was startled when Parliament passed an Act in this State to prohibit Scientology. On the other hand, the measure gave rise to a sobering thought. I agree with the member for Flinders and, provided that the legislation does not come into operation until the Psychological Practices Bill becomes effective, I support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Repeal of Scientology (Prohibition) Act."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Attorney-General whether he gave an undertaking to repeal this Act during the life of this Parliament.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I thought I had made clear many times that the Government's attitude was that the prohibition against the practice of Scientology ought to be repealed, that that ought to be accompanied by legislation providing general rules for the provision of psychological services, that those general rules ought to apply to everyone in the community, and that, if scientologists were willing to observe those general rules, they should be entitled to practise their belief, as much as anyone else would be. I said that the Government intended to introduce and pass this legislation during the life of the present Parliament. I also said that the difficulties encountered with the psychological practices legislation had made it impossible to introduce the measure before this week. I was intrigued by the statement of the member for Mitcham that in 1969 this was his attitude.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: He's wrong: it was 1968.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am indebted to the honourable member for his correction, because he did not say what he did between December, 1968, and now to produce this psychological practices legislation that he has now said he favoured then. The Government has tried hard in the time available to introduce a satisfactory Psychological Practices Bill, but this has been difficult because of the matters raised by people who think they may be affected. We do not want to push through, in this Parliament, without proper consideration, legislation that may affect people adversely, and to justify that by saying that, because we have said we will do it, we will do it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is obvious that the Attorney is not willing to answer my question.

The Hon. L. J. King: You don't know whether I did or not. You were talking all the time I was speaking.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney thinks that the best method of defence is offence, and that is why he tried to get stuck into me. He did not say whether he had given a straight-out undertaking.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BREAD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3295.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): As I notice that the Bill deals with dough, I expect that the Government is anxious to have it passed as soon as possible.

Mr. Carnie: I wish you wouldn't talk for the bun of it.

Mr. WARDLE: Very well; I will get down to the whole meal! This short Bill deals entirely with the matter of weights as a result of metric conversion. As I do not think that, as a consequence, the housewife will notice any difference in the size of a loaf of bread, I support the Bill.

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

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3295.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support the Bill. When the House has considered previous amendments to the Citrus Industry Organization Act, I have expressed support for the orderly marketing of citrus not only locally but also for export. Bearing in mind the reason behind the establishment of the Citrus Organization Committee, it was hoped that we might have been progressing towards the orderly marketing of citrus on an Australia-wide basis and not just within the State. However, I understand that, notwithstanding, growers in my district and in that of the member for Chaffey have stated that the committee would be more effective if they could elect more growers as members. I only hope that through this change we will have a more effective committee that will be able to achieve the objects that many of us have been anxious for it to achieve. I regret that the decision taken recently in New South Wales has set back for some time the possibility of the orderly marketing of citrus on an Australia-wide basis. Nevertheless, it appears that most of the growers in South Australia believe that, if possible, we should maintain a structure for the orderly marketing and distribution of fruit within this State. Consequently, if this Bill gives growers better representation, I support it. If the measure is passed, as I expect it will be, I should like the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, to say when it is expected that the proposed election will take place and, more especially, in view of the financial situation of the committee, who will be responsible for meeting the costs of that election. I should like an assurance that, if necessary, the Government will underwrite the expenses of the election.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill and, in doing so, I agree with the member for Mallee that the many citrus growers in both our districts desire a statutory committee. The provisions of the Bill represent a compromise between the extreme views expressed about how the Citrus Organization Committee should be constituted. Over about the last nine months I have tried to find out what the majority wants, and the views given to me have ranged from those who have advocated a board to be appointed by the Governor, without any grower representatives, to those who have said that the board should comprise only grower representatives. The Bill is a compromise based on the differing views of those who claim to speak on behalf of the industry. This is the fourth or fifth occasion that this Act has been amended to try to deal with the disunity that has been evident in this industry since the original legislation was enacted in 1965.

In late January this year, a poll of growers was held to decide whether a levy on an acreage basis to finance the operation of a statutory body should be introduced, but this proposal was defeated. I then took it on myself to try to find out from people engaged in the citrus industry just what they wanted and to ascertain whether they were willing to pay for a statutory authority to operate. In February, I called meetings: first, of representatives of the grower organization; secondly, of co-operative packers; and thirdly, of private packers. Unfortunately, I could not make a definite conclusion as a result of those meetings, as the views expressed differed widely.

In August, I sent a questionnaire to about 150 growers, packers and district branches of grower organizations, asking what they required

to make the legislation acceptable and workable. Once again I obtained widely differing opinions. As I could not, from the replies to the questionnaire, draw any conclusion that would guide the Government on what action to take, I circulated to growers in the industry a proposal for a new concept of orderly marketing under new legislation similar to the marketing of primary products legislation that operates in New South Wales and Victoria. About 20 per cent of growers took the trouble to return this pamphlet. Unfortunately, this response was not sufficient for me to take any action on this proposal. A pamphlet was then circulated to every registered citrus grower in South Australia, and 250 growers took the trouble to reply, those replies being five to one in favour of the proposal that had been put by me.

Dr. Eastick: That gave you the courage to go on.

Mr. CURREN: In this matter, I do not claim to be particularly courageous.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think you've been extremely courageous.

Mr. CURREN: I have tried to find out from the growers just what they want. However, as is often the case in primary industry, grower apathy prevents any organized action from being taken. The response I received to this pamphlet was a little better than the response received by other people who have tried to obtain an expression of opinion from growers. After a life time of association with fruitgrowers, I consider that this response was remarkably good. I called a meeting of the various sections of the industry to consider a new concept of marketing under a statutory authority with the power of acquiring a crop.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are very patient.

Mr. CURREN: Yes, and it is necessary that anyone who wants to get an expression of opinion should be patient and persistent. I know that my efforts to try to obtain something substantial from growers and the industry about what is required and what is acceptable have been appreciated, and this appreciation has been expressed in public and in press statements by leaders of the industry. I called a series of meetings to discuss this matter with people engaged in the citrus industry who had supported the marketing operations of the Citrus Organization Committee. I discussed the matter with the Riverland Samor marketing group; I was invited to meet the central executive of the Murray citrus growers association; and I also met co-operative packers.

Only one group, the central executive of the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association, expressed an opinion on the merits of this proposal: it did not say the proposal was no good, but it damned the proposal with faint praise. The association commended me for my efforts in trying to bring some orderliness into the industry. The amendments in the Bill will enable registered citrus growers to elect to the committee the representatives they want and the new committee will decide future policy on marketing and administrative matters and determine how finance is to be obtained in order to administer the Act. I hope that most citrus growers and packers will support the committee to be set up.

Mr. Nankivell: This will be their last chance.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Mallee asked the Minister when the election was to be held. From what the Minister told me I understand that the result of the election will be known before January 13 next. Contrary to the belief of the member for Rocky River, this will not be my last speech in this House, although it may be my last speech for this session. Predictions have been made about my political future, but I have no fears. I am fairly resilient, and I have done my best to represent the people in my district.

Mr. Venning: They gave you a spell for a while.

Mr. CURREN: They did, but—

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have recommended to members on this side that they confine their remarks to the contents of the Bill. The matter being discussed now does not relate to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member has been busy interjecting and not listening. It is my function to determine whether the honourable member for Chaffey strays from the Bill.

Mr. CURREN: People in the Chaffey District have realized that they want me back here and, because of my efforts in pursuit of orderliness in the marketing of citrus, I am sure that many people who have not voted for me before will vote for me in future.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill deals with the members of the citrus organization, not with the member for Chaffey.

Mr. CURREN: I support the Citrus Organization Committee, whether the members are elected by citrus growers or nominated by the Governor. Having studied the Bill, the

principal Act, and the amending Act of 1970, I realize that a quorum for a meeting has been three members. The present Bill increases the number from five to seven, and I have circulated an amendment—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in discussing an amendment.

Mr. CURREN: I commend the Bill, and trust that all members will support it. I hope that citrus growers will support the organization that will be elected as a result of the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New clause 5—"Meeting of Committee."

Mr. CURREN: I move to insert the following new clause:

5. Section 17 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (5) the word "three" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four".

This provides that a quorum will be met by four members, instead of three, on the enlarged committee.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support the amendment, which is very reasonable.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I compliment the member for Chaffey on his study of this Bill. Obviously, he has been most assiduous in his approach to it, and there is no doubt that he knows his oranges. His amendment corrects an oversight, as there should have been an increase in the number of members prescribed for a quorum on the enlarged committee.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3297.)

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I support the Bill. Its major amendment provides for an increase in penalties prescribed by the Act. The Minister has pointed out in his explanation that these penalties have not been altered since 1908 and, as all other costs have regrettably escalated since then, the penalties must be increased. This increase in penalties has also been requested by other bodies involved in this matter.

The Bill refers to the alcoholic content in spirits. At present this content is ascertained by use of a Sykes hydrometer. The principle of a hydrometer relates to the specific gravity of the fluid. Apparently certain additives, such as caramel and sugar, when added to spirits affect hydrometer readings. In other States and in other countries this practice has been discontinued and a method of testing by distillation is now used. To offset this, the Wine and Brandy Producers Association has made the point that it is necessary to add more alcohol to obtain the correct hydrometer reading, and I am not sure whether members of the public will support this measure. It lowers the alcoholic content of South Australian-made spirits, but this is being done because of the difference in similar products imported from overseas and other States. Imported spirits are tested by a more modern method and do not conform to the South Australian legal requirements; therefore this measure brings us into conformity with the rest of the world.

The Minister in his second reading explanation referred to disposable syringes, electrotherapy machines and massage and slimming apparatus at present not being within the ambit of the Act. When I questioned why disposable syringes would come into the ambit of the Act, I was told that an anomalous situation applied in this State regarding disposable syringes because, although freely available for sale, they are usually packed in sterile packets. However, it appears that under the existing law no-one can be prosecuted if a disposable syringe is not sterile. The regulatory power sought in this Bill corrects this anomaly.

Similarly, with electrotherapy machines and massage and slimming apparatus, I am often amazed at the grandiose claims made in advertisements in regard to this equipment. When this measure becomes law it will in some respect control these claims and ensure that false and misleading claims are not made.

Clause 36 introduces a new section dealing with the recovery of costs of analysis. If a shopkeeper is prosecuted for not conforming to the food and drugs regulations, the cost of any analysis which is conducted for the purposes of any proceedings under the legislation and of which evidence is tendered may be recovered from the defendant. It seems that a person found not guilty of the charge could still be liable for the cost of analysis and, depending on the substance, that cost could be excessive.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Recovery of costs of analysis."

Mr. CARNIE: I move:

In new section 50a to strike out "be recovered from" and insert if"; and after "proceedings" second occurring to insert "is convicted of an offence, be recovered from that defendant".

As the clause stands, a person found not guilty could be liable for the costs of analysis, whereas the amendments would make him liable only if he were convicted.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): As the amendments accord with the intention of the clause, I support it.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (37 to 41) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 3297.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): It is a long time since a Bill was introduced comprising 58 clauses, so many of which change amounts of money in the principal Act. Disregarding those provisions that merely bring the existing Act up to date, I point out that the Bill really contains only three main provisions.

The Hon. L. J. King: It's another Bill about dough.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes; in fact, as some of the increases are substantial, I wonder whether what I previously said about the Government's attitude to dough is not even more applicable here. I support the Bill, as I am sure do all members on this side. Clause 35 contains provisions relating to a lodging-house, and here I point out that the regulation under which councils have been operating provides that, where premises are occupied by three or more persons who are not members of the proprietor's family, those premises shall be deemed to be a lodging-house. A lodging-house is subject to inspection by a health inspector, and I refer to this matter lest anyone gain the impression, on reading section 125 of the principal Act, that where premises are occupied by the proprietor's family and perhaps only one, two or three lodgers such premises shall be deemed to be registered as a lodging-house and inspected accordingly. Clause 35 also provides for the making of regulations, and this is a much better situation than that existing previously. All clauses between clauses 36 and 53 merely increase the various sums specified in the present Act, and clause 54 deals with regulations "as to radioactive substances and irradiating apparatus". Clause 55 relates to regulations "prescribing the fee payable by the local board to a medical practitioner", the "fee for the examination by the central board of plans of proposed bacteriolytic or septic tanks" and to the "regulating and controlling the construction, installation, maintenance and operation of swimming pools". As the major provisions are constructive and will be of benefit to local boards of health, I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. My only concern relates to section 35, to which the member for Murray has referred. Section 125 of the principal Act provides:

> Whenever any building, or part thereof, is let in lodgings or for the purpose of board and lodging, the same shall be deemed to be a lodging-house.

I am concerned that the premises of a person who may take in only one or two boarders may be required to be registered. I point out that many country people board schoolteachers purely to help those teachers and that registration may be required in such cases. Clause 35 (*f*) provides wide-ranging powers to make regulations. Although I realize that it is the Government's policy to include such provisions so that the House will not have an opportunity to debate various matters, I hope that the Attorney-General will explain specifically what the Government has in mind concerning this provision.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Limit of number of inmates in a lodging-house."

Mr. GUNN: The provisions of this clause are so wide that even a person who took in one lodger could be forced to register, to keep records, and so on. I realize that local boards of health will make their own regulations, but this provision is not specific enough. The Government should make clear what it wants.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The effect of the clause is that it leaves the local board to make the regulations. The board is empowered to provide for the registration of lodging-houses. A lodging-house must be a place where the business of providing accommodation for lodgers is carried on. The legislation confers powers on the local board to make regulations. As the Government is not assuming this power, we cannot dictate to

the local boards as to regulations they should make.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Would the acceptance of one lodger constitute the business of taking in lodgers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I would think that, if no more than a single lodger was in a house, it would not be a lodging-house. I understand that a lodging-house is a business where it is understood that people can pay for accommodation. I do not think that the fact that I provide accommodation for a member of my family (or even for a stranger) would make my house a lodging-house. It seems to me that, where someone accepts lodgers and receives remuneration for them, it is reasonable that the local board should have power to require registration of those premises as a lodging-house.

Mr. HALL: I move:

In paragraph *(a),* after "lodging-houses", to insert "having more than three lodgers".

It is not good enough for the Attorney-General to say that he thinks that a person who takes in only a single lodger will not be operating a lodging-house. Section 125 provides that whenever any building, or part thereof, is let in lodgings or for the purpose of board and lodging, the same shall be deemed to be a lodging-house. The Attorney has said that the power under this clause will be with the local board, but that is not good enough. It is our business to legislate in these matters. What the Attorney is saying is that if local boards want to do so they can make all these small lodging-houses register.

When I went to school I boarded in private houses. It would be ridiculous for people who take in a boarder to supplement their income to have to register under this provision. Thousands of students and workers take lodgings in houses, the owners of which need the extra income. Such people do not want to be forced to comply with all these local government regulations. This is typical of the carelessly introduced legislation of the Government.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the amendment. I am surprised to hear the honourable member say that this legislation has been carelessly introduced. The present provision has been in the principal Act for at least 35 years, and this amendment is an attempt to alter such a provision. The provision for registration and the definition of "lodging-house" have not caused any difficulties during this time, and I am sure that this hastily conceived amendment needs much consideration.

Mr. WARDLE: Since 1894. this provision has been included in the Act, and councils have exercised a responsible attitude towards it. No council would declare a house that provides board for only one student from the country to be a lodging house that had to be licensed and inspected. The lodging-house that accepts strangers for a fee should be registered and inspected, but, because councils have exercised responsibility, no serious situation has been created in the 78 years that the Act has operated.

Mr. HALL: We are now imposing a financial aspect in this provision, because a prescribed fee may be required, and it is reasonable that we should place a limitation in the Act in relation to this provision. As we are widening its application we should limit the possibility of that application. We are limiting the right of the freedom of a person to let lodgings to one person.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is "That the amendment be agreed to." Those in favour say "Aye"; those against say "No". The motion passes in the negative.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I heard someone say "Divide".

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair did not hear a call for a division, and did not order one, because that is in the hands of the Committee. I have ruled that the motion passed in the negative.

Amendment negatived.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (36 to 58) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 23, at 2 p.m.