

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 27, 1974

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

ABSENCE OF CLERK

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, because of the temporary absence on account of illness of the Clerk, under Standing Order 30 his duties will be performed by the Clerk Assistant. Pursuant to Standing Order 31, I have appointed Mr. G. D. Mitchell (Second Clerk Assistant) to carry out the duties of Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms.

PETITION: ONE TREE HILL ROAD

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 305 persons who expressed concern that the reforming of the roadway between One Tree Hill and Kersbrook had not been completed and that, in its present condition, it created a situation conducive to road accidents. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would urge the Government as a matter of urgency to provide further funds to complete the upgrading of this road.

Petition received and read.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I give notice that tomorrow I will move:

That this House censure the Premier for his flat refusal, so that he may go on his trip overseas, to agree to an extension of the sittings of Parliament beyond this week to deal with the very large number of current controversial issues, such as (a) the rocketing price in the cost of living; (b) the continued determination of the Government to control the media; (c) the widespread resentment of the Government's boating legislation; (d) the disastrous economic effects of the fruit fly infestation; (e) the apparent willingness of the Government passively to accept the paltry amount for grants for South Australia proposed by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads; and (f) the meat strike at the abattoirs; and, secondly, the many items of unfinished business still on the Notice Paper.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: OVERSEAS VISIT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There seems to be an impression amongst some people in South Australia that I am due to leave this State on Friday of this week. That is not true: there has never been a proposal for me to leave the State prior to April 6, which is Saturday week.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you coming back?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I am. I assure the honourable member that I shall be able to give him that pleasure and assistance. In relation to the sitting of this House not being extended for a further week, that is in no way related, of course, to my leaving South Australia, because I shall be here next week.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Royal Adelaide Hospital—Redevelopment of North-field Wards (Stage J),

Hallett Cove South Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

NURIOOTPA BY-PASS

In reply to Mr GOLDSWORTHY (March 13).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The preparation of construction drawings for the Greenock-Nuriootpa by-pass is virtually complete. Construction is scheduled to commence in January, 1975, subject to the availability of funds and successful negotiations with owners of land required for the project

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

In reply to Mr. GUNN (February 28).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The procedures involved in administering controls under the Building Act and the Planning and Development Act are closely related. It is desirable for the extent and nature of the controls exercised under the two Acts to be co-ordinated to the maximum extent. It is common practice, for example, for building applications submitted under the Building Act to be used as applications under the Planning and Development Act, thereby saving the applicant considerable expense. I am aware that exemptions contained in the new Building Act are not entirely reflected in the Planning and Development Act, and I see no reason why the two Acts should not have similar exemption provisions. I had hoped to introduce amending legislation during this session, but it has not been possible to do so.

FRUIT FLY

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, any information to give the House regarding the outcome of a meeting between union officials and casual fruit fly workers at Glenside this morning and, if it happens that those employed to control this serious infestation do go on strike now or before this outbreak is controlled, will the Minister accept direct manpower assistance from the fruit industry itself to control the outbreak? I understand that a meeting of men employed by the Agriculture Department to spray and strip fruit was to be held this morning to discuss a dispute stirred up initially by union agitators. The State Secretary of the Australian Workers Union (Mr. Dunford)—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: —is reported in this morning's press as saying that a strike by these 250 fruit fly pickers and sprayers was imminent. Because of the seriousness of this outbreak to the whole of the fruit industry in South Australia, which is worth millions of dollars, and the dire economic repercussions for the entire fruit and citrus industries and their export potential, I ask, if these men do go out on an irresponsible strike—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK:—whether now or later, assistance will be accepted from growers and the fruit industry itself.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I thought perhaps I should answer the Leader's question, as this morning I attended the meeting to which he referred. The information that the Leader has received is entirely wrong. A stop-work meeting, involving only about 25 men, was held.

Dr. Eastick: The others showed their responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The others were not involved in this matter. The problem was associated with truck drivers only, and the reason why the 25 men could not go

to work was that two truck drivers would not take out trucks because they were being paid less than the award rate, which was an anomaly that has now been rectified. Those men commenced work, and the remaining 25 commenced at 11 a.m. today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out again to the honourable member for Rocky River that there is only one Speaker in this Chamber.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the latest position regarding the preparation of regulations under the Workmen's Compensation Act, especially under section 8 (1a), which is the section dealing with subcontractors? Further, will the Minister say whether, although new regulations have been prepared, they require redrafting? If they do require redrafting, and as there is still much confusion in industry about the operation of this section of the Act, can the Minister say when these new regulations will be completed and ready for consideration?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understand that the new regulations have been redrafted, defining the people that we want to cover, namely, subcontractors

Mr. Gunn: Do you—

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Will you be quiet?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Taxi-drivers have been excluded from the regulations because they normally drive on a commission basis. The new regulations will now cover owner-drivers of trucks in district councils and municipalities, and they will cover subcontractors who do not supply equipment or material. That is how the regulations are drafted now, and they are before the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you any—

The SPEAKER: Order!

SEMI-GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question, which is to the Treasurer, relates to stamp duty on market transactions in semi-government bonds and securities. At present semi-government securities that are marketed attract 30c stamp duty for every \$100 in the value of the transaction. Will the Treasurer consider removing that stamp duty? South Australia is the only State where this stamp duty is imposed on semi-government bonds and securities when they are marketed. Therefore, this places the securities in a disadvantageous position compared to those in the other States, where no stamp duty is imposed on semi-government securities. Although the securities have had a good record until now, in future this imposition could inhibit their ability to raise funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Whilst in some cases South Australian duties are higher than duties in other States, in other cases they are lower, and at present I frankly feel no motive for reducing revenues, faced with the kinds of deficit for which the State has had to provide. The honourable member suggests that at some time in the future the imposition of stamp duty on semi-government bonds in South Australia will make them more difficult to market, and I can only tell him that to date we have had no difficulty whatever in marketing these bonds in South Australia. The market for them is extremely buoyant.

MOUNT GAMBIER CROSSING

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Transport use his good offices with the Road Traffic Board and the South Australian Railways to have warning signals provided at the Graham Road crossing in Mount Gambier? Over the past few years, because several accidents have occurred there, several representations have been made by the Mount Gambier council and by me regarding the provision of safety facilities at this crossing. The Mount Gambier District is fairly fortunate in having flashing lights at most of its railway crossings. However, I should like to see the programme completed by flashing lights being installed at the crossing to which I have referred, thus ensuring greater safety at that crossing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Each year, a committee consisting of officers from the South Australian Railways and the Highways Department consults, confers, and finally drafts a programme for the ensuing 12 months. Many factors, such as the number of trains and vehicles that use the crossing, are taken into account. I will refer the matter raised by the honourable member to the committee, and ask it what is the priority of this crossing in relation to other crossings.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to ask the Minister of Education a question about school buses that I did not finish yesterday. Does the Minister intend to negotiate with private bus operators who at present provide school bus services?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not repeat a question that he asked yesterday. Can he add to that question?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When the bells rang yesterday at 3.15 p.m., I had not completed asking the question, and the Minister had no opportunity to reply. I have repeated the part of the question that was included in *Hansard* yesterday, and I should now like to complete the question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A report in yesterday's *Advertiser* refers to trouble involving private bus operators who provide school bus services. One operator in the Naracoorte area, who transports about 300 children, has said that he intends to withdraw his service. I understand from what my colleague the member for Victoria tells me that this is causing serious concern in the area. I believe that yesterday, on a radio programme, the Minister said that he was unaware of details of the situation and that it would have been better if more detail had been given him. I think it relevant to point out that the member for Murray has often raised in this House the matter of improving the school bus system, referring to similar systems that operate in other States. Yesterday, the Minister said he did not intend to negotiate with these school bus operators while they threatened to withdraw their services. That seems to be a threat and in no way alleviates the difficulty or sets at rest the minds of parents who are so adversely affected by the situation. Does the Minister intend to negotiate on this matter (a matter that has often been raised in this House before) and, if he does, does he expect a satisfactory solution to the problem?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has misquoted what I said on radio. What I said on radio and television was that the first notice of any further difficulty had appeared in the press, and that no attempt had been made to supply me with information about the attitudes being taken; no attempt has been made as yet. So far, the only knowledge I have of the attitude of the Bus Proprietors Association (South Australia) Incorporated on this matter is what I have read in the newspaper.

Mr. Rodda: Not even from Mr. Weber of Naracoorte?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think that we have been notified by him, but I will deal with that in a moment. What I said was that I would not allow the school bus system to be in a situation in which bus proprietors were continually threatening to withdraw services, using that as a lever to forever hold the department to ransom, and thereby threatening the education of country children in this State. I stand by that statement, and I want to make clear that if the Bus Proprietors Association takes that attitude I am certainly not willing to negotiate with it on any overall scheme.

Mr. Venning: Who's being pig-headed now?

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'd rather let them—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the member for Rocky River and the member for Kavel—

The SPEAKER: They are both out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —are even more tired and cranky than usual and therefore cannot help interjecting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We can't hold a candle to you, brother!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Negotiations are still proceeding with individual contractors. The whole situation with respect to rates payable to school bus operators, who provide about 45 per cent of the total school bus services throughout the State, is that rates in general were reviewed on January 4 last and, as a result of that review, the costs for each school day of bus services provided by private proprietors rose from \$5 536.90 to \$6 219.50, an increase of \$682.60, or 12.3 per cent, for each school day. As a result of those negotiations, eight complaints have been received from individual proprietors about the final result of the review of their contract rates. One proprietor (Mr. Weber, of Naracoorte) has given us three months notification that he will cease his services. Mr. Weber's rates were reviewed on September 10 of last year, and an adjustment was made at that time. He received a further 7½ per cent increase in his rates in February of this year, so that the overall increase in rates that Mr. Weber has received has been very substantial. The contract with Mr. Weber provides that he can withdraw, giving us three months notice. He is completely within his rights in doing that, and now that he has given us this notice we will arrange to provide school bus services in Naracoorte so that a replacement service will be available.

The general position that I wish to make clear (and this is part of the source of the trouble) is that the Bus Proprietors Association wants a general formula applicable to the determination of rates to be applied across the State, but it is just not possible to do that. First, some school bus proprietors run a school bus service and no other service whatsoever. In that situation, the depreciation and maintenance costs, as well as other costs such as registration, are legitimately a charge on the school bus service. However, in many other cases the school bus proprietor runs other services, such as charter operations, in conjunction with the school bus services he provides. In those situations, the depreciation, maintenance or registration charge on the school bus service should be only a proportion. Further, the condition of roads and the degree of maintenance and depreciation vary enormously in various parts of the State. We have not refused to look again at any contractor's rates where a complaint has been made.

My comment yesterday was in response to the unfortunate statements appearing in the press about this matter. The prime interest of the Education Department in this regard is the education of children.

SNAIL BAIT

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation investigate and, if necessary, act to control products which are presently available for sale in South Australia for the destruction of snails in gardens? My question is prompted by an article appearing in the March, 1974, Newsletter of the Natural History Society of South Australia which details the alleged harmful and sometimes fatal effects on cats and native birds of consuming snail bait containing Methiocarb.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined. Some months ago reports were received from people who had observed some effects on pets and birds that had consumed snail bait. When discussing the complaints with officers of the Public Health Department, I was told, after an examination of the various snail baits available in South Australia, that they would be extremely unlikely to cause the effects reported at that time, but I do not know whether the chemical referred to by the honourable member is another form of snail bait that was not examined at that time. If there is substance in the present claim that it is harmful to pets and birds, I shall consider what can be done about it.

TOURISM

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Tourism say when moneys that have been given to South Australia in grants to aid tourism will be allocated to some of the metropolitan seaside councils to help them improve one of the greatest tourist attractions we have, namely, our beaches which are second to none in the world? It was announced recently in the *Advertiser* that a grant of \$192 500 had been made for South Australian tourist areas. It was also reported in the *News* recently that the South Australian Government had asked the Commonwealth Government for \$700 000 to help pay for 15 proposed tourist developments in South Australia. It was reported that grants for a fauna park at Victor Harbor, for a project at Loxton, and another for a railway in the Flinders Range, would be made out of the \$192 500 grant. Was the Glenelg mall project or any of the South Australian seaside councils included in the proposed 15 tourist developments submitted to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am grateful to the honourable member for asking this question because it gives me the opportunity to acknowledge the generosity of the Australian Government in relation to the recent announcement. During recent years the Premier has given a tremendous impetus to tourism in this State.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a failure.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Premier asked the Commonwealth Government for help to make up for the lack of attention given to tourism by the previous Liberal and Country League Governments in this State over many years. As Minister of Tourism I am particularly grateful for the support the Commonwealth is now giving.

Mr. Mathwin: How is it—

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Glenelg.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Commonwealth Government has adopted the attitude that the State Government should list the areas in which it needs assistance to develop tourism. Indeed, the Commonwealth Government announced four projects that officers of the Australian Government had considered and approved, and announcements have been made regarding those projects. I am certain that this sort of help will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government next financial year. I will certainly inform the honourable member of the other projects for which the Government is seeking support. The Government recently enacted the coast protection legislation which, for the first time in this State, took away from seaside councils the sole responsibility for beach maintenance and for the provision of facilities on those beaches.

Mr. Mathwin: But who initiated that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: This Government has helped seaside councils considerably by relieving (hem of the responsibility in relation to storm damage, by financing them up to 80 per cent of the cost of other foreshore works, and by helping provide tourist facilities in the same way.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, obtain a report on the practice of hospital benefits organizations in South Australia of refusing to pay benefits to people who attend public hospital casualty and outpatient departments? Many doctors in the Elizabeth area have refused to see patients after hours, and the only medical services available to the people in my district are those being provided in the casualty and outpatient departments of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Accordingly, my constituents are forced to seek medical attention in this way, no alternative source of medical treatment being available to them. In these circumstances, it seems reasonable that the medical associations should pay benefits to people receiving medical treatment in this way.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply from my colleague.

MENINGIE SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education explain what constitutes a disadvantaged school, and will he say whether the Meningie Area School is defined as such? Will he also say what this means in terms of policy regarding the provision of new schools or the replacement of existing schools, and whether such a school receives priority consideration? Also, is the Minister aware of the racial disturbances that have occurred at the Meningie Area School, and is he aware of the difficulties of maintaining effective supervision in this school as it is laid out? Will the Minister also say whether, in all these circumstances, serious consideration will be given to upgrading the school and lifting the morale of students and teachers by replacing it with a modern structure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A disadvantaged school is one that is placed on the List of schools defined in that manner that is submitted by the Education Department to the Schools Commission and agreed to by it and by the Commonwealth Minister for Education. Generally, these schools comprise, a significant proportion of students from socially or economically disadvantaged areas. The criteria in this respect relate to the nature of the area that the school serves. I cannot remember offhand whether the Meningie school is on the list to which I have referred, although the fact that Aboriginal students attend the school means that additional assistance is given as a

result of the Aboriginal education programme, anyway. Regarding disadvantaged schools, first, the assistance granted through the Schools Commission involves projects, which are submitted to it for approval as a result of local initiative, for the appointment of staff and the purchase of additional material and equipment. Secondly, the replacement of disadvantaged schools is carried out under a separate provision of capital funds set aside for such a purpose. The honourable member asks whether I am aware of the racial disturbances that have occurred at the Meningie school. Certainly, I am aware of the arguments that have occurred there. Intending to visit the school, I think on April 9, I have asked my secretary to inform the honourable member accordingly, as well as of my intended visit to Point McLeay, and the honourable member is being invited to accompany me. After that visit, I may be able to give the honourable member further information regarding his final question.

TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport consider making safer the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully? As the Minister would realize, I have raised this matter over a period of years and the intersection has been improved. Yesterday, I received a reply to a Question on Notice, and part of the reply states:

Minor improvements to the safety bar layout at the intersection should be carried out in May, 1974, in conjunction with current construction works on the North-East Road. No further work at this location is intended for several years.

Because of the volume of traffic that uses this intersection, especially on Fridays and Saturdays (because there is a large shopping centre adjacent to the intersection) while construction work is still proceeding, it would be an appropriate time to make major safety improvements, which, as it appears from the representations made to me by motorists and as I know as a result of my own experience as a driver, are required now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to examine the matter and obtain a report for the honourable member.

DUBLIN GARAGE

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier intervene to prevent the unfair victimization of one of my constituents and the unjustifiable removal of her means of livelihood by the ruthless operation and impact of the Motor Fuel Distribution Act? A woman constituent of mine living at Dublin purchased the local post office and store at Dublin a few months ago. Recently, the representative of the oil company that maintains the petrol bowser and the supply of fuel that this woman sells to the travelling public came to her and said, "We have to remove the bowser because of Mr. Dunstan's Bill." Having subsequently received a letter from the oil company stating that it would remove the petrol bowser at the earliest opportunity, my constituent has telephoned me in an irate and distressed state of mind, because she purchased the business only four months ago on the understanding that one of the aspects of the business of a small general store was the sale of petrol. The sale of petrol not only has an impact on her business in that respect: it also has the added effect of bringing additional business to her store. There are four petrol resellers in Dublin, of whom, I am sure, my constituent would have the smallest gallonage. She resents bitterly the removal of an important part of her operation at Dublin simply because the Premier is in an adventurous state of mind in relation to this legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter part of the honourable member's question is out of order and is not relevant to his explanation.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. HALL: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on whether I can continue to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member asked a question and sought leave to explain it. That leave can be withdrawn at any time and I withdrew it as far as I was concerned. The honourable Premier.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order—

Mr. Jennings: Question!

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to know on what basis you have refused me the right to explain my question, when in fact I have been very mild indeed in explaining the complaints that this person has made to me. They are completely factual and I have not entered into comment, except to convey that explanation to the House.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld, because Standing Orders, which this House has approved (and I interpret the approval given by this House), provide that a member may ask a question. He may then seek approval of the Speaker and the House to explain it. If at any time and without any reason whatsoever that approval is withdrawn, that is the end of the explanation. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No direction has been given by the Government or the tribunal for the removal of a pump at Dublin. If an oil company officer said that this was done by me or the Government, that statement was an untruth.

Mr. Millhouse: You've told them to reduce the number, haven't you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The ending of uneconomic marketing practices has been fully explained and debated in this House, and the House has approved legislation which is now coming into effect, but this specific removal cannot have been as a result of the legislation. I do not know to which company the honourable member has referred. I do know that companies, for their own purposes and apart from the legislation, are proceeding to reduce the number of their outlets.

Mr. Hall: What are you going to do—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot be held responsible for the statement by an oil company representative, and I cannot be held responsible for it in this House. However, if the honourable member gives me the details of the lady's name, what was done, and to what occasions he has adverted, I will report the matter to the tribunal and have it examined. The Government has indicated that in certain circumstances it would be wrong, in its view, to remove outlets that are the only reasonable outlets in an area, but it is certainly not possible for the Government to direct that no oil company shall reduce its number of outlets because of the economics of that oil company, and the Government cannot say that an oil company shall continue a contract that it has the right to revoke. I should have been surprised to hear the honourable member, during the debate on the legislation, suggest an amendment - to - that effect. He did not do that, of course.

VALE PARK INTERSECTION

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Road Traffic Board is at present considering the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Ascot

Avenue and Harris Road, Vale Park? Further, if the board is considering that matter, will the Minister say when a decision is likely to be made regarding the installation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer that matter to the board and let the honourable member know the result.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport issue a public statement or a series of statements explaining the requirements and the introduction dates of the regulations relating to the hours of driving legislation and the amendments to the Road Traffic Act regarding the G.V.W. and G.C.W. load ratings and braking? Last Saturday I attended a dinner of a transport association at Port Lincoln and I was surprised at the limited knowledge that those attending had of the requirements of this legislation. Mr. Jim Crawford, a member of the Transport Advisory Committee, was present and was able to answer questions asked by people at the meeting. However, Mr. Crawford raised a matter of concern, namely, the availability of parts in time to convert existing equipment. As at present there is a delay of several months in the supply of some brake parts and axle components, concern has been expressed about the delay that will occur as the time for conversion approaches. In an effort to avoid a rush during the last few months, will the Minister issue a statement, with the relevant information?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be only too delighted to issue statements further to those that I have issued already, and I am also delighted that the honourable member is now acknowledging the need to have press officers attached to Ministers' staffs. I assure him that my press officer has been extremely active in this area and I also assure him that that officer will be delighted to facilitate the carrying out of the suggestion that the honourable member has made. We have made statements in many publications to the effect that the new amendments will become operative from July 1, 1974. The hours of driving provisions will become operative, and the mere fact that the honourable member was told by the truck operators that there was concern about a shortage of parts needed to meet the braking requirements suggests that those people are fairly well aware that the requirements must be met.

MILLIPEDES

Mr. EVANS: I address my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, but the Minister may need to refer part of the question to the Minister of Health. Will the Minister say what action the Government has taken to eradicate the frightening millipede plague that now menaces large sections of the Adelaide Hills residential area? I have raised this matter previously in the House in earlier sessions. A report in the *News* refers to a continuing menace from the millipedes and now some persons are selling their houses because of the plague, whilst others have had to receive treatment for mental breakdown because of the fears that exist. The millipedes have been found in babies' cots in the morning and they have entered the ears of some children. Young children have been picking them up and chewing them. There is a risk that the plague will spread from Stirling to Stirling East, Bridgewater, Heathpool, and Aldgate, and all that section of the Adelaide Hills could be affected to plague proportions within the next two years. At present there is no effective method of killing the millipedes and I ask the Minister whether he will take the matter up with his department to try to find a method of treating the menace. Some irate people say that the only way to seek proper consideration of the matter

will be to bring a few bucketfuls to the houses of responsible people so that those people may realize what is the true situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! That statement is not part of an explanation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is not commonly regarded as one of the functions of the Community Welfare Department to devise new forms of insecticides or whatever is needed in a situation like this. However, I shall have the matter examined to find out whether the Government can take action to control what is undoubtedly an unpleasant plague.

FREE MILK

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say what has happened about the former free milk scheme? On August 28 last year, I asked the Minister the following Question on Notice, of which I now remind him:

Is the Government in agreement with the decision of the Commonwealth Government either to abandon or to modify the free milk scheme for schoolchildren?

Although he did not give a direct reply, the Minister said:

The proposal of the Australian Government is for the provision of milk, or substitutes, to schoolchildren on a needs basis. A meeting of Ministers has been proposed for the end of September to discuss details. It is not possible to express agreement or disagreement at this stage as no details of the proposed modification of the scheme are available. The possibility of orange juice being one of the available substitutes will be raised at the meeting of Ministers.

As far as I know, we have heard nothing more since then about the scheme. I was reminded to ask this question by a brochure which I have received (and I guess other members have received it as well), which is headed "School milk: the uniquely effective way of ensuring good nutrition for our children", and which is prepared by the former chief of the Division of Dairy Research at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. The date for the meeting of Ministers is long past. As far as I know, the substitution of juice for milk has not been introduced; the scheme has just disappeared at the behest of the Commonwealth Government without our own Government doing anything (certainly nothing effective) about it. Therefore, I put this question to the Minister, who will have an opportunity now to explain what has happened.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad that the honourable member prefaced most of his remarks by the phrase "As far as I am aware", because several statements have appeared in the newspapers and on radio and television since the honourable member asked his Question on Notice. Obviously, he did not see or hear them. The scheme has been discontinued. We have asked for several alternatives to be considered, but so far no submission has been accepted. We are currently considering a submission with regard to schools for Aboriginal children in certain areas.

Mr. Millhouse: What about all schoolchildren?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Obviously the honourable member has not seen the announcement that the scheme has been discontinued.

Mr. Millhouse: I knew that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He knew that, but he did say "As far as I am aware". I think that the awareness of the honourable member is limited.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you're embarrassed about this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Marine arrange for the Birkenhead bridge at Port Adelaide to be left open during the metal trade workers dispute that is currently causing disruption in industry in South Australia? A stream of statements has come to my notice claiming that the operation of the m.v. *Troubridge* has been interrupted simply as a result of the refusal of the bridge operators to open the bridge while they are striking in sympathy with metal trades workers. The effect of this is serious for people who live on Kangaroo Island. I have received requests from the area to seek some form of Government co-operation to guarantee continuity of service, particularly as in this case the Kangaroo Island community is in no way connected with the industrial dispute. It is claimed that, at the Jervois bridge, which is about half a mile (.8 km) away from the Birkenhead bridge, there is an alternative crossing for traffic that normally uses the Birkenhead bridge, whereas the islanders have no vehicular stock transport alternative when the *Troubridge* is out of action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that we open the Birkenhead bridge and leave it open until the strike is over. I want to be clear on that. Therefore, if the *Troubridge* decided to go out during the 24 hours (or whatever is the term) of the strike, the budge would be open. I take it that that is the honourable member's suggestion.

Mr. Chapman: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the bridge is controlled by the Highways Department, and as the *Troubridge* is operated by the Minister of Transport, I suggest that the honourable member refer the question to him.

GROCERY PRICES

Mr. ALLEN: Is the Attorney-General concerned at the intended increase in the price of groceries in this State? Yesterday, I was supplied with a list of increases in grocery prices that will come into effect tomorrow. A leading wholesaler in this State has issued a list of about 70 items that will increase in price, with the increases ranging from 2 per cent to 68 per cent. This list follows a list last month of about 150 increases. I set out 11 of the most alarming increases as follows: Fairy margarine, 8oz. (226.8 g), 68 per cent; Stork margarine, 1 lb. (453.6 g), 61 per cent; Eta superspread, 1 lb., 44 per cent; Marville, 30 per cent; dried vegetables, 60 per cent; common salt, 2 lb. (907.2 g), 23 per cent, 4 lb. (1 814.4 g), 27 per cent; rolled oats, 2 lb, 16 per cent; Deb potatoes, 17 per cent; and kippered herrings, 13 per cent. Also included are two other items, water softener salt, 19 per cent—

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member need to go through the whole list?

Mr. ALLEN: —and zinc cream, 49 per cent. Is the Attorney-General concerned at these intended price increases?

The SPEAKER: Order! When he repeated his question, I heard the honourable member ask the following question: "Is the Attorney-General concerned at these intended price increases?" That question is not in an admissible form. The honourable member may not ask whether the honourable Attorney-General is concerned: his question must have some direct connection with the portfolio under the honourable Attorney's control. The honourable member may not ask a bald question whether the honourable Attorney is concerned about an increase in prices. The honourable member must frame his question differently, perhaps asking whether the honourable Attorney will investigate the matter.

Mr. ALLEN: I will alter my question and ask the Attorney-General whether he will investigate the intended increases.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I expect to receive a report about the matter from the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs. I shall then be better able to comment.

PINE POSTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Forests, investigate the matter of pine posts treated with creosote, with a view to ensuring that the capacity of treatment plants is increased, having regard to the existing demand for such posts and the need for an adequate supply? Recently I was approached by a landholder whose property is in the Mid North. He had put in an order 12 months ago for 500 of these posts of the 4in. (101.6 mm) by 5in. (127 mm) size. He was then notified that the order had been cancelled and that no new orders would be accepted. On investigation, he found that the only way he could obtain posts would be from a delivery yard at Cavan and that the only posts available were 2in. (50.8 mm) by 3in. (76.2 mm), or 3in. by 4in. In addition, he had to be there at a time when the posts were available. The yard would not accept any arrangement extending possibly beyond a day. Therefore, the situation is acute, and the arrangement with the yard is impracticable. Will the Minister say whether steps can be taken to improve this situation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Minister of Forests, and to ask him what can be done. I think the honourable member appreciates that several factors are involved in the present shortage, one being that many people engaged in primary production are requiring the sort of material to which he has referred, whereas this was not the case two or three years ago. In addition, it is a remarkable thing (I think the members for Victoria and Mount Gambier will bear this out) that, when this type of post came on to the market about 10 or 12 years ago, no-one would use it, but it is amazing how things change. I will have the matter investigated for the honourable member.

CLARE ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport take immediate action to see what can be done to ensure safely for people using the highway extending from Clare through to Narridy and Port Pine? Over a period there have been several fatalities on this road. I travelled on the road last Monday purposely to have a look at it and to get my mind clear on the whole situation, and it is indeed in a bad state of repair. Having been constructed some years ago, the road needs upgrading, even though it has been patched continuously by the Highways Department. Before last Easter, I believe the Minister stated that police cars would patrol this road over the Easter period because it was known to be a very dangerous road from Clare right through to Port Augusta. As a result of that action, I think it was an accident-free Easter on that road. However, will the Minister give this situation his immediate attention to see what can be done, even though the overall solution to the problem may be a long-term one?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to ask the Highways Commissioner to have a further look at this part of the State's road network and to see whether action can be taken immediately to solve the problem to which the honourable member refers, although I think he has properly drawn attention to the fact that many of the problems associated with roads today are of a long-term nature.

At present, as I have indicated to the member for Frome and, I think, the member for Eyre, who have made pleas for special allocations for specific works in their areas, the funds of the Highways Department have been fully allocated, and to divert large sums would mean taking money away from some other job for which money had already been allocated. I do not think that is a very desirable situation.

Mr. McAnaney: What about funds under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Heysen would know as well as I—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen did not ask a question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —that the new Commonwealth Aid Roads Act does not become operative until July 1 next.

FOOT-ROT

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government is aware of an increase in the incidence of foot-rot that has been reported in South-Eastern districts and whether there has been any relaxation in the vigilance that has been exercised over the past 20 years in controlling this disease? Much concern was expressed about the incidence of foot-rot that occurred in clean flocks last year, and in referring to this matter I am not unaware of the problem that exists across the Victorian border. However, in view of the considerable concern expressed about an increase in the incidence of foot-rot in South-Eastern areas, will the Minister discuss with his colleague the adequacy of the steps being taken in this regard at present and whether extra vigilance will be necessary to keep this scourge under control?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague and to obtain a full report for the honourable member. I think he will appreciate, however, that that report may not be available tomorrow; if it is not, I will write to him later. Sharing his concern in this matter, I hope that there has been no relaxation of the controls that are necessary to prevent this damaging disease from breaking out.

ROAD FUNDS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Transport say what action he or the Government intends to take to safeguard the citizens of this State against the blatant discrimination proposed by the Commonwealth Government through its proposals in connection with the next five-year road programme? I think all members have received a letter from the General Manager of the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia Incorporated (Mr. Walers) in which he makes a number of interesting points on his situation and in which he states, in part:

South Australia represents about 10 per cent of most aspects of the nation's interests, whereas its share of the Federal moneys proposed is 7.9 per cent. On the basis of the number of its motor vehicles (in June, 1973), South Australia is only to receive \$375 per vehicle over the five years from the Federal Government for roadworks—the lowest of any State. This compares most unfavourably with the national average of \$465. Even more disastrous are other recommendations for matching grants and Federal stipulations on the categories for which grants are to be provided.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member going to read a lengthy letter?

Mr. GUNN: Most certainly not, Mr. Speaker. I am just briefly quoting. The letter continues:

A further blow to the State and to its vehicle owners is the necessity to increase State revenues to qualify for matching grants. On the basis of the report this has been calculated to require that vehicle registration fees would be raised by 50 per cent immediately with a further increase in three years time.

Will the Minister say what action the Government is taking in this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously the member for Eyre has been either out of the country or hibernating over the past six weeks, because I suppose that no fewer than four press statements have been prominently displayed by me as regards this very matter. The State Government has thoroughly considered the contents of the report of the Bureau of Roads, and I stress that this is all that can be commented on at present. That is the recommendation of the bureau, which is not the policy-making body of the Australian Government. It is simply a report and recommendation for the consideration of the Minister, and on this basis all State Ministers have looked at the report. We have made submissions to the Commonwealth Minister, and I have drawn attention to our percentage allocation of 7.9 per cent, bearing in mind that in the current period it is 10.5 per cent. In fact, to maintain that percentage it would be necessary for South Australia to be provided with an additional \$63 000 000 during the five-year period, and that requirement has been forcibly suggested to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport. In addition, I have issued a public warning at least four times that, if the matching requirements contained in the report are adopted by the Australian Government, I will have no alternative but to ask Cabinet for authority to increase registration fees, licence fees, and probably the ton-mile tax, by at least 50 per cent. The Commonwealth Minister is fully aware of the situation, but no decision of which I am aware has been made. Certainly, the Commonwealth Minister has not told me, and I believe that he would certainly tell me before he would tell the member for Eyre.

SUPERANNUATION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 4, line 38 (clause 5)—After "retrenchment pension" insert "or a pension referred to in section 71 of this Act".

No. 2. Page 12, line 34 (clause 5)—After "contributor" insert "or an accepted contributor".

No. 3. Page 42, lines 25 and 26 (clause 79)—Leave out "last commenced contributing" and insert "was last accepted as a contributor".

No. 4. Page 42, line 41 (clause 81)—Leave out "commenced contributing" and insert "was last accepted as a contributor".

No. 5. Page 42, lines 45 to 47 (clause 81)—Leave out all words in these lines after "or pensioner".

No. 6. Page 43, lines 5 and 6 (clause 81)—Leave out all words in these lines after "spouse" and insert "in the prescribed period".

No. 7. Page 43, line 19 (clause 81)—Leave out "last commenced contributing" and insert "was last accepted as a contributor".

No. 8. Page 75, Tenth Schedule—Leave out "or less" after "21 years", "22 years", "23 years", "24 years", "25 years", "26 years", "27 years", "28 years", "29 years".

No. 9. Page 75, Eleventh Schedule—Leave out "or less" after "21 years", "22 years", "23 years", "24 years", "25 years", "26 years", "27 years", "28 years", "29 years".

No. 10. Page 75, Twelfth Schedule—Leave out "or less" after "21 years", "22 years", "23 years", "24 years", "25 years", "26 years", "27 years", "28 years", "29 years".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. These minor amendments, which are mostly of a drafting nature, were accepted by both sides of the Council.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 9, line 27 (clause 19)—Leave out "that pension or benefit" and insert "the pension or benefit under this Act".

No. 2. Page 9, line 33 (clause 19)—Leave out "that pension or benefit" and insert "the pension or benefit under this Act".

No. 3. Page 10, line 13 (clause 20)—After "The" insert "previous".

No. 4. Page 12, line 13 (clause 27)—Leave out "former".

No. 5. Page 12, line 23 (clause 28)—Leave out "former".

No. 6. Page 12, line 39 (clause 29)—Leave out "former".

No. 7. Page 13, line 5 (clause 29)—Leave out "former".

No. 8. Page 13, line 9 (clause 29)—Leave out "former".

No. 9. Page 13, line 14 (clause 29)—Leave out "former".

No. 10. Page 13, line 18 (clause 29)—Leave out "former".

No. 11. Page 13, line 23 (clause 30)—Leave out "former".

No. 12. Page 14, line 10 (clause 34)—Leave out "on" and insert "immediately before".

No. 13. Page 15, line 39 (clause 35)—Leave out "former".

No. 14. Page 15, line 44 (clause 35)—Leave out "former".

No. 15. Page 16, (clause 36)—After line 12 insert new subclause (la) as follows:

(la) Where a former member, not being a former member referred to in subsection (1) of this section or a member pensioner, again becomes a member the previous service of that former member shall be counted as service for the purposes of this Act.

No. 16. Page 16, (clause 36)—After line 41 insert new subclause (4) as follows:

(4) In this section a reference to a former member or member pensioner who again becomes a member shall be read as including a reference to a former member who again becomes a member before the commencement of this Act.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. The amendments fall into two categories. First, there are two drafting amendments. Also, it was found that words in the Bill would have created a specific anomaly in relation to a member in another place. That was not the intention of the original Bill, and these amendments will make clear what the measure intended. In clause 36, amendment No. 15 inserts new subclause (la) and amendment No. 16 inserts new subclause (4). The fact is that the service interrupted in the way described should reasonably be counted for pensioner purposes.

Mr. CUMBE: I believe these amendments clarify the *contretemps* that we had last Thursday when discussing this problem. Obviously, certain difficulties were encountered, but these amendments resolve the matter beyond all possible doubt.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased to support the amendments, but it is ironical that members received a copy of them to peruse after the Treasurer had risen to discuss them. This is a poor show, and gives members no chance to research any problems that may be involved, particularly at the end of a session when many Bills are being introduced. Members have very little time to consider the Bills or any amendments, although it is our duty to do this on behalf of our constituents, whether we are Government or Opposition members.

Motion carried.

KINGSTON COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading

(Continued from March 26. Page 2729)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The first comment I make is that the operations of the Government in the later part of this session have made a complete parody of Parliamentary process and a complete travesty of Parliamentary procedure and of the function and role of the Opposition. For the Minister of Education to have introduced yesterday a fairly major Bill and expect members to debate it intelligently at this time is making a complete farce of this House. It is not the first time it has happened during my period as a member of Parliament. During the last week of the last session of the previous Parliament, the Minister introduced a Bill of about 80 pages that was to rewrite the Education Act, and he told members that we had only six days to absorb the details and debate the Bill. Yet it had taken eight years to prepare! The Minister introduced this Bill yesterday and then adjourned the debate on motion. The Government tries to give an image of bustling about and working hard for the good of the people, and speaks of the need for late sittings. All members know of the nonsense promulgated in the press about this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must discuss the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am making a relevant point relating to the working of this House and how this Bill fits into a pattern. It had been stated that members would be burning the midnight oil and would all be worn out. Yet we had nothing to do for the first three weeks of this session because the Government did not have its legislation prepared. Now, in the last week of sitting, although we got notice about the introduction of this Bill, other Bills are suddenly coming through without notice, and we are expected as an Opposition to come to terms with them, make all the inquiries we are expected to make, and debate them intelligently. This is making a complete travesty of this Parliament, and it is an insult to members of the Opposition.

Mr. Venning: A real dictatorship.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: During the closing stages of the last session of the last Parliament, during a debate on the Education Bill, I said:

However, Opposition members have had no real opportunity to study the Bill, which was only ready in its printed form a few days ago.

The Minister interjected by saying:

You've had six days. What more do you want?

I replied:

Yes, six days! The situation is completely farcical. When the Victorian Minister of Education (Mr. Thompson) sought to introduce a Bill which dealt only with the registration of teachers and which did not deal with other major areas affecting education in Victoria, the Labor Opposition member for Albert Park (Mr. Douve) said, on November 13, 1971.

In order to consider the measure competently, the Opposition will need more than a fortnight.

In Victoria the Labor Opposition was given a fortnight to study one aspect of education, the registration of teachers. Opposition members there complained that a fortnight was not long enough, and we have had only one day. At the moment members are very busy attending meetings and conferences. I have read the Bill during Question Time, and I make no apology for doing so. No member speaking to this debate today could have given the Bill more than a cursory glance. The Opposition is asked by the Minister

and this busy, bustling Government which is doing so much for the State, to make an intelligent contribution to this debate. This is a disgusting state of affairs, and the sooner this Government wakes up to itself and adopts a less arrogant attitude the better it will be for the people of this State.

Dr Eastick. Why is the Minister of Education always at the tail end?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe that members of his own Party are not too happy with him because he puts things before them at short notice, but that does not concern me. I am concerned to see, however, that this House is a reasonably democratic place, that the legislation receives some semblance of mature consideration, and that the Opposition has time to make reasonable inquiries about it. We are not privy to the Minister's discussions but we are charged with the responsibility of examining this legislation and the making of constructive remarks on it. I wanted to adjourn this debate until next Tuesday, but we were denied that right. I have had time to make only one inquiry in connection with this Bill. I make no apology to this House for saying that I am not prepared for this debate, and I do not know how any member could be prepared in the circumstances. We will have to study the Bill together.

A cursory reading of the Bill indicates that it follows closely the measures that have been introduced into the House in connection with other colleges of advanced education. I think the Minister has already said once that one of the big advantages he sees in the establishment of these colleges is a financial one, because these colleges will attract Commonwealth funds according to the formula. I will leave aside all educational advantages, which seem to be minimal in the Minister's original thinking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: His attitude was, "Let's get on with it, we need the money." There were other considerations, but that was one. Pre-school education is to be expanded tremendously in the future. It seems that the greatest expansion is to be at both ends of the educational system, pre-school and further education. While I was overseas last year I had the opportunity of inquiring into plans for pre-school education in many countries. In the countries I visited, the most ambitious programme for pre-school education was that contemplated in Great Britain. However, the intended expansion of pre-school education by the Inner London Education Authority depends on a tremendous infusion of funds. In many other countries economic recessions were hampering ambitious plans for pre-school education, although the most ambitious plans were those in London.

In Sweden and some other European countries, children do not start school until they are 6 or 7 years of age. Some European countries did not have plans for pre-school education. A plan was contemplated in Sweden, but it was being hampered by a mild recession. In California I noticed a contraction in spending on education. In Australia, under the policy of the Australian Government, as it calls itself, we are launching into a tremendous expansion of Government spending on education that will be as great as expansion in any other field. This is the reverse of trends occurring in some of the major countries overseas. The economic realities of life are such that the ambitions and plans are being curtailed by recessions and other economic factors. Fortunately, I believe Australia is a wealthy country. It has a satisfactory balance

of payments, and it can afford expansion in some of these areas. However, I believe the Commonwealth Government will have to come to terms with economic reality, and some of its plans will not come to fruition. I certainly hope we will attain a steady growth and expansion in our educational facilities, particularly in the area of pre-school education, because it is in this area that the greatest expansion can occur. Before the 1972 Commonwealth election both major political Parties made statements about the expansion of pre-school and kindergarten education, and the same is true regarding the policies of the major political Parties in this State. Members on this side in no way want to inhibit any expansion plans that may be contemplated.

The principal of the Kindergarten Teachers College is quoted in the *News* of July 7, 1973, as saying that enrolments at the Adelaide Kindergarten Teachers College were expected to rise soon from 182 to 450. That is a spectacular rise and it is expected that that number will be increased even further. From what the Minister said in his second reading explanation, I think perhaps there will have to be further building programmes in this State. However, I cannot remember everything the Minister said, as I heard it only once, and even then he complained because we asked him to lead it. A perusal of the Bill shows that it is similar to other measures that have been passed in this House. Fortunately, we were able to give previous Bills relating to the establishment of colleges of advanced education more than just a cursory glance. This procedure makes a complete farce of the debate.

One of the major features (other than the financial aspect, because this will attract a massive infusion of Commonwealth funds) of a Bill of this type is the matter of how the college will be governed. As was the case in earlier measures, it appears that the council will be constituted in much the same way as are those of the other colleges. The Minister appears to have effective control of the council in relation to his powers of nomination. From a quick glimpse, it appears that the council will comprise 16 members, which is reasonable. From my experience on the Council of the University of Adelaide, I would say without hesitation that that body was too large. It is difficult to say where it could be cut back, however, especially when competing interests are seeking representation on it. It comprises four students, ancillary staff and members of the staff association, as well as people elected by the convocation of electors. Because it comprised about 30 members, its meetings became completely unmanageable, as they dragged on and on. The Adelaide University Council was trying to devise ways in which to reduce the length of its meetings. The council referred to in this Bill is therefore about the right size: for the reasons to which I have referred, it would not be desirable to have it any larger. Of its 16 members, nine are either directly or indirectly, to be appointees of the Minister. However, the Bill provides that a member of the council shall not, in the exercise of his power or functions, be subject to the direction of any person or body of persons.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't suppose that means anything.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suppose it does mean something, and I am glad that provision is in the Bill. Because the Minister will have power, directly or indirectly, to appoint nine of the 16 council members, he is in a fairly dictatorial position regarding the composition of the council, the structure of which is similar to that of the other colleges. I see from the Bill that there is a new ground for

dismissing a council member. The Bill to constitute Roseworthy Agricultural College as a college of advanced education provided that the Governor could remove from office a member of the council who was dishonest or who neglected his duties. I did not think there was any mention in that legislation of physical or mental incapacity.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was in all of them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I checked on that aspect during Question Time, but I did it in such a hurry that I might have missed it. It was a quick comparison, and I make no apology for complaining again that this procedure is a complete travesty of the functions of Parliament. The Bill gives to the council powers similar to those of the councils of other colleges, and power exists to make by-laws, statutes, and so on. The only point of contention that has come to my notice (and rather indirectly) is that there has been some controversy regarding the name of the college. It was suggested that it would be appropriate to honour the lady who had been involved so heavily in the establishment of the Kindergarten Teachers College. Despite that, the Government has seen fit to call this college the Kingston College of Advanced Education, and I do not intend to move an amendment in this respect. However, I point out that this was an area of controversy, and that those who were advocating the recognition of the past services of the woman to whom I have referred certainly had a valid point.

The Minister's second reading explanation was certainly brief enough, composing as it did only one page of general comment. It is expected that these colleges will eventually assume functions broader than those of this college and the Adelaide Teachers College in their primary role of educating young people for the teaching profession. Indeed, it is contemplated that these colleges will become multi-purpose institutions. I am not clear about what is contemplated regarding this college. I think it was stated that the Torrens college would become an institution specializing in fine arts. However, the Minister's second reading explanation does not say what is contemplated for the future or whether this establishment is eventually to become a multi-purpose institution, yet the Minister said that he deemed it necessary to refer to this possible function of the college.

There is not much more that I can add to the debate. I have, because the Government has given me no alternative, been able to give the Bill only a cursory reading. Normally, I would be disposed to oppose the Bill in these circumstances: when the Government introduces a Bill of this nature and puts it before the Opposition without giving it a reasonable time to come to terms with it I am normally inclined to oppose the Bill. I have sought to delay this Bill. However, having seen Bills similar to this one pass through this House, and knowing something of the advantages of making this institution a college of advanced education, I am willing to support the Bill. Indeed, in this respect I think I am voicing the sentiments of the Opposition. However, I am certainly not willing to be treated with the contempt with which the Opposition has been treated to an increasing degree during the past 12 months.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mr. Langley

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Bill but I consider that I ought to register an objection at the way it has been introduced and debated. Five new Bills were introduced yesterday and two other Bills are listed on the Notice Paper for second reading. No notice was given of those Bills and I ask the Government what chance we have had to peruse them.

Members who were fortunate enough to have copies could have taken the Bills home at about 2.30 a.m. today and, if they had time, this morning they could have examined the measures and compared them to similar Bills, but the Bills are not on file for members generally. This Bill must be about No. 179, and I ask what chance the Opposition and members of the Government have to present a case to their electors on these measures. The Opposition is to be downtrodden further and further into the mire by the procedure that goes on with monotonous regularity at the end of each session. Last year, at the end of the session we remember—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN—the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! I did allow the honourable member for Kavel, as the main spokesman for the Opposition in the second reading, to drift from the Bill, but the same latitude does not apply to all members. We are discussing a specific Bill and that, not the procedures of Parliament, will be the subject matter of the debate.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was merely putting the matter on record lest people in my district and elsewhere who read *Hansard* wonder about the Opposition's position in this matter and lest they think that at times the Opposition is weak, as the Premier would wish it to be. I want to put on record the limited time that we have had to consider the Bill. The Government has treated the Opposition in this Parliament in a disgraceful way. We have been elected to do a job to the best of our ability, and the Government is obliged to recognize us and help us to do that job, whether we are Socialists or Liberal and Country League members.

The name "Adelaide Kindergarten Teachers College" is being changed to "Kingston College of Advanced Education" and the college will train people to deal with children between the ages of three years and eight years. I know many people at the college. In fact, my daughter has trained there recently and will receive her diploma, I think next Monday, so I can claim to have knowledge of this institution. I understand that people who have the college at heart have asked the Government to name the college the DeLissa College. Miss DeLissa came here from Sydney in 1906 and established the college in 1907, so it has been in operation for a long time. In 1916 she went to the United Kingdom and there established the Gipsy Hill Training College in England. This lady later retired and remained in the United Kingdom. One would think that, as a matter of tradition (and tradition comes only with age), it would be proper to associate this college with its founder. Perhaps the Minister, in considering this matter, did not give enough attention to the great work

done in earlier days when the college was established. Last evening I had to look after another Bill, having to stay in the Chamber from 7.30 p.m. until 12.10 a.m.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You shouldn't have to consider Bills while the House is sitting, anyway.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, to try to study a Bill while Question Time is proceeding is almost impossible. One must consider the proceedings of the House. It is asking a little too much to expect members to consider this Bill, which comprises 13 pages and 27 clauses, at such short notice. However, as the die is cast, one must do one's best. On a brief perusal, it appears that the provision relating to the appeals committee is reasonable. I understand that students at the college want this type of committee. In fact, already one staff member and one student constitute such a committee at the college. Although I should have liked to see what is the position at other colleges, I presume that this provision will be acceptable. Over the years, work at this college has been earned out satisfactorily. On the opening day and before that, I inspected the building extensions at the college. I am pleased that the old building has been preserved, as this is an asset. I think that the buildings are beautifully laid out. I hope that I shall be invited soon to visit the college again. As it is located in the district of the member for Torrens, he will no doubt keep me informed about future developments there.

This year, 250 students are attending the college. Regarding the new name (Kingston College of Advanced Education), I refer to the *South Australian Year Book*, which includes the following list of these colleges: South Australian Institute of Technology; Roseworthy Agricultural College; South Australian School of Dental Therapy; Torrens College of Advanced Education; Adelaide College of Advanced Education (formerly Adelaide Teachers College); Murray Park College of Advanced Education (formerly Wattle Park Teachers College); Salisbury College of Advanced Education (formerly Salisbury Teachers College); and Sturt College of Advanced Education (formerly Bedford Park Teachers College). With so many colleges of advanced education, we will need an index to refer to them. Possibly the use of the term "advanced education" is to facilitate grants from the Commonwealth Government. I shall be pleased if, in closing the debate, the Minister will tell me whether that is the reason. The 1969-70 Karmel report on education in South Australia contains reference to pre-school education.

Mr. Evans: Will you read it all?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, but I will read part of it. As the member for Ross Smith is now leaving the Chamber, I will not bore him with this. At page 260, the report states:

The Kindergarten Union runs the only establishment for the training of pre-school teachers in the State, the Kindergarten Teachers College. Students enter, usually after a fifth year of secondary schooling, for a three-year diploma course. A Commonwealth grant of \$670 000 has recently been made to meet the cost of new premises for the college, expected to be occupied by 1972.

As I have said, this building work is now complete. The report continues:

However, the college is financed out of the general funds of the union and, unless special Government grants are made to meet increased running costs, expansion beyond the present intake of 40 students cannot be possible. The capacity of a new college will allow an intake of 70 a year, increasing the total number of students to 199 from its present 105.

The present intake is 250 students. The report continues:

The new building has been designed to allow for later expansion to cope with 300 students, giving a possible output of teachers, after allowing for 10 per cent wastage over the three years, of 90 a year.

Although I support the principle of this Bill, I object to the Government's action in introducing it at this late stage and not allowing members sufficient time to give it the consideration it deserves. This practice is in accord with what the Minister of Education did at the end of the last session of the previous Parliament when he introduced a rewrite of the Education Act. Having registered my disapproval of and objection to the manner and speed with which the Government expects this Bill to be passed, I support it.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In supporting the Bill, I refer to one or two aspects only. As this college is situated in my district, I have watched its growth for many years, and it merits the full support of the community in its work of fulfilling a necessary service by training teachers to become directors of kindergartens. The premises housing this college have expanded from a modest beginning to the present fine building it occupies today. I remind the Minister (who is probably aware of it) that, in the early days, young boys attended this college, and Sir Bruce Ross, an eminent South Australian, was a student. The concept of colleges of advanced education has been discussed for many years, and we now have a broad spread of such colleges in South Australia. I am pleased to see that this college has reached the status it has, and I am sure that, under the auspices of the Board of Advanced Education and the Chairmanship of Mr. Braddock, who would be well known as a former member of the staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology, the college will progress. One immediate benefit, among other things, is the attraction of Commonwealth funds, and this is a most significant feature.

Perhaps we shall now have the maximum number of colleges that can be contained satisfactorily in this State. We have a broad spread of disciplines now taught by them, but I do not know how much further we can go. We see a plethora of such colleges in Victoria, but the future of these colleges remains to be seen. In his second reading explanation, the Minister stated that this college should gradually become a multi-purpose institution. This would be in line with the campus concept, in which I understand several disciplines are taught and which allows students to intermingle. I understand that the original New South Wales University of Technology failed because it changed its concept, formation, and title, and only a few disciplines were taught at that college.

I should like the Minister to explain how this college, which will specialize in training students to become teachers of young children, will become a multi-purpose institution. A fundamental concept of the curricula in colleges of advanced education is that elective subjects are an integral part of the total curricula, and I support this concept I hope that many elective subjects will be available at this college. Whilst the present site is somewhat restricted, open space is available for some campus organization to be carried out. I am not sure whether Miss Davis, the present Principal, who does an excellent job, would consider favourably our concept of equality between the sexes so that young men could be introduced into this college. Most of the five university colleges in my district are now co-educational, and, eventually, all of them will accept this principle.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think St. Mark's has not heard the good news?

Mr. COUMBE: I think it will be forced to change. The present site of the college is almost completely built on, and objections have been raised locally to further expansion. I should like to hear what the Minister has to say about this becoming a multi-purpose institution, because it may not be achieved on the present site at North Adelaide. If it cannot be achieved, will he say what he has in mind?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I will reply to the genuine remarks made by members opposite and I will ignore the viciousness of the member for Kavel—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Come off it!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON —as regards the time of introducing this Bill, because I think it would not matter what Bills were introduced during the last week of sitting: he would still make the same kind of remark.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is a pretty weak rebuttal of a statement of fact.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This Bill is similar to the other colleges of advanced education measures, with which the member for Kavel is familiar and which caused no difficulty when dealt with in this House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That is the only thing to let you off the hook in this case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Kavel apparently seems to think that the desire of those associated with the Kindergarten Teachers College for autonomy is not a desire that should be satisfied as soon as possible, if it can be so satisfied without doing things that could raise a series of questions. Certainly it has been my desire to secure the autonomy of the Kindergarten Teachers College; it has been the desire of those associated with it to obtain that autonomy, and they have been working towards it for some time. While Bills are prepared well in advance, inevitably some order has to be determined in relation to their final drafting and printing, and those at the end of the line are subjected to the sort of vicious attacks we have had from the member for Kavel.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's feeble.

Mr. Gunn: Don't you accept the responsibility for your own actions? You want to pass it on to everyone else.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I accept the responsibility for introducing the Bill at this stage, because I think it is straightforward and because I think the people associated with the college and with all the work that has gone into the preparation of the Bill would want to have the measure put through this session rather than wait for another seven or eight months until the end of this year. That is why I have pushed ahead with it, and I make no apology for it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The same as the Education Bill!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not the same as the Education Bill.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We had six days for that one.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Because of the difficulty we had in getting that Bill printed, the roneoed copies of the Bill were distributed well beforehand, and the honourable member had six days in which to study the measure. That is normal in relation to Bills introduced into this House either by this Government or by previous Governments. But that is enough of that because I am sick of the kind of vicious whingeing the member for Kavel indulges in.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want a Government without an Opposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Nothing of the sort! I am willing to have an Opposition, but I do not like to listen to garbage, and the member for Kavel indulges in too much of it. Part of the garbage contained in his speech was to the effect that the Minister had some sort of dictatorial control over the council. Nothing could be further from the truth and nothing could be further from the truth in relation to any of the colleges established. There is a provision in the Bill that makes clear that any member of the college council has to act as an independent person, and the Minister is in no position to direct any member of the college council as to what he should do.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I agree.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Thank you very much. The member for Kavel seemed to say that the Minister still had dictatorial control. He contradicts his own argument and then argues when I say that the only argument he can produce is garbage. The reason for desiring a multi-purpose activity within a tertiary institution is that students and staff gain from contact with other people operating at the same academic level but not necessarily doing the same course. There is a danger at this college and certain other colleges that a predominantly female membership limits to some extent the kind of contacts that can be made by students and staff of the college. The idea that a college should be multi-purpose is one that has a sound academic basis and, while previously it was a condition for Commonwealth Government finance, this no longer applies. This college has already been financed fully by the Australian Government so the question of the multi-purpose nature of the college has nothing to do with the financial situation.

Mr. Coumbe: I just wanted to know how you were going to achieve it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will come to that when I discuss the site. I think it is fairly clear that so long as this college stays on its existing site it will be difficult for it to establish a multi-purpose character.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, although I am not surprised that there are so few here listening to the Minister of Education.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think the remarks of the member for Eyre are better ignored, as are most of the things he does. The site is restricted, and it will be difficult to establish any significant multi-purpose activity within the college on that site, especially in view of the expanded enrolments that will be necessary at the college if the overall expansion in pre-school education is to take place throughout the State. We hope that enrolments at the college will build up to a first-year level of 150, so that within a few years the college enrolments will be about 450 students, or about four times more than the enrolments in 1969. That is a rapid expansion.

Unfortunately, it will be necessary to achieve that expansion in enrolments within the time required to stay on the present site, because if we were to shift the college the planning stages and building would require a period of four or five years and, if expansion in first-year enrolments in order that more pre-school teachers could be trained depended on shifting the site, it would be four or five years before it would be possible to expand enrolments at the college. In the interests of the rapid development of pre-school education in South Australia, that is not a feasible alternative at this stage. We intend to expand on the existing site without, we hope, encroaching in any way on to other properties in the immediate vicinity. We hope, too, that the City of

Adelaide Development Committee will support our proposal. The funds for that expansion have already been allocated by the Australian Government for the current triennium. The urgency of the expansion in pre-school teacher training is therefore realized by the Australian Government, through its willingness to fund the expansion of this college.

If one can hypothesize and imagine that the college has been shifted to another site and that there are opportunities for multi-purpose development, one cannot say definitely in which way such a development shall occur. One would imagine, in the main, the development having some kind of relationship with the things that are already happening in the college. However, there is a need for additional training of all kinds at the tertiary level. This has resulted, for example, in a course in journalism being commenced this year at Murray Park College of Advanced Education. A nursing education course will commence at the Sturt college, associated with the Flinders Medical Centre, and so on. Many proposals are currently being considered for additional financial support in the current triennium and, indeed, for the expansion of various programmes in the 1976-78 triennium.

Even if a new site for this college was being contemplated, I do not think one could say with certainty what kind of other courses would be established in it. Certainly, I imagine that the college council will be interested in developments that give a more even balance of the sexes, and in developments that will enable staff resources at present available to be used in other courses. The interest would therefore lie in developing courses that had some relationship with what was already being done. That kind of restriction is not necessarily one that can be imposed regardless of other factors. Regarding the multi-purpose aspect, I refer to the Torrens College of Advanced Education and to the way in which it will develop not only in the art areas but also in the general craft areas. That is a logical development, as art and craft teacher training in this State is virtually confined to the old Western Teachers College, and the combining of the School of Art and Western was quite a logical development.

The member for Glenelg raised the matter of the name of the college. I considered this matter carefully, as did Cabinet. True, those associated with the college wanted to recognize Miss DeLissa's contribution in establishing the college. The Government decided not to accept this suggestion, as it was considered that the name DeLissa was not well known in this State other than by those who were particularly interested in the training of pre-school teachers.

Dr. Eastick: Mellor is.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is so, but that name was not suggested. From a longer-term point of view, it was considered that, in order to promote an understanding of the name DeLissa (and the community ought to have some understanding of it), we would permanently identify this college with the training of pre-school teachers to the exclusion of anything else. Ultimately, we hope that on some other site somewhere in Adelaide this college will develop as a multi-purpose institution, and its name should therefore not necessarily be identified purely with pre-school teacher training.

Mr. Mathwin: That would apply to anything, wouldn't it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All the other names are general names and do not carry a certain connotation, apart perhaps from the name of the Institute of Technology. Although it has "technology" in its title, that college of advanced education is branching out with its

activities into many different areas that have no relationship with technology in the mind of the average citizen of this State.

Mr. Coumbe. Predominantly?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Even on the question of predominance, the developments in commerce, librarianship, social work, pharmacy and, indeed, in the paramedical fields generally, are of such a nature and extent that the term "technology" is to some extent a misnomer. Be that as it may, I am not proposing that that should be altered. The remainder of the colleges have general names not associated with a certain form of education. In the past we have not named former teachers colleges in such a way as to associate them purely and simply with teacher education. That is why it was considered that the name DeLissa was not appropriate in this case and that another name would be preferable. I can only repeat that this matter was carefully considered. I have discussed this matter with Miss Davis and Mrs. Simpson, and with others associated with the college, as well as with my Cabinet colleagues, and this conclusion has been reached. I have stated the reasons, which I believe are significant, for the decision to name the college "Kingston" rather than "DeLissa". Inevitably, one must make up one's own mind on the matter.

Mr. Mathwin. Kingston is the name of another person.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is so, but it is the name of a person who happens to be fundamentally related to the history of this State and who was the most outstanding Premier of the last century.

Mr. Coumbe: He was the subject of your maiden speech in this House. If it hadn't been for Kingston, you wouldn't have had anything else to say.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is a he. There were plenty of other things in that speech, as the honourable member well knows. Remarks like that do not do him justice.

Mr. Mathwin: What did Kingston have to do with kindergartens?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What did Sir George Murray have to do with teacher training, or Charles Sturt with teacher training or nurse education? They happen to be well known names in the community which are reasonably euphonious and which roll off the tongue fairly well. They also happen to be names that have historical significance in South Australia. The Government happens to give importance to the selection of those names for that reason. They may not be acceptable to the member for Glenelg and, if that is so, I am sorry.

Mr. Wright: Call it "Hudson House"!

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is not possible, as the member for Rocky River will be pleased to know.

Mr. Coumbe: Would you agree to a "Hudson Memorial Wing"?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Fortunately for all of us, if someone eventually comes along and wants to call Clare High School the Venning Memorial High School, a Government decision excludes the names of current politicians or political candidates from being used on Government or semi-government buildings, and three cheers for that!

Mr. Coumbe: You wouldn't mind having the word "memorial" attached to something named after yourself shortly?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, but if the honourable member is putting in a subtle plug for himself in some

way or another, perhaps it could be considered. I think I have covered most of the points that have been raised by honourable members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Conditions of membership of council."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: During the second reading debate I referred to the ability of the Governor to remove people from office. I have compared this Bill with the legislation dealing with Roseworthy College of Advanced Education, and I have found that the provisions of sub-clause (6) (a) are not included in the latter measure.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): That was an oversight I think the provision is included in legislation dealing with Torrens College of Advanced Education and in legislation dealing with other colleges. It deals with a situation that can arise, and in another State a member of an institution who had reached the end of his tether, to put it kindly, could be removed from office only by a decision of both Houses of Parliament, because in the legislation there was not a provision similar to the provisions in this clause. It seems to us that there should be such a provision in regard to any college or university.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems to me that this provision gives the Governor the necessary power. The Adelaide University Council has had continuing difficulties, and I think the power is essential.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I should hope that something could be done next year or in the next session, when we have had experience of all the relevant Acts, to review them comprehensively, bring them up to date, and remove any inconsistencies or anomalies.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"The Director."

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask the Minister what is the reason for the change in title from Principal to Director.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The other Acts refer to the Director, as against the Principal, and the present council of the college, operating under the aegis of the Kindergarten Union, specifically requested that the word "Director" rather than "Principal" be used. We acceded to that request.

Clause passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Property."

Mr. COUMBE: I seek clarification about what the Minister has in mind in introducing a Bill later to constitute the Kindergarten Union in a new form. Many people have worked hard and have collected funds to operate kindergartens under the aegis of the Kindergarten Union, and these kindergartens help to pay some of the costs. The Kindergarten Union and the college are complementary to each other, but they are separate in many ways. In considering the activities of this college and the impact on the Kindergarten Union, it is important to know what the Minister intends, because students from this college will staff Kindergarten Union kindergartens.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The current legal position is that the Kindergarten Teachers College is part of the Kindergarten Union. That condition means that the employer (the Kindergarten Union) is also the training authority, through the college. That is one of the basic reasons for the whole object of autonomy: that it is not appropriate that the union should be the training authority.

At present, a committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Braddock, and comprising Judge Olsson, Mr. Haines of the Institute of Teachers, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Anders, is recommending to me draft legislation designed to bring the Kindergarten Union under Statute and to establish a pre-school committee.

This action was taken after much thought. When I became Minister, the Kindergarten Union had a budget of \$680 000, including the Kindergarten Teachers College provision. The budget of the union this year will be \$2 200 000, excluding the cost of the Kindergarten Teachers College. In the years ahead, the Government allocation (both State and Commonwealth) to the union will increase significantly. At present, the union has its own constitution, and it would be unwieldy to try to amend that constitution. The Government and I (and perhaps the union) believe that there should be a small amount of Government representation on the board of the union, and that teachers in the field should also be represented (I certainly agree with that). Because the current constitution is difficult to amend, it seems best to create a special Statute for the union. As this may be a hybrid Bill, the matter will probably be referred to a Select Committee.

We aim to regulate the activities of the union by Statute, while maintaining its basic character. Considering the large sums of Government money that will be involved, I believe that it will be in the best future interests of the union if it is brought under Statute, with its activities being controlled by Parliament. I assure members that there is no intention of limiting the ability of local kindergarten committees to work towards establishing kindergartens. We hope they will have the same kind of relationship with the Kindergarten Union that they have had in the past. In view of the large-scale operation now involved, we thought it would be much more satisfactory if the necessary changes were brought about by Statute.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (19 to 27) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second leading.

(Continued from March 26. Page 2727.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill.

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

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—In the title—After “publications;” insert “to amend the Police Offences Act, 1953-1973.”

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 4)—After line 16 insert new definition as follows:

“legal practitioner” means a person admitted and enrolled as a practitioner of the Supreme Court of South Australia.

No. 3. Page 2, lines 22 and 23 (clause 5)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause (2) as follows:

(2) The board shall consist of six members appointed by the Governor of whom—

- (a) one shall be a legal practitioner;
- (b) one shall be a person who is, in the opinion of the Governor, a suitable representative of the major churches in this State;
- (c) one shall be a person who is, in the opinion of the Governor, a suitable representative of publishers;
- (d) one shall be a person skilled in the field of child psychology;
- (e) one shall be a person nominated by the Minister of Education; and
- (f) one shall be a person nominated by the National Council of Women.

No. 4. Page 5, line 16 (clause 12)—Leave out “or public”.

No. 5. Page 5, lines 23 to 25 (clause 12)—Leave out “exercise its powers in a manner that will, in the opinion of the board, achieve a reasonable balance in the application of those principles”, and insert “give priority to the principle that members of the community are entitled to protection (extending both to themselves and those in their care) from unsolicited material that they find offensive”.

No. 6. Page 7, lines 33 and 34 (clause 16)—Leave out “any classification or conditions assigned or imposed by the board to or in respect of a publication” and insert

- (a) any classification or conditions assigned or imposed by the board to or in respect of a publication; or
- (b) any decision by the board to refrain from assigning a classification to a publication”

No. 7. Page 7—After line 39 insert new clause 16a as follows:

16a. *Appeal to Minister* (1) A person who is dissatisfied with any decision of the board to impose any prohibition or conditions or to assign or refrain from assigning a classification may appeal to the Minister against the decision.

(2) An appeal must be instituted within three months after the day on which notice of the decision was published in the *Gazette* by notice in writing, addressed to the Minister, setting forth in detail the grounds of the appeal.

(3) The Minister shall consider any appeal under this section and may affirm, reverse or vary the decision of the board as he thinks fit.

(4) Notice of any decision of the Minister upon an appeal under this section shall be published in the *Gazette*.

(5) An appeal under this section does not suspend the operation of the decision against which the appeal is instituted.

No. 8. Page 8, line 5 (clause 17)—Leave out “by the board” and insert “under this Act”.

No. 9. Page 8, line 9 (clause 17)—Leave out “by the board” and insert “under this Act”.

No. 10. Page 8 (clause 17)—After line 16 insert new subclause (4) as follows:

(4) No person shall sell or distribute any copies of a restricted publication that are not wrapped in accordance with the regulations. Penalty: Five hundred dollars.

No. 11. Page 8, line 26 (clause 19)—After “19” insert “(1)”.

No. 12. Page 8, line 33 (clause 19)—Leave out “or”.

No. 13. Page 8 (clause 19)—After line 35 insert

“or
(d) to have sold, distributed, delivered, exhibited or displayed a publication during a period specified in a certificate subsequently given under subsection (2) of this section in respect of the publication.”

No. 14. Page 8 (clause 19)—After line 35 insert new subclause (2) as follows:

(2) Where an application has been made to the board for the classification of a publication, the board may certify that it is satisfied that during a specified period commencing on the day on which the application was made and ending on or before the date of the certificate appropriate restrictions upon the sale, distribution, delivery, exhibition and display of the publication have been generally observed.

No. 15. Page 9—After clause 21 insert new clause 22 as follows:

22. *Amendment of Police Offences Act.* The Police Offences Act, 1953-1973, is amended by striking out subsection (4) of section 33.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

First, a series of amendments concerning the qualifications of members of the board, apparently to make it a replica of the Queensland Literary Censorship Board, has been written in. The Government does not believe that this should be provided in the legislation. Secondly, amendments require that priority must be given by the board and the Minister to the protection of people and minors from publication of material over the right of people to read what they wish to read. This situation is completely contrary to the principles of the Bill, which previously provided that there must be a reasonable balance between these two desirable ends. The amendments propose that allowing people to read and see what they wish shall be entirely subservient to the question of the publication of material that may be offensive to those who do not solicit it or to people in their care. That concept is not in accordance with the published policy of the Government stated before the election, and the Government does not accept it.

A minor amendment concerns refraining from classification of a publication, and it is undesirable. The previous provisions are adequate in this respect. The last amendment is obviously aimed at introducing this matter into a political area. It is suggested that there should be an appeal to the Minister from any decision of the board, and the Minister must then exercise a personal judgment in deciding whether to overrule the board. The purpose of this amendment is to bring the matter back from an independent board into politics, and it is only for “porn” politics. This device of honourable gentlemen in another place is patent, but it will not be submitted to by this Government. If this is the kind of politics they wish to play, it is a cynical attitude on their part designed to get away from the principle of this measure: that is, to provide proper control in the classification of publications.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments negate the policy on which the Government was elected and defeat the objects of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Dean Brown, Dunstan, Keneally, King, and Tonkin.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room on Thursday, March 28, at 9.30 a.m.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—Insert title as follows:

A Bill for
An Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971, as amended.

No. 2. Page 1—Insert words of enactment as follows:

BE IT ENACTED by the Governor of the State of South Australia, with the advice and consent of the Parliament thereof, as follows:

No. 3. Page 1—Insert new clause 1 as follows:

1. *Short Titles*—(1) This Act may be cited as the “Film Classification Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1973-74”.

(2) The Film Classification Act, 1971, as amended, is hereinafter referred to as “the principal Act”.

(3) The principal Act, as amended by this Act, may be cited as the “Film Classification Act, 1971-74”.

No. 4. Page 1—Insert new clause 2 as follows:

2. Repeal of s.4 of principal Act and enactment of section in its place—Section 4 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted in its place:

4. Film not to be exhibited unless classified—(1) A film shall not be exhibited in a theatre unless one of the following classifications has been assigned to the film in pursuance of a corresponding law or by the Minister:

- (a) for general exhibition;
- (b) not recommended for children;
- (c) for mature audiences;
- (d) for restricted exhibition;

or

(e) such other classification as may be prescribed.

(2) If a film is exhibited in contravention of subsection (1) of this section, the exhibitor shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

(3) The Minister may, by instrument published in the *Gazette*, declare that a classification assigned to a film in pursuance of a corresponding law shall be ineffective in this State and if such a declaration is made—

(a) the film shall bear a classification assigned to it by the Minister in lieu of the classification assigned in pursuance of the corresponding law; or

(b) if the Minister refrains from assigning a classification to the film, it shall be deemed not to have been classified in accordance with this section.

(4) This section does not impose any obligation upon the Minister to assign a classification to a film.

(5) In exercising his powers and discretions under this section, the Minister shall have regard to standards of morality, decency and propriety that are generally accepted by reasonable adult persons in this State.

No. 5. Page 2 (clause 3)—Insert at the beginning of the clause—

3. Enactment of s.11a of principal Act—The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act immediately after section 11 thereof:

No. 6. Page 2 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (1) and insert new subsection (1) as follows:

11a (1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, where

(a) a classification has been assigned to a film by the Minister; or

(b) a classification has been assigned to a film in pursuance of a corresponding law and a certificate has been issued under subsection (3) of this section,

then, notwithstanding any law relating to obscenity or indecency, it shall not be an offence to distribute or exhibit the film in this State.

No. 7 Page 2 (clause 3)—After subsection (2) insert new subsection (3) as follows:

(3) The Minister may issue a certificate stating that he or his nominee has personally viewed the exhibition of a film to which a classification has been assigned in pursuance of a corresponding law and that the classification so assigned is, in his opinion, the appropriate classification for that film to bear.

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

I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. Several amendments concerning the forms of classification present no difficulty. A proposal is made that South Australia should have an over-view, in effect, beyond that of the Commonwealth by some application to the Minister. In relation to films it is necessary for the Minister to have some structure by which he examines locally produced films, but I do not foresee any great difficulty there. It will not mean that I have to view these films, because it is possible to delegate my authority. In these circumstances I see no great objection to the Legislative Council's amendment in this respect, because it should be workable.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): It is an unusual day (perhaps one may say a red-letter day) when the Premier accepts *in globo* a series of amendments of this magnitude from the Upper House. I believe that, in accepting these amendments, the Premier has appreciated the work of another place in bringing forward legislation that will be to the distinct advantage of the people of South Australia.

Motion carried.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 9 and 10 (clause 2)—Leave out the clause.

No. 2. Page 1, lines 11 to 17 (clause 3)—Leave out the clause.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

The purpose of the amendments is simply to remove from the Bill the principle on which the Bill was founded, to give the State Government Insurance Commission the right to write life insurance business. It completely defeats the purpose of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) The amendments are reasonable because the Treasurer has been unable to advise this Chamber or the people of this State how much the new venture will cost South Australia. I accept an earlier statement that this Bill is a result of a recommendation from the commission itself and that it was a matter canvassed before the 1973 election. However, the Government has been unable to give this place or the people of South Australia any idea of the cash flow, the likely profit or loss, and a complete financial report on the measure, and this leads me to believe that the Treasurer

is speaking tongue in cheek when he asks members here not to agree to the reasonable amendments made by another place.

Mr. COUMBE. The amendments affect a fundamental aspect of the Bill which was dealt with by Opposition members in this Chamber when the Bill was before us earlier. Members on this side thought the matter so important that they called for a division on it. Now members on this side are fortified by the action of another place in making these amendments.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Earlier, in this Chamber the Opposition put forward a valid reason why the State Government Insurance Commission should not move into the field of life insurance. I am pleased to see that the other place has obviously seen those valid reasons and, having considered them in a rational and logical way, has decided to agree with us. I therefore cannot support the motion. I think we gave valid reasons why any movement by the State Government Insurance Commission into the field of life insurance would be against earlier promises by the Government, and we also showed how it would react against sound economic management by the commission. I therefore support the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and oppose the motion.

Motion carried

The following reason for disagreement was adopted: Because the amendments defeat the object of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs Arnold, Dunstan, Nankivell, Olson, and Wright.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 10 pm.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message requesting, in accordance with Joint Standing Order 1, the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment of a joint committee on the Bill.

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

That the House of Assembly do not concur in the request of the Legislative Council for a joint committee on the Bill.

The reason I move this disallowance—

Dr. Eastick: Did you incite those people out there yesterday?

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: You are suggesting—

Dr. Eastick: You were out there with them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition suggests that I incited people who gathered outside the Chamber yesterday. I resent that suggestion and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has objected to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. Will the Leader withdraw the statement?

Dr. EASTICK: No, because the statement I have been asked to withdraw was not the statement I made I said. "Did you incite those people yesterday?" However, I have been accused by the Minister of saying that he incited the people yesterday. They are two entirely different matters I cannot withdraw my words.

The SPEAKER: in view of the statement of the Leader of the Opposition, I ask the Minister what is the statement to which he objects?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I withdraw my point of order in view of what the Leader of the Opposition has said, although I cannot see what logical reason there could have been for asking that question I ask members to reject the Legislative Council's proposal for the same reasons that were canvassed here in an earlier debate.

Mr. Coumbe: Can you please explain the message to me as I do not have a copy on my file?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The point has been taken by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he does not have a copy of this message on his file.

The SPEAKER: The message is the one I read to members yesterday. So far as I am aware, that message has been printed.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is obvious to members on this side that rather than defeat this legislation outright, as some members of the Legislative Council would have wished to do, those members decided to stall the implementation of this legislation by carrying the second reading—

Mr. Gunn: You are frightened of—

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —and this lactic was thought of in an attempt to delay the operation of the Bill. There is no question about that in my mind. The motion we are considering is to establish a committee consisting of members from both Chambers.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you scared of the truth?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The member for Davenport should talk about being scared—

Mr. Dean Brown: You are scared of the facts.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —of the facts of the matter. I point out to him once again that this matter has been reported on by a committee established by Ministers of Environment to study the facts. We know the facts, and the Opposition knows the facts but does not want them implemented in the legislation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has moved a motion and, as it is difficult to hear his comments, I ask members to refrain from interjecting. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know what would happen if the committee was established, it would be sitting in two years time and the members of the committee would, I think, never be satisfied with making a decision on this matter. The object of the Legislative Council's motion is to delay the introduction of the measure and, at the same time, try to make it appear that another place does not oppose the move made by the Government. I am not willing to accept the Legislative Council's motion. I certainly hope that the Opposition does not continue with the same altitude as it expressed in identical terms, making it clear (and I know what we may expect here) that it has been canvassed and caucused and has decided to try to defeat the Government's object in this matter.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): To say that I am disappointed at the Minister's speech is to say the least. First, he imputed certain motives to another place, and I consider this to be out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whether the Minister was out of order rests with the Speaker.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister imputed motives to Opposition members which I believe to be completely incorrect. When this matter was being debated in this Chamber I moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House of Assembly. I made clear what my motive was at the time: simply that the Bill should be investigated further because we were considering for the first time in South Australia a different type of deposit system.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It has been applying for years.

Mr. COUMBE: We were considering a different type of deposit system in this State, including the setting up of certain types of collection centre. Collection centres exist in various parts of the State, but we were considering setting up a certain type of centre working under a certain method, as set out in the Bill. The object of my motion at that time was to give people interested in the subject an opportunity to express their views. The Minister may be generous enough to recall (and I think I repeated it once or twice) that the Opposition was not necessarily opposed to the deposit system, because such a system already applied in the State on certain types of container. However, we said that we were considering this type of container.

Surely the Minister had nothing to hide in having the Bill referred to a Select Committee of the House on which he would have had a majority. However, the Minister chose not to accept my motion. The Bill then went to another place, where it was decided that the motion now before us be considered, namely, that a joint committee be set up. Incidentally, such a committee can provide equal representation from both sides in each Chamber. The Minister has said that the committee will still be considering the matter in two years time, but the motion provides that the committee must report on the first day of the next session. The Minister may say to me, "Having got that in, the committee could say that it had not concluded its investigations, and could seek leave to report at a later date." The sincerity of the mover of the motion is shown because the committee is ordered to report on the first day of the next session. The other place could have moved a motion without including those words, and the Minister knows that.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It was moved that way, too.

Mr. COUMBE: We are considering a motion that provides that the committee is "ordered to report on the first day of the next session".

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That was the Liberal Movement's idea.

Mr. COUMBE: What will happen if the motion is carried? We will have a joint committee of the two Chambers to investigate the whole problem. The Minister said that he and his Ministerial colleagues in the other States had considered this matter and come to some kind of arrangement, or that they had issued a report. I forget the Minister's exact wording, but I know that "report" was used by the Minister. I hope that I am not misquoting him. Opposition members have not seen the report, nor has the Minister tabled it so that we could have had the benefit of it. Government members may have had the benefit of it, but I do not know. I assume that it is a Ministerial report. The public has not seen the report. To the best of my knowledge, if members of the public had seen the report the Opposition would have seen it. Why has the Minister not tabled the report? One of the objects of

a Select Committee considering the whole problem would be that the points made to the Ministers to enable them to compile the report could possibly be made to a Select Committee.

Surely people who appeared before the committee would be welcomed by the Minister. They would be not only the consumers (who, after all, are important), but also producers, retailers, conservationists, and people interested in the total environment who could tell the committee what they believed should be done. I would be willing to accept the committee's findings. I moved the other day to refer the Bill to a House of Assembly Select Committee. However, it is now to be a joint committee. Surely many other Bills of less consequence than this measure have been referred to Select Committees.

Regarding the Minister's allegation of a delaying tactic, Opposition members throw that back in his teeth. The idea is to obtain further information not for the Government or the Opposition but for the benefit of the people of the State, so that this problem may be considered in a complete and proper light. If it is proved that the way set out in the Bill would be the best method, it should be adopted. However, there is at present some doubt in the minds of certain people whether this is the best method to adopt; that is the crux of the matter. Different views have been expressed in this House, in another place and by the public. The best way to resolve these matters is to allow the public to come forward and give evidence so that the best method can be ascertained. After all, what we want (and I believe all members will agree with me in this respect) is to ascertain the best method of control, and to implement it. The Minister has postulated one method, but the Opposition has said that it is not sure that it is the best method.

The Hon. L. J. King: The Leader was sure when it was first announced.

Mr. COUMBE: I am talking about this debate. Incidentally, the Leader put his point of view when he spoke in the debate, and I know that he would be willing to get up now and repeat what he said then. It is obvious what his feelings are on this matter. The Government has advanced the proposition on which it maintains a certain point of view, but the Opposition is not sure that that is the best method. However, it wants the best method, and it believes the best way to ascertain what is the best method of tackling the disgusting nuisance of litter on our roads and in the community is to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. The public would welcome such an inquiry, to which they or their representatives could give evidence.

The matter of deposits has been raised. The Opposition said recently that a deposit system was already operating in this State and that it was working quite well. However, the Government proposes a different type of system. This aspect should be inquired into to see whether this is the best method to adopt. The Minister referred to several deposit values. Indeed, he referred to the deposit of 1c and 5c on different types of container. Are these deposits correct?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: Should they all be the same, or should they be different?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yes!

Mr. COUMBE: These are the matters that affect the public. It should therefore have the right to come forward and give evidence to a joint committee, which must report back to Parliament on the first day of next session.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We know what that means.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister says that the motion to refer the Bill to a joint committee should be opposed. However, most of what he said was a tirade of abuse because of the action taken in another place. He said first that the Opposition was using delaying tactics. This was a strong point of criticism in his speech, and he went on to criticize honourable members for the action that they had taken. He also made certain allegations.

In supporting this motion, I am not influenced by any consideration other than to try to obtain the best possible result for the people of South Australia. It is on that basis, and because I believe reference to a joint committee to be the best method (seeing that the Minister did not agree to my earlier motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee of this House) that I will support the Legislative Council's request and vote against the motion moved by the Minister.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): We have received a genuine request from the Legislative Council for this Bill to be referred to a joint committee. We have seen the Minister stand up today and accuse another place of playing politics—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That's true.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —but let us look at the evidence before us. The Minister has constantly gone out and deliberately tried to whip up public support for this legislation. He has stood up and said, "The Legislative Council is trying to stop this; it is trying to play politics." But who is trying to play politics: none other than Brutus Broomhill himself!

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You knew a week ago that this was in the wind.

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has played politics in this issue. Indeed, he has played politics in his handling of the whole situation: the mere fact that he has gone to the public in the way he has and tried to whip up public support—

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister today—

Members interjecting:

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Payne: Why shouldn't he go to the public?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister now stands up and says, "We have already examined the situation; we have received a report."

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We have.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: But where is that report? If the Minister has that report—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We have.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —why has he not released it to members? Even the Deputy Premier claims that a report has been made, but why has it not been tabled?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is impossible to hear the remarks of the honourable member for Davenport above the terrific din.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister claims to have received a report. If it is a genuine report which comes out in support of the legislation, and if it is a thorough report, why has it not been tabled? One can draw only one conclusion: that the report is not worth the paper on which it is written. Obviously, the report is inconclusive, and obviously it has not been

thorough. If it was, the Minister would certainly have offered members a copy of it. The Minister has taken a stand which shows clearly that he is afraid to face the facts and to hear the evidence that would be presented to a Select Committee. Does that not make him an unreasonable man?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Claim that I am an unreasonable man. Go on!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am claiming that the Minister is unreasonable. The very fact that he rejects a genuine offer to refer the Bill to a joint committee shows that he is unreasonable.

Mr. Burdon: Where do you stand?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the Legislative Council's request, and I reject the motion moved by the Minister. The Opposition has said that it is concerned about conservation and that it wants to see this State's litter problem cleaned up as quickly and as effectively as possible. However, it has raised doubts as to how effective and constructive this Bill is, but the Minister has not been willing to examine them. That, of course, makes him an unreasonable man.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The very fact that Government members are interjecting almost like a chorus of monkeys suggests that they are trying to make a political issue of this. Members on this side supported the second reading but asked that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The Minister had every opportunity of ensuring that the Select Committee was a Select Committee of this House; he would have had the numbers on the committee and he could have determined when the committee would report back. If the Minister was really concerned about collecting the facts and if he had wanted a Select Committee report as soon as possible, he would have accepted our plea for a Select Committee of this House. But no! We see from the evidence that the Minister is not concerned about collecting the information. He does not want a Select Committee of any type, even if it was to report back later this year. If he had wanted a Select Committee to report back, he would have accepted our proposal. We cannot possibly support the Minister's motion, which tries to make political capital out of this issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I find myself in an unusual situation.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can hear a chorus from the Liberal and Country League, led by the member for Rocky River. I believe that I made a mistake last week in the way in which I spoke on this matter. That is an admission which I suppose not many of us make in this House; I do not often make it myself. When I spoke in this debate last week I supported the second reading of the Bill and said that I would support the move for a Select Committee. I have discussed this matter with various people since then. Over the weekend we had a Liberal Movement convention. Although this topic did not come up formally, many people discussed it with me. Since those discussions I have received a letter from one of those people, and it has led me to conclude that I was wrong in saying that I would support a Select Committee. I certainly support the Bill, and I now believe that I made a mistake in saying that I would support a Select Committee.

I could have let this go and not said anything, because whatever I do when the vote is taken I will not affect the result. However, I believe that, on a matter that is very important and of deep principle and significance, I should state my position. The letter from which I shall quote reflects the sort of thinking that has caused me to have second thoughts on the question of a Select Committee. I am sorry that the member for Bragg is not here to hear this letter. Ah! He is arriving now, and he could not have come at a better time, as he is mentioned in the letter. The following is part of the letter:

Until I joined the Liberal Movement I had never belonged to a political Party. I joined the L.M. largely because of its policy on the environment as set out in a pamphlet entitled "Liberal Movement on Environment" and sent to me by my representative in the State Parliament, Dr. Tonkin, who was at the time a member of the L.M.

The writer of the letter has obviously moved since she received that pamphlet. The member for Bragg will be relieved to know that she now lives in the Mitcham District. The letter continues:

On Saturday, March 23, when I approached you about the Beverage Container Bill, you quoted part of paragraph 6 49 of the Jordan report. To me that indicates a very superficial approach to the matter. That report was published two years ago, and the position continues to worsen. Of much deeper significance and equally applicable to the subject of the Bill are paragraphs 2.139, 2.140, and 2.143.

I will not quote the paragraphs that she sets out in her letter, but members can see them on pages 70 and 71 of the report; they deal with the use of the world's dwindling resources.

Mr. Payne: They would deal with the argument of the member for Davenport.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure that he is aware of that part of the report. The letter also states:

On Thursday, March 21, I attended a lecture by Professor M. W. Thring of University College, London, entitled "A rational world policy for energy" and sponsored by the Royal Australian Chemical Institute. Professor Thring stated that if we are to attempt to prevent almost certain disaster the energy consumption per capita per year must be reduced (or increased for the under-developed countries) to the present average for the world. That means that for the U.S.A., energy consumption must be reduced to about one-sixth of its present value; for Australia the figure is perhaps one-quarter to one-fifth. Does the remark—

the remark that the writer refers to is the remark I made which was quoted in the paper—

that the can manufacturers should be given "one last chance" show the slightest comprehension that such reduction in the use of energy is necessary?

In the last week I have thought about this matter a great deal as a result of what this person and others have said to me, and I have concluded that I should support the Bill as it stands, although I have some reservations about some parts of it. It would not be worth while waiting the extra three or four months—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Or more.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister knows how long the recess will be.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Select Committee could adjourn again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is carrying uncharitableness too far, but I agree that it is possible. I concluded that I was wrong in supporting a Select Committee, and I therefore support what the Government is doing now—rejecting the Legislative Council's proposal for a joint committee.

Mr. Rodda: If you can acknowledge this once, you will acknowledge it again, and leave the Liberal Movement,

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is ever-hopeful, usually without the slightest foundation. He has shown that again in this instance. There is no chance whatever that I will come to that conclusion. The honourable member may just as well speak to the member for Bragg or, indeed, the member for Hanson, who were shadow Liberal Movement members; they are only a shadow of their former selves. I support the view of the Government.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre). I am disappointed, although not surprised, at the Minister's attitude. We realize that the Labor Party will never accept any proper suggestion from members on this side or from another place. On this occasion the member for Mitcham has admitted that he made a mistake. I consider that he has made many mistakes in the past 12 months, but this is the first one he has admitted making. However, I will not go on with that matter at this stage.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: I know that Government members, particularly Ministers, would like to digress because they have been caught out at their game. They are proving that they do not want the people who will be affected to scrutinize the legislation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The best scrutiny is obtained by putting it into operation, and you know that

Mr. GUNN: That is nonsense. In the second reading debate we stated clearly that we wanted the matter examined properly, because too many questions had been left unanswered. If the Government is so greatly concerned about the litter problem, I will put it to the test and see how genuine it is. We will test the Minister and see whether he is genuine. The member for Elizabeth wants to destroy the can industry in this country and the member for Florey, by interjection in the debate, made wild and untruthful allegations, under privilege, about people in this House. He has reflected gravely on the standing and integrity not only of members on this side but also of people in business who have not the right of reply on the floor of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! This debate will not be turned into a personal issue, and the honourable member will refrain from making accusations against other members.

Mr. GUNN: I shall be pleased to continue, but there seems to be some difference. Members on the Government side have, during the whole of this debate, cast reflections on members on this side and on other people. I said I would put Government members to the test. I intend, when the House meets in June or July next, to introduce legislation for on-the-spot litter fines.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You want to goad them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre must speak to the subject matter before the House.

Mr. GUNN: I foreshadow my intention and I do not intend to be put off by what the Minister says, because he has already said that education is silly. We should not educate people! He is on record as having said that, so we would expect the interjection that he has made. The member for Mitcham has spoken about the world energy requirements. I ask whether the honourable member has considered how much energy will be required to collect and process cans. I have been told (and I have no reason to doubt it)—

The Hon. L. J. King: Who sent it to you?

Mr. Coumbe: It is available in the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. GUNN: I completely deny the Attorney-General's allegation that I am under instructions. Members on this side do not act under instructions, nor do they sign obnoxious pledges as the Attorney-General does. We can think for ourselves.

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Rocky River wants to persist in superseding the authority of this House, I will have to deal with him under Standing Orders. There can be only one Speaker with authority in this Chamber, and the honourable member has been warned previously. Next time the honourable member does that he will be dealt with. The motion before this House is that a certain matter be referred to a joint committee, and this is not a second reading debate. The question of referring a matter to a joint committee does not allow an open second reading debate.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to debate the matter before the House, because members should consider it seriously. I fully support the decision made by another place, because it will allow all sections of the people affected to give evidence to the committee. For the Minister to claim that this is only an avenue of indefinitely stalling or deferring the Bill is complete nonsense.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, the Minister has not read the document before us. It states that the committee is to report on the first day of the next session.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It can report that it wants another 12 months to consider the matter, and you know that.

Mr. GUNN: We have seen how the Government operates, but I am confident that the L.C.L. would not resort to that skulduggery.

The Hon. L. J. King: We don't share your confidence.

Mr. GUNN: Members on this side and members in another place want justice to be done. The Government is obsessed about the representatives of the steel can industry and anyone else—

Mr. Duncan: It seems as though you're the representatives of the steel can manufacturers.

Mr. GUNN: I take exception to that remark and ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre has taken exception to a remark that I did not hear. I ask the honourable member to say what were the remarks to which he took exception.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Elizabeth said that members on this side were agents of the steel can manufacturers. That is completely untrue and a reflection on members on this side, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold that it is a remark to which objection could be taken.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, I take strong exception. The remark is unparliamentary and has cast aspersions on members on this side. I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre has asked for a withdrawal of a remark made by the honourable member for Elizabeth. Does the honourable member for Elizabeth desire to withdraw his remark?

Mr. Duncan: No, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, the Government is hell bent on diverting the argument before us. It will use every method at its disposal to hoodwink the nation and the people. It does not want legislation to have proper scrutiny. The

Minister of Environment and Conservation says that he has a report that has ample evidence in it to convince this House and the people of this State. Why does he not table the report?

Mr. Becker: He's not game.

Mr. GUNN: He has not the courage of his convictions. Did the people who advised him and who helped draft the Bill also prepare the report? If the Minister has confidence in the report, why does he not table it so that not only members of Parliament but also the people can see it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think sufficient heat has been generated in this debate already, and it is time honourable members cooled down and debated the matter calmly. Once again, I point out to the honourable member for Eyre that there is a substantive motion before the House "That the House of Assembly do not concur in the request of the Legislative Council for a joint committee on the Bill." I point out that the debate on such a motion must not be as wide as is a second reading debate. I have warned the honourable member for Eyre previously. I do not want to take direct action against him but, if he insists on continuing to debate this motion as if he were making a second reading speech, I will have to inform him of his rights.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister referred to the report when he spoke to the motion, I thought I would have the same privilege. This report was used by the Minister as the basis of his argument in opposing the proposal of the Legislative Council. He has now refused to make that report available to members on this side and to the general public. He has suggested that we contact the Premier of Queensland (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) and obtain a copy from him. It is disgraceful to suggest that, if members of this Parliament cannot obtain documents, they should get them from another State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wasn't serious, was he?

Mr. GUNN: We have to take him at his word.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I don't think he's that stupid.

Mr. GUNN: I will not comment on that. I do not want to reflect personally on the Minister although, in view of his inconsistent attitude, it would be easy to do so. I am disappointed that, in an important matter such as this, the Government is willing to leave so many questions unanswered. We have not been given sufficient information. I have still not received from the Minister a reply to inquiries I made in January. Many people in the community require information of this type. I believe people generally would like to see this matter properly ventilated and all questions answered. The Minister should take a sensible course, allowing the Bill to be referred to a joint committee that could report back to Parliament on the first day of the next session. That would not be a holding-up operation, it would simply allow the proper democratic processes to take place. If the Minister does not accept this proposal, he will prove again that the Labor Party is a reactionary and conservative body.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Mr Speaker, you asked for a quiet and reasoned approach to this matter.

Mr. Keneally: Then why are you speaking?

Dr. EASTICK: I hope that members opposite, including the member for Stuart, will allow me to say the few words I want to say in a quiet and reasoned way. Several reasons have been given why the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, but so far only one reason has been given by the Government in opposition to this proposal. The member for Mitcham said what action he might take on the basis of what he called new information.

Although I may suspect the nature of the information. I point out that what he says raises the point that should be considered. All information available should be marshalled to determine what benefit or lack of benefit will derive from this Bill. A prominent overseas authority has recently raised the problem associated with energy. Which will involve the use of more energy: the can or the bottle? Cans are crushed and recycled. Refillable bottles are heavy and must be cleaned, refilled, rehandled, and so on. Possibly they would have a far greater effect on the energy problem than would steel cans.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the honourable Leader to the fact that the substantive motion before the Chair is "That the House of Assembly do not concur in the request of the Legislative Council for a joint committee on the Bill." Once again, I point out that the subject matter of this debate is whether or not there should be a joint committee. This motion does not allow for open debate, as is permitted during a second reading debate. I ask honourable members to confine their remarks to the substantive motion before the Chair.

Dr. EASTICK: With due respect, I have simply been giving reasons why we should agree to the request of another place. As the member for Mitcham has pointed out, we must consider what course is in the best interests of conserving energy. The member for Elizabeth would not withdraw the statement he made. In fact, he was withdrawn from the Chamber by the Premier, and one can only suspect that he was given a little education. The Minister of Education also wants to join the band wagon by claiming that members on this side are agents of the can industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't say that.

Dr. EASTICK: I point out that members on this side are charged with a responsibility: we do not need to be the agents of any organization. As individuals, we want to make a contribution to this debate and to take part in the decision made by the House. We want this matter examined more closely. I point out that the effect of this measure will be to increase the worker's beer price by 5c a bottle, instead of 1c a bottle as the Minister suggests.

The Hon G. R. Broomhill. Nonsense!

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister knows that what I say is true, but he wants to walk away from the responsibility of examining this matter. I support the Legislative Council's proposal, and oppose the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs Broomhill (teller), Max Biown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Rus-sack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Arnold.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

[Sitting suspended from 6.4 to 7.30 p.m.]

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2—After clause 5 insert new clause 6 as follows:

Enactment of s 78a of principal Act 6. Power to award compensation against Crown—The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 78:

78a. (1) Where a person suffers loss or injury as a result of the wrongful act of a child who is under the care and control of the Minister, that person may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction against the Crown for the recovery of compensation for that loss or injury.

(2) A court before which an action is brought under this section may award such compensation as it considers just to compensate the person by whom the action is brought but no such compensation shall be awarded unless the court is satisfied on the balance of probabilities—

(a) that the Minister has failed to exercise proper measures to control the child by whom the loss or injury was caused;

and

(b) that the plaintiff would not have suffered the loss or injury if in fact the child had been properly controlled by the Minister.

(3) A court is competent to entertain an action under this section if it is competent to entertain claims in tort of or above the amount sought in the proceedings under this section.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

The amendment is, in substance, the same as one moved in this Chamber previously. I explained on that occasion the reasons why the Government was unable to agree to the amendment, and I have nothing to add to what I then said.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Government's attitude is inflexible and most unfortunate, because an opportunity exists for it to take the initiative and bring into effect a scheme that is needed. Even Government members have emphasized the financial difficulties that can arise from damage to property. In an English matter (*Home Office v. Dorset Yacht Company Limited* (1970) 2 A.T.I. E.R. 390) Lords Morris, Reid, and Pearson, of the House of Lords, expressed their opinion that the Home Office was responsible for damage to property caused on an occasion when Borstal inmates left that establishment. The case was before the Lords on a question of law only. The issue before Their Lordships was that youths had escaped from a Borstal home and had taken a yacht. While they were in charge of the stolen yacht, damage had been caused to a second yacht. The owners of the second yacht sued the Home Office for payment of damages. It was held that a duty of care was owed to the owners of the second yacht, even though the damage was caused by a third party (the Borstal youths), and that there was no immunity from liability on the grounds of public policy. It was considered that the taking of the yacht and the damage to another yacht should have been foreseen if a proper degree of control was not exercised by the authorities. The fact that the damage was caused by a third party did not obviate a duty by departmental officers to the respondents.

The Attorney-General's attitude is that he would have to lock people up to prevent them from causing damage. That is not exactly the true position. As in the case I have cited, the people concerned should at least be under adequate supervision to prevent their causing damage. The Attorney-General may fear that this would impose too great a responsibility on him, as Minister, and on his officers, but he must accept total responsibility.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. One would have thought the Attorney-General would be a little more flexible in his attitude. The Government must accept some responsibility in this matter. People from institutions are in the care of the Government, and that is where the responsibility lies. In the case of an escapee causing damage to property or stealing a motor vehicle, the unfortunate owner has no claim if the property is not insured.

In some cases the property is irreplaceable, and the Attorney should consider the victims of these offences, because many of them are ordinary people and unable to afford such a loss. I expect the Attorney to support the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: It is the less fortunate members of society who will be penalized if this amendment is not accepted. Often the Attorney has strongly urged members to support consumer protection legislation and, therefore, he should accept this amendment. The general public should not have to suffer losses caused by damage to their property by juveniles who have escaped from institutions, and the Government should accept the responsibility of providing some compensation for these people.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: People in my district are unfortunate because of the siting of McNally Training Centre. In 1972, about 360 people escaped from this centre, and in 1973 there were 280 escapes. Opposite this centre is situated the Magill Home for the Aged, and there have been many reported thefts of motor vehicles from this home. Therefore, property should be protected against this type of offender, and people in my district should not be penalized because the Community Welfare Department has selected that area in which to establish a training centre and because that department has so little apparent concern for the security in the centre. Whilst his department allows a policy of boys moving in and out of the centre with some freedom, the public's property should be protected. I therefore fully support the amendment and hope that the Attorney-General, being a reasonable man, as members know he can occasionally be, will also accept it.

Mr. EVANS: I believe the amendment is reasonable and, whether or not the Government accepts it, I consider that a future Government will do so. There is nothing wrong with society's accepting, through the Minister, parental responsibility when the laws of the country have decided that the Minister should accept the responsibility of a parent, and that is exactly what this amendment means. Not all people insure their properties against damage; nor should they be obliged to do so. If a property is not insured, the responsibility of paying for repairs to damage falls on the parent involved. There is, therefore, nothing wrong with society's being responsible. All members, if they are responsible, should support the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I, too, support the amendment. When the Committee considered this matter previously, the only argument that the Attorney-General advanced against it was that it would cost money. However, when a person's property has been damaged and the Crown is liable, the matter of cost should be only a secondary consideration. A person whose property is damaged may not have covered it by insurance. Although the Attorney-General has advanced some comprehensive measures to protect the public in relation to other matters, he does not now seem disposed to give people a chance to obtain redress. The Attorney-General's attitude is inconsistent with that adopted in the past to most measures for which he has been responsible.

Mr. RODDA: I agree with the member for Fisher that, if this Government does not accept the amendment, a future Government will enact this provision. I have seen people suffering in the manner referred to by the member for Davenport when Struan House in the South-East was operating in its former role. I, too, support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Langley and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Coumbe and Evans.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendment is unworkable and involves the expenditure of public money on a wrong principle.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is intended to achieve three purposes. It effects metric conversions in the Gas Act, 1924-1969. In addition to converting imperial measurements it substitutes the term "heating value" for "calorific value". The former term is now preferred, and the definition of "calorific value" contained in the principal Act is no longer appropriate, because it relates to gas saturated with water vapour, whereas the majority of natural or refinery gas now supplied in South Australia is free from moisture, or very nearly so. Provision is made in the amendment to the first schedule for the standard of heating value of other manufactured gases to be related to gas saturated with water vapour.

Thirdly, the Bill empowers the South Australian Gas Company to pay dividends to its members at a rate of interest approved by the Treasurer, removing the present maximum rate of interest of 8 per cent. This has become necessary, as the present rate approved by the Treasurer and paid on South Australian Gas Company bonds exceeds the maximum dividend rate. This is inequitable to the members and, accordingly, it is intended to allow the dividend rate to be related to the long-term bond interest rate. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 deletes the definition of "calorific value" from section 5 of the principal Act and inserts a new definition of "heating value".

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive replace the word "calorific" with the word "heating" in sections 8, 9, 12, 17, and 18 of the principal Act. Clause 8 also amends section 18 by replacing the term "British thermal units" with the word "megajoules". Clause 9 amends section 27 of the principal Act by removing the maximum rate of interest payable on dividends and providing that the rate be a rate approved by the Treasurer. Clause 10 amends section 36 of the principal Act which empowers the South Australian Gas Company to charge a rental for standby meters where the consumer has not used more than 300 cubic feet (8.49 m³) of gas in a month. The amendment alters the figure to 10 cubic metres, which equals about 353 cubic feet. The position of the consumer is therefore slightly improved.

Clause 11 amends the first schedule by providing metrically expressed standards of heating value for the Adelaide, Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Mount Gambier supply areas.

The conversions from British thermal units for Adelaide (natural gas) and Whyalla (simulated natural gas) are exact. For Port Pirie the exact conversion is 18.7 megajoules, and this has been rounded off to 18.5 megajoules. The figure of 24.6 megajoules for Mount Gambier is fractionally below the present standard. This has been requested by the Mount Gambier Gas Company Limited to enable it to provide uniformity in its various undertakings. The Director of Chemistry considers that the slight reduction in heating values in the case of Port Pirie and Mount Gambier will have no noticeable effect on the performance of appliances. Clause 12 also converts the tests for purity and pressure of gas so that they are expressed in metric terms. This Bill is a hybrid Bill and will, in the ordinary course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It has as its principal object the making of amendments to enable the principal Act to be consolidated under the Acts Republication Act, 1967. It also contains certain amendments that are consequential on or consistent with other legislation enacted by Parliament. Clause 1 is formal. Regarding clause 2, paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) are consequential on the change of title from Commissioner of Crown Lands to Minister of Lands. Paragraph (c) strikes out the definition of the "Western Division of the South-East".

That definition and other related and consequential amendments to the principal Act were enacted by the Land Settlement Act Amendment Act, 1948, but those amendments have never been used in the administration of the Act. The Land Settlement Act initially provided *inter alia* for the acquisition of under-developed land either by agreement or by compulsory acquisition. The 1948 amending Act provided for the acquisition of any land in the Western Division of the South-East, whether the land was under-developed or not.

The Western Division of the South-East was defined in the schedule to the principal Act by reference to specific sections in various hundreds in the counties of Grey, Robe, MacDonnell and Cardwell, and that schedule was enacted by the 1948 amending Act. Many of those sections have since been renumbered and some have been subdivided, and therefore the description of the Western Division of the South-East as presently contained in that schedule is out of date; and, if the schedule is retained in the Act, it will need considerable investigation to up-date it before the Act is consolidated and no useful purpose would be served by such investigation, as no land in the Western Division has ever been acquired; nor is it intended that any such land will be acquired in the future. In other words, the schedule and all references to it in the Act are now a dead letter, and accordingly this Bill proposes to repeal them. Clause 3 repeals section 10 of the principal Act, which fixes the salaries of the Chairman and members of the committee. These salaries were last fixed in 1969, but are capable of being altered by regulation under the Statutory Salaries and Fees Act.

The amendment of one Act by regulations made under some other Act is not a desirable procedure, and clause 3 enacts a new section 10 to provide that the salaries and rates of salaries may be fixed from time to time by determination of the Governor and, until the Governor determines otherwise, shall be the same as they were immediately before this Bill became law. This procedure would retain the same flexibility in the fixing of salaries without referring to any specific amounts in the section that would be capable of alteration, and would become out of date if amended by regulation under the Statutory Salaries and Fees Act.

Clause 4 converts two references to 20 miles in paragraphs (a) and (b) of the proviso to section 11 (1) to 32 kilometres, being the nearest practical conversion. Clauses 5 and 6 make consequential amendments. Clause 7 makes amendments that are consequential on the repeal of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925, and the enactment of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969. Clause 8 makes further consequential amendments.

Clause 9 repeals section 27a of the principal Act. This is consequential on the repeal of the definition of the Western Division of the South-East by clause 2 (c) and the repeal of the schedule by clause 16. Clause 10 is also consequential on the repeal of the definition of the Western Division of the South-East by clause 2 (c) and the repeal of the schedule by clause 16. Clauses 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 are consequential. Clause 16 repeals the schedule to the principal Act which, as I have already explained, is a dead letter.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill, if approved by Parliament, will enable the South Australian Meat Corporation Act to be up-dated with a view to being consolidated and reprinted under the Acts Reproduction Act, 1967. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definition of "stock" in section 3 by including "buffaloes" in the definition. This is consistent with the proclamation published in the *Gazette* on August 22, 1963, declaring buffaloes to be stock for the purposes of the Act. Clause 3 amends section 7 by redefining the metropolitan abattoir area by reference to present council boundaries. Clause 4 amends section 30 by adding in paragraph (c) after the passage "Superannuation Act, 1969, as amended" the passage "or any corresponding subsequent enactment". Clauses 5, 6, and 7 make metric conversions, and clause 8 makes a grammatical amendment. Clause 9 is a consequential amendment. Clause 10 repeals section 110 of the principal Act which is now obsolete.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It provides for the conditional registration of dentists. It sometimes occurs, especially in the case of foreign graduates coming to live in South Australia, that the board is not satisfied that the applicant for registration is fully competent to practise dentistry without supervision or restriction. The board may, however, be satisfied that the applicant is competent to practise dentistry in restricted aspects or is competent to practise dentistry provided that his work is supervised. At present the board has no option but to refuse legislation to such applicants. In several cases this is neither fair to the applicants nor in the best interests of the State. The Bill therefore enables the board to grant registration subject to conditions. Under these conditions the applicant may be prevented from practising dentistry otherwise than under the supervision of a registered dentist, or the aspects in which he may practise dentistry may be restricted.

The Bill also provides that all fees payable under the Act shall be as prescribed by regulation, and provides for the payment of application fees in relation to the various registrations that may be effected under the Act. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the annual fee payable by a registered dentist shall be fixed by regulation. Clause 3 provides for the conditional registration of certain applicants. Clause 4 provides that a dentist shall pay a prescribed application fee for registration, together with the first annual fee (which is refundable if registration is refused). Clause 5 provides for the deregistration of a dentist who contravenes any condition subject to which his registration was granted. Clause 6 provides for the fees that are payable upon application for registration as a dental auxiliary.

Clause 7 provides that the annual fee payable by a registered dental auxiliary shall be fixed by regulation. Clause 8 provides for the fees that are payable upon application for registration as a dental clinic. Clause 9 provides that the annual licence fee payable by a registered dental clinic shall be fixed by regulation. Clause 10 makes it an offence for a registered dentist to contravene any condition subject to which his registration was granted. Clause 11 provides that no appeal lies against a decision of the board to refuse conditional registration or to deregister a dentist on the ground that he has acted in contravention of a condition subject to which his registration was granted. Clause 12 provides the power to make regulations prescribing the fees payable under the Act.

Dr TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (WARRANTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 2662.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Bill is merely a procedural one to alter the provisions for the return to gaol of a person who breaks parole outside this State. At present two members of the Parole Board may demand the return of a person who is within South Australia. However, when a person has moved to another State, an order is required from a court, judge, policeman, stipendiary or special magistrate, coroner, justice of the peace, or officer of a court. The position is unworkable and creates much delay. Therefore, this amendment has been introduced to provide that two members of the Parole Board, acting with a justice of the peace, may demand the return of the person, and the Liberal and Country League Opposition supports the Bill.

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

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 3—After clause 11 insert new clause 11a as follows

11a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 33—Drains to public sewers—Section 33 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (3) the passage "or premises".

No. 2. Page 3—After clause 12 insert new clause 12a as follows:

12a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 44—Power to drain lands—Section 44 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (3) the word "are" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "is".

No. 3. Page 4, line 8 (clause 15)—Before "any" insert "build".

No. 4. Page 4—After clause 17 insert new clause 17a as follows

17a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 66—Government land and premises—Section 66 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "which are" first occurring and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "which is".

No. 5. Page 5—After clause 19 insert new clause 19a as follows.

19a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 78—Initiation of liability to rates—Section 78 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (4) the word "become" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "becomes".

No. 6. Page 5, line 22 (clause 20)—After "amended" insert "—

(a)"

No. 7. Page 5 (clause 20)—After line 24 insert the following:

and

(b) by striking out from subsection (3) the passage "a poundage of one shilling" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "interest at the rate of five per cent per annum".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. They are drafting amendments to which there is no objection. They do not alter the content or intent of the Bill.

Motion carried.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 4, line 10 (clause 16)—Before "signed" insert "and".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to. I support the amendment, because it is important.

Mr. COUMBE: I support the Legislative Council's amendment. I am pleased to see that the Minister has taken cognizance of the wisdom of the other place.

Motion carried.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 5 to 8 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

"hypnosis" includes any activity or practice prescribed as being hypnosis for the purposes of this Act "

No. 2. Page 14, line 22 (clause 32)—After "32" insert "(1)".

No. 3. Page 14 (clause 32)—After line 29 insert new subclause (2) as follows:

(2) On or after the expiration of the third month next following the commencement of this Act, a person other than a registered psychologist shall not, without the consent in writing of the Minister (proof of which consent shall lie upon that person) use or have in his

possession any prescribed instrument or prescribed device.

Penalty: Five hundred dollars.

No. 4. Page 14 lines 30 to 34 (clause 33)—Leave out the clause.

No. 5. Page 15 line 31 (clause 38)—Leave out "A person" and insert "On or after the third month next following the commencement of this Act, a person".

Amendment No. 1:

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

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

This amendment alters the definition of "hypnosis". The members of the Select Committee on this Bill will recall that the definition of "hypnosis" in the draft Bill was subjected to some criticism by witnesses, who claimed that there could be confusion with certain other trance-like states that did not really amount to hypnosis. Nevertheless, the Select Committee took the view that the definition should stand. For reasons good or bad, the Legislative Council has taken a different view, preferring to rely on the ordinary meaning of the word "hypnosis". Frankly, I think this makes little difference. I am willing to accept the amendment, and I hope other members will do so, too. The Legislative Council has added the rider that there may be included in hypnosis any activity or practice prescribed as being hypnosis for the purposes of this legislation. This gives the opportunity to those administering the legislation to prescribe a certain practice, if that is desirable.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Legislative Council's amendment, which gives a degree of flexibility that was not so apparent in the original provision. There is a doubt in the community about some practices that go on under the name of hypnotherapy. A warning was given previously that any practice considered to be against the best interests of people in the community would certainly be considered by this Parliament. This amendment allows those administering the legislation to move more quickly, whilst still requiring the matter to be scrutinized by Parliament. I inferred from the Attorney's remarks that he thought that the Legislative Council did not quite know what it was doing in making this amendment, and I think that suggestion is a little uncharitable. I believe that the amendment shows that members of another place are aware of the danger that exists of some unwanted practice being followed in the community under the guise of hypnosis.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the motion. A possibility exists that people engaged in stage hypnosis can get over the provisions in this legislation by having a stage show that is conducted for the purpose of hypnotherapy; in other words, they would make a spectacle out of the legitimate treatment, under hypnosis, of certain conditions. There is something a little obscene about the practice of hypnosis as entertainment. The present amendment will satisfactorily solve this problem.

Mr. McRAE: I support the motion on the same ground as stated by the member for Bragg. There is no more degrading spectacle than the use on stage of so-called hypnosis. It is only a question of time before those who profess to be able to make entertainment out of something so deep-seated in the human psyche cause tremendous damage and irreparable harm. I am deeply intolerant of those who degrade human beings by making fools of them in the alleged practice of hypnosis on the stage. They are renegades and hypocrites.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 2 and 3 be agreed to.

These amendments are related. New subclause (2) empowers the administration to make regulations prescribing an instrument, and it then becomes unlawful for a person other than a registered psychologist to use or have in his possession that instrument or device. I do not know that any immediate purpose is likely to be served by this provision. I do not have in mind any instrument which, on present indications, would be likely to be prescribed. However, in legislation of this type, this is probably a useful provision to have. To be perfectly frank, I should say that the Select Committee concluded that the provision in the original Bill, which would have prohibited the use of the E-meter, was not practicable and could not be recommended. I do not want to lead anyone into thinking that, by accepting these amendments, I have in mind prescribing the E-meter, because I do not have that in mind. I realize the value of having a general power included in this legislation, and I recommend that the amendments be accepted.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree that the E-meter is not the predominant factor, but several reservations have been expressed that make it desirable to include a provision to allow for regulations to be made. I trust that this power will never be used, because I hope the circumstances for its use will never arise but, if any group develops an instrument through which people can be exploited, this legislation will be able to control it.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5:

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 4 and 5 be agreed to.

These are drafting amendments. An overlapping occurred between clauses 33 and 38 but, as amended, clause 38 adequately covers the ground previously dealt with by these two clauses. I recommend that the Committee accept the amendments.

Motion carried

[Sitting suspended from 8.22 to 9.16 p.m.]

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MISCELLANEOUS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 9.25 to 9.45 p.m.]

CONFERENCES

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conferences with the Legislative Council on the Classification of Publications Bill and the State Government Insurance Commission Act Amendment Bill to be held during

the adjournment of the House, and that the managers report the results thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and there being an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House I accept the motion to suspend Standing Orders. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have a point to make on this matter, Mr. Speaker. The Premier in his motion has provided that the managers shall report forthwith when we sit again. I presume that that will be at 2 p.m. tomorrow, and that will cut into Question Time unless some special arrangement is made for the full hour of questions. I do not mind there being reports forthwith on these matters, so long as we do not cut into Question Time on the last day of the session. Unless I can obtain an undertaking from the Premier that we will get that, and get a good time of the day (not at 5 p.m. tomorrow) for a full hour of questions, I am not willing to agree to this motion. Is the member for Mallee saying something about an urgency motion?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is addressing the Chair.

Mr. Nankivell: It would cut out Question Time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What? Is Question Time being cut out tomorrow?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have said enough to make my point. On behalf of all members on this side (even if Government back-benchers are not interested in asking questions tomorrow), I seek an undertaking that members will get a full hour of Question Time tomorrow, because I point out to the Premier that it will be the last opportunity that members have for four months, on the estimate of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, to ask any questions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition naturally raised this matter with the Government at a time when the member for Mitcham and his colleague were not here. I naturally gave an undertaking that a full hour of Question Time would be allowed tomorrow to enable members to ask their questions, and that will be done.

Mr. Millhouse: His own members don't even seem to know.

The SPEAKER: Order! Although this is the penultimate day of sittings, I remind the honourable member for Mitcham that he has still one more day to go.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 28, at 2 pm.