

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, December 11, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

CANNERIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As several proprietary canneries have closed recently, leaving growers in an unfortunate situation, will the Attorney-General consider amending the Companies Act to provide that, in relation to the debts of canneries, the growers will be considered as secured creditors and, consequently, given preference in relation to the allotment of moneys on the winding up of canneries?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter is being considered.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. ARNOLD: During the last few months the Government has given considerable time and study to the situation concerning water licences. Can the Minister of Works make a statement on this matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As this matter is of considerable interest to many people and as members have asked questions about it, I have prepared a full statement. The issue of water licences under the Control of Waters Act for irrigation purposes on the Murray River has concerned the Government since coming into office. Following receipt of an inter-departmental committee report on diversion uses, the Government has carried out intensive investigations into the whole future use of the river system. The indiscriminate granting of large acreages in recent years, aggravated by some unauthorized plantings, has led to the necessity of severely curtailing further acreage increases, which in turn has posed special hardships for the small and incomplete plantings of many diverttees. Bearing in mind the responsibility to protect the whole future of the Murray River system in South Australia and at the same time to provide some relief to the small applicant, the Government intends to introduce a new system of regulating diversions for irrigation purposes from the Murray River as follows:

- (1) That a water allotment be issued to diverttees instead of the existing water licence and that water be made available by measure instead of for a given number of acres as at present.

- (2) That meters be installed on all diversions, that the Government supply and install these meters at Government expense, and that an annual meter rent be charged according to the size of the meter.

- (3) That any unauthorized plantings occurring subsequent to the commencement of these regulations will be vigorously prosecuted in the interests of all other diverttees.

- (4) That, in order to protect permanent plantings, a basic allotment be granted for horticultural purposes, with special allotments for agriculture and vegetables, and that steps be taken in a year of restriction to ensure that reasonable restrictions be applied to agricultural plantings and vegetables before horticulture, without severely penalizing non-horticultural crops.

- (5) That those applications for increased acreages received prior to December 1, 1968, below a maximum total holding of 50 acres be granted and that no increases above this size be permitted in the present circumstances. Processing of these applications will be undertaken expeditiously.

The necessary proclamation and regulations to give effect to the above decisions will be prepared immediately to give those who wish to make vital arrangements the opportunity to proceed in the immediate future. It must be strongly emphasized that there is a real and definite need to have the South Australian allotment of water increased as well as the adequate storage of Murray water at Chowilla. The effect of the above proposals means that some relief will be given to the small diverttee in genuine need of expansion to his property but that, in order to protect the safety, and indeed the whole future of the Murray River system, no further increases can be permitted until a more satisfactory arrangement can be negotiated in regard to the State's share of Murray waters and improved irrigation distribution methods can be introduced by producers.

MILLICENT COURT

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the appointment of a clerk of court at Millicent?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: An experienced female court clerk has been engaged to assist the clerk of the court. This arrangement has relieved the clerk of court of considerable clerical work and is working quite satisfactorily. It is therefore not intended at this stage to appoint a full-time clerk of court.

CHILD ADOPTION

Mr. McANANEY: The application of a married couple in my district to adopt a baby has been approved for about four months, and they cannot understand the reason for the delay in adopting a child, as they believe that a number of babies is awaiting adoption. Will the Attorney-General obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sorry to hear of the delay; I hope it is not undue. I will inquire about the specific case, if the honourable member can give me the name so that I can pursue the inquiry. I point out, however, that it is not as easy as taking a baby and giving it to the first prospective adoptive parents who may be on the list. It is a matter of great care to match as well as we can babies to prospective adopters in the hope that the child and the parents will, in future years, be compatible and that the child will fit into the adoptive family. This means that frequently it is necessary to wait until a baby is available who will, it is expected and hoped, fit in with the adoptive parents. This may be the reason for the delay (it often is the reason for the delay in these cases) but, if the honourable member gives me the information I have asked for, I will certainly inquire.

RAIL FARES

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago, as a result of a question I asked the Premier, he announced that it was proposed to increase rail fares throughout South Australia, or at least in the metropolitan area. In a subsequent question, I requested the Premier to give special consideration to avoiding any increase for metropolitan passengers who had to travel some distance to and from work and who were therefore already experiencing considerable outlay each week in the payment of rail fares (in some cases the outlay could be \$2.50 or more a week). The Premier promised to consider the representations I made, and I believe he can now give a report on the matters and provide the details of the unpleasant pre-

Christmas news he has for people living in the metropolitan area. Will he give that information?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a short reply on this matter. The Railways Commissioner has reported that tentative fare schedules have been prepared and are now the subject of a very close examination. Specific information cannot be given until the full report has been considered and finalized. When this is done, Cabinet will consider the matter.

Mr. Broomhill: Will it be in time to be a Christmas present?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sure it will be considered as soon as this close examination has taken place. The consideration should not take much time, but, as yet, the Minister has not brought the schedules to Cabinet. When he does that, we will take fully into account the honourable member's representation.

ROAD CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about contract work in district council areas?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The ability and capacity of councils to undertake construction work on behalf of the department will be considered before contracts are let for roadworks. Where councils are capable, there is no reason why they should not continue to carry out debit order works to the same extent as they are at present. However, care will be taken to avoid building up councils' work forces and equipment purely for short-term construction works that will not continue over a long period of years. In these cases, it is more economical and satisfactory for peak requirements to be met by contract construction. The effect of the Government policy to undertake more work by contract will not in itself, therefore, require any council to dispose of equipment or to retrench locally-employed personnel.

HOUSE INSPECTIONS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A constituent of mine at Whyalla has had a house built, first on temporary finance and then on a loan secured from the Savings Bank of South Australia. He has found serious faults in the roof of this house, although it was inspected by the local government inspector and the Savings Bank inspector. I have approached the Savings Bank to see whether he can be helped in his dilemma. The Savings Bank says that

it is not responsible or liable for supervision of construction of the building but is responsible only for periodic inspection. An inspection was only external, because the house was closed and the inspector could not get in. The bank has lent \$7,500 on this house and the owner can have recourse only by engaging a solicitor and endeavouring to get rectification by the builder. I have an architect's report on the house, which states, amongst other things:

I find it difficult to understand how such construction can go undetected when this building must have been subject to inspection by both the City Commission building inspector and by the lending authority's inspector. It does not, in my opinion, need any great degree of building knowledge to see that the construction of the roof above the rear porch was unsound and inadequate.

Cracks are being caused to appear in the house, and the architect's report, which is in great detail, gives particulars of many deficiencies in the house. Will the Premier find out whether the method of inspection apparently generally adopted by the Savings Bank of South Australia can be vastly improved, particularly because of the large amount of money laid out on house purchase, and also whether this man can be helped by having this matter rectified by the builder?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to take this matter up with the bank on two aspects: first, as the honourable member has suggested, the general matter of inspection being a safeguard to purchasers and, secondly, on behalf of the owner. I should appreciate being given particulars of the name and address of that person.

MONARTO CROSSING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question about the Monarto rail crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is the practice on all Australian railway systems to erect warning signs at level crossings, in accordance with the standards laid down in the Standards Association Road Signs Code. In order that such signs shall be effective and be clearly visible by day and night, it is essential that they be sited as close as practicable to the carriageway. It is also necessary that these signs be protected as far as possible against damage by passing vehicles. Accordingly, fencing is erected by the Railways Commissioner and painted white so that it will be clearly visible and effectively define each

crossing. The Railways Commissioner is obliged, under the provisions of his Act, to construct such fences so that they will prevent the straying of cattle or horses on the railway. He is also obliged to construct, at openings in such fences provided for the passage of trains, an open ditch or ditches across the railway or other works, and to maintain such obstacles at all times, in order to comply with the stated provisions of the Act. It is essential that such fences be substantial. However, consideration has been given to the possibility of modifying the type of fencing used hitherto and trials have been initiated with the aim of meeting the conflicting requirements of a substantial obstacle on the one hand and a diminished likelihood of secondary damage to a road vehicle after collision with a train. Reverting to the narrowing of the distance between the fences at level crossings, it should be pointed out that such a provision ensures that the level crossing warning signs are within the angle of vision of approaching motorists and also it serves to act as an additional indication of the presence of a railway. To maintain the fences at full roadway width at such points would tend to render the motorist oblivious to the presence of a level crossing.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the committee that will consider the occurrence of train derailments in this State and also about whether the report will be made available to members of this House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport states that the inquiry is one which obviously must be of a highly technical nature seeking to establish the cause or causes of derailments. Its purpose is to find these causes, and in no way is it appointed to conduct a witchhunt. The Government cannot say on what lines the inquiry will develop, but every facility to conduct its inquiries will be given to the committee by both the Government and the Railways Commissioner. It could be that the committee will find it necessary to seek information from other railway systems. This may or may not be given on a confidential basis. It is for reasons such as this that my colleague said, "The Government will make a statement that will be read in this Council." The committee's duty is to report to the Government. If it is in the public interest to make the report publicly available, this will be done. A decision in this regard,

however, can be made only when the report is received. The honourable member will note the reference to information that may have to be sought from other railway systems. It may be that the information from such systems in other parts of Australia would not be forthcoming if they knew the information they gave would be subject to public scrutiny. However, it is not the Government's intention to retain it as a secret document, any more than it is necessary in the public interest to do so.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about the derailment of a goods train between Gawler and Elizabeth?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The three HS hopper waggons which were involved in the recent derailment near Elizabeth were subsequently weighed and their gross weights were 67 tons 4cwt., 68 tons 2cwt., and 74 tons 18cwt. respectively, the corresponding payloads being 49 tons 2cwt., 49 tons 12cwt., and 55 tons 13cwt. These waggons are incapable of carrying 65 tons, as mentioned by the honourable member. It will be seen that one waggon exceeded the gross load of 72 tons which is permissible on the South Australian Railways, but pending the finding of a joint inquiry concerning the derailment, it is not possible to say whether this excess loading had any bearing on the accident. The 65-ton load referred to by the honourable member would have represented a gross load exceeding 83 tons. Generally, Imperial Chemical Industries tends to be slightly below the maximum gross load of 72 tons rather than to exceed it.

BREATHALYSERS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of November 19 regarding the States in which the breathalyser is used as an aid to detecting offences for driving under the influence of alcohol; what percentage of alcohol registered on a breathalyser is considered the maximum limit in each State; of the States that use breathalysers as a detecting device which ones use it mainly after an offence has been committed; whether any States conduct spot checks, similar to checks on driving licences in this State; and whether there has been any effect on the accident rate in this State as a result of the use of breathalysers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member asked a question in a number of parts. The first part concerns those States in which the breathalyser is used as an aid

to detecting offences for driving under the influence of alcohol. The answer is Western Australia, South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, Queensland; and it is believed that the Australian Capital Territory and New South Wales intend to use the breathalyser but it is not known whether they have passed enabling legislation yet. I do not think New South Wales has, and I am not sure about the A.C.T. The second part of the question concerns the percentage of alcohol registered on a breathalyser which is considered the maximum limit in each State. The answer is that there are two separate offences relating to "drinking and driving" in each of the States. The first is the more serious drive under the influence offence, which in South Australia is described in section 47 (1) of the Road Traffic Act. The second is the less serious statutory offence in respect of persons who drive a motor vehicle while having more than a certain concentration or percentage of alcohol present in their blood. The South Australian equivalent is described in section 47b (1) of the Road Traffic Act. The statutory levels at and over which it is an offence to drive in the different States (separate from their drive under the influence offence) are as follows:

Western Australia, .08 per cent (.08 grams or more of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood); South Australia, .08 per cent; Victoria, .05 per cent; Tasmania, .08 per cent; Queensland, .10 per cent (with the proviso that if the analysis provided for in the Queensland legislation indicates a concentration of .08 per cent or more, then the driver's licence is automatically suspended for 24 hours).

Newspaper reports concerning A.C.T. and N.S.W. indicate the following (and for the A.C.T. I rely on the *Advertiser* of April 22, 1968):

The Minister of the Interior expected to soon advise that police recommendation for introduction of voluntary breathalyser tests for a 12 month trial period with a .08 per cent level has been accepted.

For New South Wales, I attribute my source of information to the *News* of November 7, 1968.

Mr. Hudson: You're playing it hard.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I always play it hard. The present report states:

The Transport Minister announced that he would introduce legislation to authorize "breath tests" before the end of the month. He said that a motorist with .08 per cent would be charged as unfit to drive. Motorists would be required to take a roadside chemical test.

The third question concerns the matter of which of the States that use the breathalyser as a detecting device use it mainly after an offence

has been committed. Regarding Western Australia, section 37B (1) of the Western Australian Traffic Act refers, and in brief sets out that a member of the Police Force in that State can only require a "breath test" if he has reasonable grounds to believe (1) that a person was the driver of a vehicle which occasioned or was the cause of personal injury or damage to property; or (2) that a driver has committed any offence against their Traffic Act in which driving a motor vehicle is an element; and that person had at the time alcohol in his body.

In South Australia, section 47c (1) of the Road Traffic Act is applicable. A member of the Police Force in this State may require a person to submit to a "breath test" only where he believes on reasonable grounds that a driver has behaved whilst driving or attempting to drive a vehicle in a manner which indicates that his ability to drive is impaired. The practical effect is that a driver must first attract attention through his driving before the police can ask for a test and it guards against random testing. The honourable member may recall that when the Bill was before the House there was some controversy and discussion about whether we should have random roadside tests. This idea was canvassed in the Royal Commission's report, but it was decided by the then Government, and that decision was supported by both Houses, that we should not.

In Victoria, the appropriate reference is section 408A (4) of the Victoria Crimes Act. It is worded in substantially the same terms as the South Australian section. We have obviously closely followed the Victorian legislation. In Tasmania, section 41 (c) (1) and (2) of the Traffic Act refers to this matter. In that State a member of the Police Force may direct a driver to submit to a "breath test" if he has reasonable grounds for suspecting that the person concerned may have consumed intoxicating liquor at the time of his being in charge of or attempting to drive a motor vehicle.

In Queensland, it is section 16A of the Traffic Act. A member of the Police Force in that State may request any person found by him to submit to a "breath test" if he suspects on reasonable grounds that such person was driving or attempting to drive a motor vehicle, and having regard to his behaviour such person had alcohol in his body, or in relation to the motor vehicle in question such person had committed any offence against the Traffic Act, or was in charge of a vehicle involved in an incident resulting in any per-

sonal injury or damage to property. Details are not known about A.C.T. or New South Wales.

In reply to the fourth part of the question (whether any conduct spot tests), no information is available about Western Australia, Victoria, Tasmania or Queensland, although the wording of their various sections, referred to in paragraph 3, does not appear to provide for this. Spot checks (random testing) are not conducted or provided for by legislation in South Australia. No parallel can be found in the various Statutes relating to "breath tests" with the South Australian "check on driving licence provision" of section 98 of the Motor Vehicles Act.

The fifth part of the question concerns whether there has been any effect on the accident rate in this State as a result of the use of breathalysers. The reply is that it is still far too early for any assessment to be made in this connection. The legislation enabling "breath testing" was only proclaimed on November 24, 1967. Accident statistics are available for the six months' period ended June, 1968, but cannot be compared with the corresponding period ended June, 1967 (when there was no compulsory "breath testing"), because there has been a change in the criteria for determining the classification of casualty accidents and the number of injuries involved in same. This change took place during the change-over from manual compilation to data processing of accident statistics, and no comparison will be able to be made until the statistics for the six months ending June, 1969, are available.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: I was concerned, as were several farmers, at the statement made by the Chairman of Directors of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, at a meeting held in the Kadina Town Hall on Friday last, that South Australia was losing out to other States on shipments of grain to Asian countries because this State's ports could not accommodate large bulk-grain carriers. In view of this alarming statement, will the Minister of Marine ask Cabinet to have a full investigation made by the Public Works Committee into the deepening of Wallaroo harbour, to enable this port, which has always been recognized as the major exporting port for grain, to compete with ports in other States in accommodating large bulk-grain carriers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I did not have the privilege of hearing the speech of the Chairman to which the honourable member has referred, I can inform him that I, as Minister, and members of my department are clearly aware of this point and have been considering the matter closely. However, I will now consider the specific matter concerning the Wallaroo harbour.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. NANKIVELL: At 4 p.m. yesterday, when the bells rang, I was asking a question of the Minister of Lands, and I now repeat it. It was supplementary to a question asked yesterday by the member for Victoria concerning Bool Lagoon. In his reply the Minister said that this water was being let out of Bool Lagoon and was being conveyed through Drain M (which, he proudly said, had a capacity of 700 cusecs) and was being tipped into the sea at Beachport. Can the Minister say whether consideration was given to diverting this water up Baker Range Drain, because floodwaters have been below normal this year, Alf Flat is nowhere near full, and a large area that is normally flooded by Baker Range Drain could well do with this water? If this matter has not been considered, will the Minister consider the possibility of diverting the balance of this water in that direction?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I reported as a fact, and not with pride, that Drain M could take 700 cusecs: nevertheless, it is a fact for which I think all members, as well as the Land Settlement Committee, can take some credit. I understand there is no possibility in present circumstances of diverting water from Bool Lagoon into any drain other than Drain M. The purpose of doing this is to get rid of the water quickly. Now, having obtained the necessary photographs and waited for the nestlings to hatch, grow, and become independent, we must take the next step of getting rid of the water quickly, so that the floor of the lagoon is in a condition in which a proper channel can be cut, so that the water can be drained more effectively in future. In these circumstances it is not possible to divert the water in a northerly direction. Normally, it would not be an impossible excavating task, but in the circumstances that face the drainage board at present it is not practicable.

TOURIST FACILITIES

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the cleanliness of toilets in hotels and roadhouses?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As promised, I took up the matter of the cleanliness of hotels and roadhouses with the Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism. The Director-General of Public Health has reported that the problem of cleanliness and attractiveness of facilities provided for the travelling public is important in regard to both health and tourism. Clean toilet and ablution facilities have a special importance, and both the Public Health Department and local boards of health pay attention to this matter. The Director-General has not been able to find evidence of spread of disease from dirty installations of this kind, except through the medium of flies. But the aesthetic effect is important both for the general community and the tourist industry. His department has one health inspector employed full time in ensuring compliance with the requirements of the Food and Drugs Act and the Health Act in licensed premises. Other inspectors and medical officers from the department pay special attention to hygiene and sanitation in places open to the public in the course of their general inspection work.

Local board inspectors, especially in tourist areas, also pay particular attention to public facilities of this kind. Numbers of hotels, motels, and roadhouses have increased considerably in recent years, and the mobility of the people has increased even more. This has required a greater effort by health authorities to ensure satisfactory environmental conditions. The matter was stressed last week in Port Lincoln at a public health conference of departmental officers and members and officers of all local boards of health on Eyre Peninsula. Greater efforts are being made, and success is being achieved in many places; but it is clearly neither possible nor desirable for health inspectors to be on hand at public premises all the time. Responsibility for cleanliness rests directly on the occupier. Advice and help are always available on request from the Public Health Department or local authorities and unsolicited inspections and reports are made, and corrective action is ensured, as frequently as is reasonably possible.

If members would care to call the attention of the department to any specific examples of unsatisfactory conditions, arrangements will be made to inspect them and ensure whatever remedial action is necessary. My colleague the Minister of Tourism has similarly commented that, without specific information as to the premises complained of, it is possible to deal with the matter in only a general way.

Certainly there are some premises which could be improved. Both hotels and roadhouses are governed by the Health Act. Hotels are under the supervision of the Superintendent of Licensed Premises who has reported that any complaints concerning licensed premises, including hotels and restaurants, should be reported promptly to him so that appropriate action can be taken. The Superintendent says it is well known in the liquor trade in this State that the South Australian hotels on the average are far superior to those in any other State in the Commonwealth as regards facilities generally, toilet facilities, and cleanliness, etc., and it is his intention to strive to continue to improve the facilities.

GAS TANKER

Mr. VIRGO: I refer the Attorney-General to the following article which appears in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday of this week:

A rail tanker able to carry 15,000 gallons of bottled gas, or enough fuel to supply 750 houses for three months, will arrive at the South Australian Gas Company's Osborne plant at 10 a.m. today.

The tanker, in fact, arrived on schedule. The report continues:

The tanker, built in Sydney at a cost of about \$40,000, will transport gas from the Port Stanvac refinery to Sagasco plants at Osborne and Brompton and to depots at Renmark and Naracoorte.

As the South Australian Railways Islington workshops are fully equipped with machinery, manpower and the know-how to construct all types of rolling stock of the highest quality, will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport the reason why this tanker was built in Sydney and not at the Islington workshops owned by the South Australian Government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I guess that this was probably a decision taken before the present Government came into office (I do not know), but I will have inquiries made, and the honourable member will be notified (as I guess he would like the information as quickly as possible) by letter.

THEVENARD HOUSING

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the housing problem at Thevenard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: On April 29, 1968, a call was made for engineers at various locations, including two positions at Thevenard, and in connection with the

latter location the advertisement stated that barracks and hostel accommodation was available for single men. Two married applicants were appointed to the positions at Thevenard. In his application, one of the applicants stated that he was married but did not refer to the matter of accommodation, while the other stated that he required either a house or temporary barracks accommodation as a single man. Before the appointments were actually made, both employees were written to pointing out again that departmental housing was not available at Thevenard and inquiring if they were prepared to accept the appointments without such housing. One of the applicants stated that, if no departmental accommodation was available, he would attempt to acquire private housing in Thevenard and would accept the appointment. The other raised certain complaints regarding the lack of departmental accommodation and stated that he sought the position at Thevenard only to maintain status and remain there until he could obtain a similar position elsewhere. He went on to say that he did not wish to be bypassed because of lack of departmental accommodation. Accordingly, his application was permitted to stand.

The first applicant referred to will shortly be granted departmental housing at Thevenard. The other, who stated that he sought the position with a view to transferring as soon as possible, cannot be provided with a railway cottage. It is understood his wife is at present boarding at Thevenard. There are no children in the family. It would be appropriate to point out that one of the appointees was junior to another applicant, who was not recommended because he endorsed his application "house required".

BUS SERVICE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about a private bus service that traverses Valley View?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The bus service referred to is one of several licensed services operated by Lewis Brothers Coach Services in the Para Hills, Clovercrest and Valley View areas. These services were instituted at a time when the areas were sparsely developed and when the limited number of roads suitable for bus traffic left little choice in determining bus routes. Considerable housing and road development has taken place over the years and some of the bus

services have recently been re-routed in order to serve more effectively the present-day requirements of the majority of residents.

TIMBER TREATMENT

Mr. BURDON: Representations have recently been made to me about a married couple in the city who about two years ago built a new home in which they installed hardwood flooring of Tasmanian oak. As many of us know, most of the species of Australian eucalypt, particularly sapwood, are subject to attack by the powder-post borers (lyctus) and, indeed, the floor of the house concerned has been attacked by this borer and virtually ruined. Although I understand that in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria regulations provide that this timber must be treated before it is sold, I understand that there is no such provision in South Australia and Tasmania. Although I should prefer people to use South Australian radiata pine, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests to consider, in the interests of people using various hardwoods in the future, implementing regulations providing that the timber must be treated?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will discuss that question with my colleague.

WIRRAPPA ROAD

Mr. RICHES: Last week the Attorney-General promised to obtain for me a report from the Minister of Roads and Transport on the Highways Department's attitude towards sealing of the road between Port Augusta and Wirrappa. I said then that the Commonwealth Government blamed the State Government for not getting on with the work, that the State Government complained that it was not getting a grant from the Commonwealth Government, and that the Commonwealth Government claimed that it had provided special grants from which this work could be financed. In the meantime, the years have gone by and the road has been left in a deplorable state. The Attorney-General will recall that he said he believed the Minister of Roads and Transport would not let the matter rest. Has he a report from the Minister to hand or can he give me information on the matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid the report is not to hand; I hope it will be ready tomorrow. If it is not ready tomorrow, I (or the Minister) will later inform the honourable member by letter.

COMTEL INTERNATIONAL

Mr. HUDSON: My question concerns former employees of Comtel International Proprietary Limited, a company now in the hands of the receiver. The former employees are still owed wages and holiday pay by the company and have been informed by the receiver (Mr. Winter) that no money is available to pay them at this time. The sum of about \$3,000 is involved. However, the former employees are led to understand that the company is still awaiting payment of a sum of \$20,000 from the Highways Department for the installation of an inter-communications system in the new building at Walkerville. Will the Attorney-General raise this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport as one of urgency to see whether or not the statements I have made are correct and, if they are correct, to ensure that this payment to Comtel International or to the receiver is made as rapidly as possible so that these former employees can receive before Christmas the wages and holiday pay owing to them?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

BIRD LIFE DESTRUCTION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the effect of weed poisoning at roadsides on bird life?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received a report on the matter, extracts of which are as follows:

The first detailed poisoning experiments in South Australia were carried out on a 13,500-acre property which was a waterfowl research area used by the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department. Over 120 species of Australian birds have been recorded on the property and despite the laying of 650 miles of poison trail within a few months, as well as some limited follow-up poisoning since, there were no observable deaths of Australian birds. There have been one or two instances of individual birds being killed and, in the case of sparrows and starlings, deaths have occurred when the poisoning takes place close to the roosting spots. It is the considered opinion of many biologists that the harmful effect of rabbit grazing far outweighs the disadvantages of 1080 when used by persons who have been trained in its proper use. In fact, the application of present-day poisoning techniques has given confidence to many landholders that they can keep their rabbits under control without the need to destroy standing scrub. Thus, in many cases over the past few years, the proper use of 1080 has resulted in the preservation of native vegetation (often described simply as rabbit harbour), thus assisting in the conservation of bird life. If a landholder is still not convinced about the use of poison on his

roadside then there is nothing to prevent him eradicating the rabbits in any other way he sees fit. To sum up:

- (a) There is no evidence to suggest that 1080 accounts for many bird deaths.
- (b) There is a considerable amount of circumstantial evidence to suggest that 1080 is not a risk to any bird species.
- (c) Native vegetation, of utmost importance to the survival of birds, is dramatically changed by rabbit grazing. Poisoning achieves the control of rabbits without the need of removing the scrub.
- (d) Poisoning on roadsides is permissible by councils which are encouraged to use only trained personnel.
- (e) Councils having access to 1080 are closely supervised in its use by the Director of Lands.
- (f) There will be no need to use 1080 on roadsides where a landholder eradicates the roadside rabbits by some other method.

I might add that 1080 is widely used throughout Australia in fauna reserves.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. RODDA: I wish to refer to the use of radiata pine in bushel boxes used by people in the citrus industry. The Citrus Organization Committee's newsletter has pointed out that people using these boxes can choose from the bushel box, the cardboard container and the Bruce box, all of which are acceptable containers for fruit. My district has some case mills which contribute considerably to the welfare of some of the major towns. For instance, there is the mill of A. W. Donnelly at Penola and the case mill at Naracoorte, both of which make substantial contributions to the economy of the towns. It appears that many people in this industry are under the impression that they must use the Bruce box exclusively. This is not the case, as has been clearly shown in the newsletter to which I have referred. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Forests to have brought to the notice of those concerned that any of these three containers can be used?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question of last week about service stations?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I even had this yesterday. I point out that the honourable member apparently considers that the lessee of a service station is an employee.

Mr. Virgo: No.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member's question read in that way. The terms of a lease between an oil company and the lessee of one of its properties are not known to the Government, which believes in encouraging free enterprise. If a person considers that it is a good business opportunity to become a lessee of a service station, this is his own concern and there is no award which applies unless that lessee employs labour, when his employees would be subject to the appropriate award.

GUMERACHA FACTORY

Mr. GILES: Some time ago, I told the Premier that there was a vacant building in the Gumeracha township that would lend itself to some type of industry, and he asked me for further information about the building. I now have that information. The building is 69ft. long x 90ft. deep, and this part has a concrete floor. The front is of solid construction. There is an annex on the side, 30ft. x 24ft. and not cemented. The whole of the building is at tray height. I hope that this information will enable the Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Industrial Development, to help establish an industry in this building.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall seek further details from the honourable member, especially on such matters as price, availability of the building for sale, and length of any tenure available. I will then ask the Director of Industrial Promotion to find out whether any persons who have inquired of the department are interested in establishing an industry in the honourable member's district. In the meantime, any suggestions that the honourable member makes about industries likely to be interested in obtaining the building will be useful.

GERARD RESERVE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my recent question about Gerard Reserve?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The reply is short and, as usual, to the point. I am pleased to report that work is proceeding on the installation of the irrigation pump on the Gerard Aboriginal Reserve by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

BURRA COPPER

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier received from the Minister of Mines a reply to my question about the possibility of supplying natural gas to Burra if the Burra copper mines are reopened?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The investigation of the Burra mines has reached a stage at which sufficient work has been done to determine within reasonable limits the tonnage and grade of the remnant ore left in the old open cut area. However, great difficulty is being experienced in devising a metallurgical treatment process which will recover an economic proportion of the copper in the ore. Until this problem is successfully overcome, the matter of the application of natural gas to the industry is rather academic. However, there is no doubt that, if the economics of the situation justify it, natural gas could be made available.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the provision of spectacles for pensioners in country areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Little can be added to the statement provided in the reply to the question of August 20 last, namely that a decision is awaited from the Commonwealth Government to the submission made by the Australian Medical Association that the provision of specialist services be included in the pensioner medical scheme. The introduction of a pilot scheme at Mount Gambier Hospital for the provision of spectacles to pensioners cannot be introduced because the medical practitioners in the district, although in favour of the introduction of such a scheme, have indicated that they will not participate in it until the Commonwealth has decided whether specialist services should be made available to pensioners. Inquiries of the Secretary of the Australian Medical Association (Mr. Dobbie) reveal that no reply has yet been received from the Commonwealth Government to the Australian Medical Association's submission in this respect.

KULPARA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: On Monday evening last the Secretary of the Kulpura Primary School Committee telephoned me, asking me to take up with the Minister of Education the possibility of providing a school library in the additional timber frame classroom promised for that school. As the Minister knows, welfare clubs operate in association with most primary schools and high schools throughout the State and, if a library is not provided at a school, the children have to vacate a classroom to enable the welfare club to meet. Will the Minister ask her officers whether provision can be made for a school library in the new classroom to which I have referred?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that.

HOSPITAL ACCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, a reply to my question about hospital accounts and the issue of a summons?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In the absence of detail it has not been possible to give an answer in relation to the specific incident raised by the honourable member. However, it is the general practice in all Government hospitals that, where it is found an account has been paid prior to the issue of a summons, the summons is withdrawn immediately and any costs are borne by the department. Such incidents occur rarely. Where payment is made subsequent to the issue of a summons, but prior to its being served, the summons is also withdrawn, but the court costs are re-charged to the debtor. Should the honourable member provide the name and address of his constituent, it would be possible to obtain details of the circumstances arising from this case.

PRINTING OFFICE LAND

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the burning of undergrowth on the site of the proposed Government Printing Office at Netley?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: An order has been placed with a contractor who has the equipment and specializes in clearing and burning off, to treat the site of the proposed new Government Printing Office at Netley. Several inspections have been made to check the progress of the drying out of the growth. It is expected that it will be possible to burn off the area within the next two weeks. Action has already been taken to provide fire breaks to facilitate the burning off of the area.

HOSPITAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the basis on which contributions by councils to the Hospitals Fund are estimated?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In his question the honourable member has stated that the District Council of Stirling was suddenly ordered by the Hospitals Department to make a compulsory contribution of \$3,941 to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, has compared that with the fact that the District Council of Port Pirie was ordered by the same department to contribute only \$2,300 to the Port Pirie Hospital

(\$100 up on last year), and has asked what formula is used to establish the contribution forced to be paid. It is particularly difficult to draw comparisons between compulsory rating contributions for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and those for country Government and country Government-subsidized hospitals because of the fact that these are determined on completely different bases. However, the following information is provided in an endeavour to clarify the situation. The authority to require a local government body compulsorily to contribute towards the maintenance of a public hospital is contained in section 38 (1) of the Hospitals Act, 1934-67, which provides:

Where, in the opinion of the Director-General, any area, or any portion of an area, is served by any hospital to which this Part applies, or will be served by any proposed hospital to which this Part applies, he may, with the consent of the Minister, by notice to the council of the area, declare such his opinion and require the council to contribute any sum or sums of money for the purpose of the hospital or proposed hospital in accordance with the notice.

With the continued expansion of the metropolitan area, consideration has been given for some time to including the District Council of Stirling in those councils required to contribute towards the maintenance of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and a firm decision was recently made to include it for 1968-69. It is likely that in future years additional metropolitan district councils may also need to be required to contribute to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. On October 16, 1968, the District Council of Stirling was informed of the above decision and of the fact that its contribution for 1968-69 would be \$3,941. For many years those local government bodies contributing to the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been assessed at the rate of .381c in the \$ on the basis of the waterworks assessment for their area (where such assessment is available) or on the basis of their own total assessment. The letter to the District Council of Stirling included the information that the sum of \$3,941 had been calculated at the rate of .381c in the \$ of its 1967-68 assessment (\$1,034,399). On November 28, 1968, a further explanatory letter was sent to the District Council of Stirling and this indicated that in deciding to require the District Council of Stirling to contribute to the Royal Adelaide Hospital during 1968-69, full consideration was given to the fact that the council had contributed towards the maintenance of Stirling District Hospital (average of \$1,350 for three

years to 1966-7, and about \$1,555 for 1967-8) and that, during 1965-6, the council made a voluntary capital donation to that hospital of \$6,000. In this regard the council is in a position similar to many other metropolitan local government bodies that have been required to contribute towards the maintenance of the Royal Adelaide Hospital but, in addition, have provided considerable financial assistance (for both capital and maintenance) to community hospitals serving their districts. The proposed contribution by the District Council of Stirling for 1968-9 of \$3,941 towards the Royal Adelaide Hospital (which is really towards the maintenance of metropolitan Government hospitals, as separate compulsory rating is not levied in respect of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital) represents only 2.627 per cent of the council's rate revenue for 1967-8 of \$149,995.

The rating of local government bodies deemed to be served by country Government and/or country Government-subsidized hospitals is completely reviewed each year on the basis of the financial needs of the hospitals and the ability of the various councils to contribute rating. It has long been considered that such rating could reasonably be measured on a State-wide average basis, as representing approximately .6 per cent of the rate revenue of a council, or .833 cents in the dollar of its assessment. The District Council of Pirie (not Port Pirie) will be required, during 1968-9, to contribute \$2,300 for the Port Pirie Hospital and \$360 for the Crystal Brook Hospital, making a total of \$2,660. This figure represents .664 cents in the dollar of the council's 1967-8 assessment (\$400,888) and 4.874 per cent of its 1967-8 rate revenue (\$54,578). It will readily be seen that these figures greatly exceed those quoted for the District Council of Stirling. During 1968-69, the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie will be required to contribute \$11,250 for the Port Pirie Hospital, which represents 1.263 cents in the dollar of assessment and 4.543 per cent of rate revenue.

RELIEF

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my question of December 3 regarding procedures in the public relief branch of his department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The support of the Leader's question was that there were delays caused and difficulties put in the way of those who were entitled to certain forms of relief in this State. From my inquiries, I believe that a special benefit of \$1.50 a week is paid by the Commonwealth Government to

persons in receipt of unemployment benefits for each dependent child under the age of 16 years. I believe the Leader thought the amount was \$1.60 a week. When the child attains the age of 16 years, payment of this special benefit ceases but if the child is not a student and is unemployed he may himself apply to the Commonwealth for unemployment benefits. Current rates are \$3.50 a week for persons aged between 16 years and 17 years and \$4.75 a week for persons aged 18 years to 20 years. In those cases where the breadwinner of the family is in receipt of Commonwealth unemployment benefits and supplementary assistance (up to \$4.00 a week for two-parent families and \$7.25 a week for one-parent families) is being paid from State relief funds, an additional amount of \$1.50 a week may be paid for each dependent child over 16 years who is a full-time student. Applicants are required to produce evidence that they are currently in receipt of Commonwealth unemployment benefits, and in a few cases of suspected malingering additional evidence in the form of certificates from employers that they have sought work is requested. It may be that the case that prompted the Leader's question was one in which there was suspicion of malingering, either rightly or wrongly, because the description he gave in the explanation to his question rather fits in with the last sentence of my report. If the Leader will give me the name of the person who apparently has complained to him, I will inquire to ascertain whether there was undue delay in that case.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Local Government, replies to the questions, asked by the member for Edwardstown and me, whether an opportunity would be given to the people of Colonel Light Gardens to vote on the issue of the Garden Suburb's being incorporated with the Mitcham council?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Both the honourable member and the member for Edwardstown have asked me this question. I will give the answer to the member for Unley, because I already have for the member for Edwardstown three other answers, some of which I know he regarded as urgent (when he asked the questions, anyway). The Minister of Local Government reports that he has appointed a committee to inquire into and report on the practicability and desirability of

the amalgamation of the Colonel Light Garden Suburb with the city of Mitcham. The committee is to be known as the Colonel Light Gardens Inquiry Committee, and the members are as follows: Chairman, Mr. M. E. S. Bray (Secretary for Local Government); members, Mr. P. L. Randell (Mayor of Mitcham), Mr. T. J. Sellars (Garden Suburb Commissioner), Mr. J. S. Abraham (representative of the Auditor-General). The secretary will be Mr. R. D. Bachmann.

Mr. Virgo: Why isn't the local member on the committee?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: With very great deference to the member for Edwardstown and the member for Unley, who lives in Edwardstown and is, therefore, concerned with the Garden Suburb, I think the inquiry will probably be more expeditious if the member for Edwardstown, the member for Unley and I are not on the committee. The committee will pay particular reference to the following:

- (1) Ward names and ward boundaries.
- (2) Arrangements for the use or disposal for the future benefit of ratepayers of any accumulated funds of the Garden Suburb. (I do not think there will be many accumulated funds, from what I know.)
- (3) Any special arrangements considered necessary regarding the amount of rates to be payable by ratepayers within the present boundaries of the Garden Suburb for a period to be determined.
- (4) Arrangements relating to the staff and property of the Garden Suburb.

Mr. VIRGO: The terms of reference clearly presuppose that the decision to amalgamate the two areas has probably been well and truly made, because there is no mention in the terms of reference of determining the desirability of amalgamation or of seeking the views of the people concerned. Therefore, will the Attorney-General give this House an unqualified assurance that, before Colonel Light Gardens is submerged in the city of Marion, the opinion of the ratepayers of Colonel Light Gardens will be ascertained?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: First, I should like to correct the honourable member: if there is any amalgamation, it will be not with the city of Marion but with the city of Mitcham. Secondly, I point out that the honourable member has framed his question on a wrong premise, because the whole object of the committee (and I have read this to the honourable member) is to inquire into and report on the practicability and desirability of the amalgamation of the Garden Suburb with the city of Mitcham. These matters have not been determined in advance.

TAILEM BEND HOUSING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of December 5 about housing at Tailem Bend?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust states that the trust has 25 rental houses in Tailem Bend and that, as these houses become vacant, they are occupied by applicants. Generally, the houses that become available in this way have satisfied the demand in the town. A further survey of the housing position in Tailem Bend is scheduled to be carried out in the first three months of next year.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. VIRGO: On October 24, I directed the Treasurer's attention to the anomalies currently existing in workmen's compensation payable, and on December 4 the Premier, on behalf of the Treasurer, promised that he would expedite a reply, which I understand has now arrived. Will the Treasurer give it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have made a preliminary examination of this matter and, as the honourable member has said, it is some time since the rates in this State were reviewed. However, I found that when last the rates were fixed they were generally, I think in all cases for the scale both of persons with no dependants and of those with dependants, above those of other States. That may be subject to correction.

Mr. Virgo: It would be, too.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not far out. It was the general position at that time. Since then two things have happened: first, the other States have revised their scales of benefits—

Mr. Virgo: And we have remained stagnant.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: —but we have widened the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Act considerably.

Mr. Broomhill: We have only caught up with the others.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The present rates are still above the revised rates in Victoria, which is our nearest industrial competitor.

Mr. Virgo: Ha, ha!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member thinks that that is a matter for some mirth—

Mr. Virgo: The poor workers get hurt, don't they?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is probably correct, but the honourable member appreciates (and if he does not he should devote more of his energy to industrial economics) that we are in a competitive world in our industrial position in this continent, and we must have regard to charges on industry in the various States.

Mr. Virgo: Insurance companies, not industry.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Who pays insurance premiums?

Mr. Virgo: The premiums here are the same as those in other States.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I said that I have had a preliminary look at this matter, but I have not come to any conclusion about it, and I will continue my examination so that I shall be able to discuss it with my colleagues soon. What I have said is the result of researches I have made.

MENINGIE POLICE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether an additional police officer will be appointed at Meningie this year? If such an officer is to be appointed, when is it intended that this appointment will be made, and will a house be provided in the town by the department for this officer?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to obtain replies to these three questions.

SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICTS HOSPITAL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the south-western districts hospital?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As indicated in my earlier statements, administrative planning and preparation of design briefs for the combined medical school and teaching hospital facilities proposed for Flinders University will need to proceed in the absence of specific information from the Australian Universities Commission that such a project will be supported. I still hope that such Commonwealth support will be forthcoming and made known in the near future. With the formation of joint planning committees, it is expected that detailed briefing of the architects can be undertaken during 1969 so that complete proposals for hospital construction can be submitted to the Public Works Committee in January, 1970.

Assuming that up to six months will be required by that committee for analysis of such a major project, it is estimated that working drawings and tender documents could be prepared from June, 1970, onwards. This would

enable tenders to be called for the main block of the hospital building in January, 1972, with construction commencing in mid-1972. Other sections of the hospital will also be developed during this period, so that total construction and the installation of equipment should be completed by June, 1975. A period of 18 months has been allowed for commissioning the new hospital to permit entry of medical students to the clinical years of their course in January, 1977. Medical students attend at the hospital for three clinical years. Therefore, the first graduates from Flinders University medical school should have completed their formal medical course at the end of 1979, becoming available to undertake hospital duties at the beginning of 1980.

Some medical students are currently taking the first year of their six-year course at Flinders University and then moving to Adelaide University for their second and third years. It is expected that, as from 1975, medical students will be able to commence their second year and eventually complete their course at Flinders University.

BARMERA HOSPITAL

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on December 4 concerning the future of the Government hospital at Barmera?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The information to be presented to the public meeting to be held soon could be summarized as follows:

1. It is recognized that there is urgent need to rebuild the Lady Weigall Hospital at Barmera, which is at present operated as a Government hospital.

2. The Government is already committed to heavy Loan expenditure on projects already reported on by the Public Works Committee, and it is most unlikely that funds from this source would be available for an extended period. The object of the present offer is to enable Barmera to be provided with first-class hospital facilities within 18 months, without the necessity for a protracted investigation. Previous investigations of this type regarding hospitalization in the Upper Murray have not favoured a Government hospital at Barmera.

3. In view of the desire that Barmera should continue to have a hospital providing high standards of medical and hospitalization services, it would be possible to proceed almost immediately with the building of a new hospital of, say, 35 beds, provided that the local community is prepared to take over the hospital and operate it as a Government-subsidized hospital.

4. If this were agreed, the one-third of the capital cost normally required to be provided by the local community for the building of a Government-subsidized hospital would, in this case, be provided by a bank loan, which the

Government would arrange to liquidate (both capital and interest) over the term of the loan by including provision for this in the annual Government maintenance subsidy. The rate-payers' commitment in local government contributions to a Government-subsidized hospital would be the same as if it were a Government hospital.

5. The high-grade equipment already provided by the Government in the present Barmera hospital would remain available to the proposed new subsidized hospital.

6. The proposed change from Government to a Government-subsidized hospital would allow for complete local operation of the hospital.

Although the public meeting (which was chaired by the Chairman of the District Council of Barmera) decided that it could not agree to the Government's proposals at this stage, the request of the District Council of Barmera to appoint a committee of six members to inspect appropriate Government and Government-subsidized hospitals in the country areas of South Australia as soon as possible is appreciated. When this inspection is made, a report and recommendations will be made to a further public meeting to be held at a date to be arranged. The Government also offers to facilitate the inspection to be made by the committee and to provide finance to cover any costs incurred by the committee.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Mines to my recent question about the retrenchment of some employees in the Mines Department?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The dismissal of four employees from the Mines Department is not related to any slow-down in departmental activities. Seismic operations of the department cease at this time for the summer period, and this involves a reshuffle to retain key personnel and the stand-down of others employed on a seasonal basis. This has resulted in the dismissal of two of the four employees in question, whilst the other two have had to be replaced for other reasons.

BERRI HOUSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question about the provision of houses at Berri?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports that an officer of the trust will conduct a survey at Berri before Christmas, and the results of the survey will be made known as soon as they become available.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the delay that occurs at the Northfield motor repair shop concerning the approval of estimates?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Repairs to motor vehicles under eight tons and light machinery estimated not to exceed \$150, and repairs to motor vehicles over eight tons and heavy machinery estimated not to exceed \$600, may be commenced immediately the vehicle or machine can be admitted to the workshop. Where, however, the cost could possibly exceed the figure shown, it is partially stripped and a detailed estimate prepared. This is submitted to higher departmental authority where, having regard to the future work requirement for that type of machine or vehicle, a decision is made to have it fully overhauled, short-term repaired, or scrapped. Time spent in ascertaining the precise repair work which must be carried out, in pricing the parts and in examining the works programme to estimate future requirements, certainly delays admission of machines and vehicles to the workshop. Certain measures to overcome this problem have been suggested by the Auditor-General (honourable members will recall that he has prepared a report, which has been tabled in this House, as a result of certain allegations) who will discuss them with the department.

SOUTH-EAST HOUSING

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Housing obtain a report on the current and future proposals of the Housing Trust to erect houses in the townships of Keith and Bordertown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

TRAIN PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on December 4 about the availability of railway passes for those employees now deprived of rail travel because of the replacement of a previous service by a bus service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Free staff leave passes are available for travel on passenger trains or buses on those routes where the Railways Department charters road passenger vehicles, and on goods trains, provided suitable accommodation in the brake van is available.

The passes may be used for travel throughout the State and to destinations in other States. Employees located on lines which do not have a passenger train service or a departmentally controlled road passenger service are therefore not denied the use of their station-to-station passes or privilege tickets, except between their place of employment and the nearest convenient station from which passenger trains or departmental buses operate, and only then when goods trains do not provide a convenient connection.

ELIZABETH INDUSTRY

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier further details about the retrenchment of men at the Texas Instruments (Australia) Limited factory?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On November 1, 1968 (the date of the takeover by Crane Copper of the Texas Instruments Limited interest in the metal rolling mill at Elizabeth), the management of Crane Copper offered the employees in the rolling mill plant re-employment by the new company (Crane Copper) under the same terms and conditions as applied to the employment with Texas Instruments Limited. This proposition was submitted to the staff by notice and by letter, and 99 per cent accepted it. On November 22, Crane Copper merged with Austral Bronze Metal Manufacturers Proprietary Limited, a subsidiary of Metal Manufacturers Limited, resulting in some replanning within the company, including some rationalization. As a result of this, the company (Austral Bronze/ Crane Copper) has now decided to melt and cast copper and bronze at its New South Wales plant and to carry out in the Elizabeth plant more finishing operations than were previously undertaken. The 14 people declared surplus to the company's requirements are from the melting and casting section and have been given notice of termination of employment to be effective from January 15, 1969 (not a week's notice as stated in the question).

Mr. Clark: I did say, I think, that they were given the opportunity to work over Christmas.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I see. The company confidently expects that in the new year employment will be increased as additional finishing section activities are brought into operation. From this it can be seen that the takeover on November 1, 1968, did not disturb employees' retention prospects, but it was the second merger later in the month that caused a complete change of plans.

STUDENTS' PAY

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about a reduction introduced by his Government in the sum paid to students working full time in the Public Service during their holidays?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Until recently the employment of university under-graduates during the long vacation was not significant and for the few persons concerned it was convenient to use the same rate as payable to officers who were employed in the Public Service on a career basis. However, as it appeared that this year the number would be increasing and as there was no justification for continuing to pay these casual employees (who usually had no intention of remaining in the Public Service) the salaries fixed for career officers, the board reviewed the rates and fixed a new scale for such employees. It now appears that certain undertakings were entered into with such employees before the board's decision had been fully promulgated, and this led to the situation referred to by the member for Glenelg. The board is of the opinion that these undertakings should be honoured and accordingly has decided that the new scales will not become operative until next year. The salaries of those already engaged will be adjusted back to the old basis as from the date of commencing duty.

DRIVING INSTRUCTORS

Mr. HURST: A constituent of mine who has an instructor's licence in connection with a professional driving school informs me that licences are being issued to part-time instructors, some of whom are doing two jobs. In view of the necessity to maintain a high standard of efficiency and safety on the part of these instructors, will the Treasurer examine the situation and ascertain the number of part-time driving instructors? Further, will he ascertain whether there is any deterioration in the standard of persons performing part-time instruction? This matter is apparently becoming a problem in Victoria and has been one of public interest in that State. Will the Treasurer examine the situation and obtain a report on the position in this State?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the matter to the relevant authority.

CARLTON SCHOOL

Mr. RICHES: I have previously asked questions about the erection of awnings at the Carlton school. At the beginning of the summer the Minister of Education promised to ascertain when these awnings would be

erected. She did so, and was told that every effort would be made to expedite the matter, particularly as there had already been several days on which the temperature had exceeded the century. However, nothing has been done, and the school authorities have heard nothing about an intended start on this work. Will the Minister use her best endeavours to see that this work is put in hand at least in time for the commencement of school after the Christmas holidays?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I really am disappointed to hear what the member has just said. I said that I would try to expedite this matter for him in view of the hot weather which could be expected and which, of course, has been experienced recently. However, I will take up this matter immediately on return to my office and see whether I can get some information, which I will pass on to the honourable member forthwith.

HOUSING FINANCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: On Saturday I was approached by a constituent who wishes to build his house on a section of land in Bordertown. He had contracted with a wellknown custom building firm to erect on his own land a three-bedroom house. He had been informed that it was, and he understood it to be, the normal practice of the State Bank, through which he expected that he would borrow the money, to advance 85 per cent of the cost price of such a dwelling. However, instead of that, he has been informed that the house, which retails at \$10,500, will attract a maximum loan from the State Bank of only \$5,000. Will the Treasurer inquire into the matter to see why this type of house (a type that is widely built and, I understand, accepted to be of a reasonably high standard) is not considered to be sufficient security for the bank to lend more than this sum?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member will give me the name of the company concerned architecturally in building the house, I will have the matter examined.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. VENNING: I apologize to the member for Unley, as this question concerns a part of Greenhill Road that is in his district. I am concerned about the dirt road that runs alongside the Greenhill Road opposite the Methodist Ladies College, and I have talked to the member for Unley recently about this matter. People drive their cars on to this land as they turn around from the school and off the bitumen to go back to the city. I understand

that the Highways Department has a special programme for this road involving a dual highway but, in the meantime, this land is being used by parents who go to the school to see their children and by people who park there. As this land is in a shocking condition, will the Attorney-General take up the matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether something cannot be done about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In fact, I noticed the poor condition of this roadway when I visited the Methodist Ladies College a few weeks ago. I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague.

APPRENTICES

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question of December 5 about the alleged reduction in the number of apprentices?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I am pleased to say that on present indications there will be an increase of about 10 per cent in the intake of apprentices in this State, compared with the year 1967. After the annual report of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures had been received, the Secretary for Labour and Industry wrote to the President of the chamber pointing out that he was apparently unaware of the increased intake which had occurred this year, and concerning which I had made a press statement on September 16, 1968. It was pointed out to the President that, as full day-time training of apprentices did not apply in any trade until the beginning of the 1968 school year, his contention that this had caused a decline in the intake of apprentices in 1967 did not appear to be justified. I take this opportunity to appeal to all employers, whether large or small, of skilled tradesmen to ensure that they examine their own future need for tradesmen and consider whether they can employ, as apprentices, some of the young men and women who are now leaving school, so that our skilled work force will be expanded to ensure that we can match the demands of our expanding economy.

SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about subdivisions?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I still have two replies for the honourable member, and this is one of them. My colleague has informed me that in general no delays are occurring. There could be isolated cases,

because of some complication, where a delay has occurred. If the honourable member will give details of a specific case or cases, the matter will be further investigated.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

Mr. VIRGO: I understand that the Attorney-General has still another reply for me, this time in relation to secondhand dealers. Will he now give it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. Virgo: This one is four months old.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is a reply for which the honourable member has been asking almost weekly for some time and which I notified him that I had yesterday. I am at present considering whether or not to recommend to Cabinet, because of the views of the Marion council, appropriate amendments to sections 7, 9a and 9b of the Secondhand Dealers Act. The purpose of such amendments would be to allow a council to object to the issue or the renewal of a licence, and to ensure that the council is able to object on the grounds that the situation of premises proposed to be used by the licensee is, for one reason or another, unsatisfactory.

FLEXIBLE SCHOOLS

Mr. VIRGO: I have had correspondence from a constituent (or should I say "from a resident of the hills"?) referring to the article which appears in the *Advertiser* of December 3 under the heading "Flexible School of the Future" and which states that the Education Department is about to build and furnish eight revolutionary new schools. It refers to the location of the schools, one of which is to be in Blackwood. I am sure that the Attorney-General, in his capacity as member for the district, will be interested in the views expressed. This person has told me that the present Blackwood school is in two parts. The old section, now used as an infants school, is situated between Gladstone Road and Brighton Parade. The new section houses the remainder, with the exception of grade 5. It is located at the end of Seymour Street, a distance of about one and a half miles west of the old school. The Blackwood school is poorly placed in respect of the most rapidly developing area of the zone it serves. The new school was built after agitation by the member for Mitcham. Land was acquired in his district, about a mile from the boundary of the Edwardstown District. This action is difficult to understand, as the Education Department

already owns a large area of land about two and a half miles west and in the growing areas of Bellevue Heights and Eden Hills.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It is not hard to understand: it is in a better district.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is out of order in interjecting.

Mr. VIRGO: As I was addressing my question to the Minister of Education, I thought the Attorney-General would be out of order and I thank you, Sir, for correcting him. Will the Minister of Education supply me with information about the location of the new school, and can she comment on the poor location of the existing school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The matter now raised by the honourable member has already been the subject of representations made to me by the Attorney-General in whose district, of course, this school is situated. Action is being taken as a result of those representations.

Mr. Virgo: That is what the person concerned is complaining about.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member referred to these flexible schools, I wish to say that not only is one of the new type of schoolroom being erected at the Blackwood school but there are also seven other schools scattered throughout the State at which this new type of classroom will be erected. One will be in my district of Burnside, but that is coincidental. However, I will call for a report from my departmental officers on the location of the school and let the honourable member have a reply that he can give to the person who I believe is a constituent of the Attorney-General—

Mr. Virgo: I didn't say that.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: —and who wrote to the member for Edwardstown.

GRAIN STORAGE

Mr. RICHES: Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, obtain for me, if possible, a report on whether the emergency wheat storages at Solomontown are full, whether it is intended to provide additional storages and, if it is, where and when they will be provided?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague immediately.

SAMCON BUILDINGS

Mr. RICHES: I refer to the announcement that several new Samcon buildings will be built to house dental services in country centres.

Early in the planning stages it was decided to provide this type of dental service at Port Augusta to serve the whole of the areas to the north and west of Port Augusta, but Port Augusta was not mentioned in the announcement made a week or so ago, perhaps because buildings that could be available were in use. Will the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, have this matter examined and get a report on the present position?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the information as soon as possible.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Some time ago, because I had received a report from two schools that subsidies had been cut by 50 per cent, I asked the Minister of Education whether the Government's policy on school subsidy payments had been changed. I have now received a letter complaining about the position at a particular school. In 1967-68 the subsidy allocated was \$460 in category 1 and \$340 in category 2. An amount of \$300 of the category 2 provision was allocated to the school oval but the school has only recently received permission to grass the oval and, therefore, it was not able to spend any of the \$300. This year the school applied for a subsidy of \$605 in category 1 and for \$300 for oval development. The category 1 allocation was reduced to \$300, less than half the amount applied for and about 35 per cent less than the amount allocated last year. Can the Minister say whether the policy has been changed since I asked the previous question, and what is the position regarding subsidy?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: There has been no change: the matter stands as it was when I replied to the honourable member a short time ago. If the honourable member gives me the name of the school to which he refers, I will have the matter examined and give him a reply as soon as possible.

LIQUOR EDUCATION

Mr. WARDLE: During the debate on the Bill to reduce the minimum drinking age in hotels from 21 years, I referred to the practice of the Queensland Education Department regarding education in the use of alcohol. Can the Minister of Education say whether she has received a copy of the Queensland report and whether she will consider including this subject in the school curriculum?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Director-General of Education is at present discussing this matter with interested organizations. I

have seen the brochures issued by the Queensland Government. As soon as the Director-General has completed his discussions, he will make a recommendation to me and a decision will then be made whether to introduce a similar scheme. I cannot give a definite reply at present.

—

**PARKIN CONGREGATIONAL MISSION
OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INCORPORATED BILL**

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): As a member of the Congregational community, I should like to place on record my appreciation to the Government and to the Attorney-General for introducing this Bill as a Government measure which has saved the Congregational Union much expense. The Bill will enable the trust to further its work in a way in which the Hon. William Parkin would have wished it to do if he were here now to supervise the way this money should be spent. I should also like to thank the members of the Select Committee for their co-operation and genuine interest in the work of the trust and in the proposal to alter the terms of the trust. I support the third reading.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): As a member of the Select Committee, I was most impressed by the evidence given to the committee by Mr. R. J. Keynes, the Reverend M. F. Sawyer and Mr. P. R. Morgan, President, Secretary, and Solicitor respectively of and for the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated. I am sure that all members of the committee, of which the Attorney-General was Chairman, could see there was a need for some change in the way the funds were to be used. Mr. Keynes, Mr. Sawyer and Mr. Morgan presented their evidence and answered any queries in a most able manner. I am sure honourable members appreciate that, as a result of the Bill, the money will be used to best advantage, to meet the requirements of the church, and to comply with the wishes of Mr. William Parkin. I, too, support the third reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): The Government was only too pleased to help the Congregational Union in

the way in which it has by my introducing this measure as a Government measure. Obviously, the objectives it was desired to incorporate in the trust are good ones, and I hope they turn out to be as beneficial to the Congregational Union, to all other Christian churches and to the community generally in South Australia as it is hoped they will be.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Copies of the Bill are not due in the Chamber for about another hour, but, having discussed this matter with the Deputy Leader, I understand that he agrees to my proceeding now. The Bill amends the Bush Fires Act in order to render its operation more effective in the prevention and control of bush fires. The amendments are made at the recommendation of the Bush Fires Advisory Council. A major alteration made by the Bill is the increase in the number of fire control officers who may be appointed by district councils to carry out the obligations of the Act. This number is increased from 15 to 30. In addition, the limitation upon the powers of the Minister to authorize the appointment of additional fire control officers is removed. Further provisions are inserted in the Act to enable the Minister or a council to appoint a new class of officer, to be entitled a "fire party leader". These officers are authorized to carry out basic fire fighting duties, and it is intended that they should take charge of parties of volunteers in fighting fires.

A major fire in the Stirling district of the Adelaide Hills could give a typical illustration of the need for "fire party leaders".

Under the Act the maximum number of fire controllers which can be appointed for the Stirling district is 30. A further 15 could be appointed from neighbouring districts, but there is little to be gained by councils exercising this power, because neighbouring controllers can operate in any district *ex officio*, and would, in any case, most likely be fully occupied handling their own units. Because of the toll taken by sickness, private avocations, holidays, and domestic commitments, any council district is fortunate to have more than 60 per cent of its appointed fire controllers in the field at any one time. When a fire or fires continue longer than 24 hours the number of available fire controllers is further drastically reduced. Whilst one supervisor can direct a force of several hundred fire fighters from a properly organized control centre, there is a need for a leader for every 10 men in the field, in addition to the fire controllers responsible for the tactical direction of operations, if all available manpower is to be usefully and economically employed. All men in excess of those who can be directly controlled become a liability, rather than an asset.

On the occasion of the Black Sunday fires (on January 2, 1955) Emergency Fire Fighting Services headquarters despatched more than 2,000 volunteer fire fighters into the Adelaide Hills. Such a force alone would need 200 party leaders if best use were to be made of them. The Bill also makes alterations to the provisions dealing with the notice to be given where stubble or scrub is to be burned during the conditional burning period. It enables the Minister to prohibit the lighting of fires in the open air during the conditional or prohibited burning period in an area outside a district council area. Several drafting anomalies in the Act are also rectified. In dealing with the Bill's provisions, clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 3 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act, and clause 4 amends the interpretation section of the principal Act by striking out definitions of expressions that do not occur in the body of the Act.

Clauses 5 and 6 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 7 amends section 28 of the principal Act by increasing the number of fire control officers who may be appointed in the first instance by a council, from 15 to 30. It is considered that this is a much more realistic figure. Clause 8 strikes out subsection (2) of section 29 of the principal Act.

This amendment thus removes the limitation upon the power of the Minister to authorize the appointment of additional fire control officers. Clause 9 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 36 of the principal Act. Clause 10 inserts new section 37a in the principal Act. This new section empowers the Minister, or a council, or any person acting under the written authority of the Minister or a council, to appoint such persons as he or it thinks fit to be fire party leaders. A fire party leader may be appointed for any period that does not extend beyond June 30 next following the date of his appointment. New subsection (3) provides that a fire party leader is to be deemed to be a volunteer fire fighter within the meaning of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act, 1949-1957.

Clause 11 amends section 41 of the principal Act. Where a council has, by resolution, altered the conditional burning period or the prohibited burning period, the council is required to give notice of the commencing day and the last day of the period as altered. The notice must also be in a form approved by the Minister. This amendment is inserted because some notices that have, in fact, been published under the Act have been in an obscure and ambiguous form. Clause 12 makes a decimal currency amendment to section 43 of the principal Act. Clause 13 amends section 49 of the principal Act. This section sets out the rules for burning stubble. At present, a maximum of 48 hours' and a minimum of six hours' notice is to be given of the burning off of stubble. The amendment requires that a maximum of seven days' and a minimum of four hours' notice should be given. This amendment was suggested by the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association. Difficulties in communication have been experienced in that area, and the amendments are thought to provide a more realistic time table for the giving of notice. The amendment also provides that notice may be given to the clerk of the council or a member of the office staff of the council.

Clause 14 makes a corresponding amendment to section 50 of the principal Act, which deals with the burning of stubble in township allotments during the prohibited or conditional burning period. Clause 15 makes a decimal currency amendment. Clause 16 makes an amendment to section 54 of the principal Act. This section sets out the rules for burning scrub, and the amendments correspond with the amendments made to

section 49. Clause 17 makes a drafting amendment to section 55 of the principal Act to bring the wording of subsection (2) into conformity with the wording of subsection (1). Clause 18 expands the powers of a council to delegate its powers by providing that a council may delegate to a committee its powers to grant permits under section 50, as well as its power to grant an exemption under section 56, which it may delegate as the Act stands at present. Clauses 19 and 20 make decimal currency amendments.

Clause 21 amends section 61 of the principal Act. This section at present empowers a council to prohibit the lighting of fires in the open air in the area of the council during the prohibited or conditional burning period. The amendment gives the Minister a corresponding power in relation to any portion of the State outside the area of a council. Clauses 22 to 26 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 27 amends section 68 of the principal Act. This section at present provides that a person shall not, during the prohibited or conditional burning period use an internal combustion engine for the purpose of harvesting an inflammable crop unless the engine is fitted with a spark arrestor. The provision is extended to engines used for transporting an inflammable crop or for spreading lime or fertilizer.

Clauses 28 and 29 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 30 makes a drafting amendment to section 71 of the principal Act by inserting a penalty for infringement of its provisions. Clauses 31 and 32 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 33 makes drafting amendments to section 77 of the principal Act by inserting a penalty for failure to comply with a notice under the section or infringement of its provisions. Clauses 34 and 35 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 36 amends section 86, which sets out the powers of a fire control officer in fighting a fire. The amendment confers these powers upon a fire party leader, with the exception of the power to light fire breaks and the power to remove persons from the area of the fire. Clause 37 makes a decimal currency amendment.

Clause 38 amends section 90 of the principal Act. This section at present empowers a fire control officer, acting under the authorization of a council, or a forester to prohibit the lighting of fires during the prohibited and conditional burning period, if the weather conditions are such that the fire might become out of control. This provision is amended

to enable the fire control officer or forester to exercise this power at any time during the year. The section is also amended to enable a prohibition extending over a period of not more than one week to be imposed. At present the prohibition is valid only for the day specified in the notice. Clause 39 extends the provisions creating an offence for hindering a fire control officer to a fire party leader. Clause 40 makes a decimal currency amendment. Clause 41 empowers a fire party leader to require a person whom he believes to have committed an offence under this Act to disclose his name and address. Clauses 42 and 43 make decimal currency amendments. Clause 44 amends section 97 of the principal Act by investing a fire party leader with an immunity from liability for acts done in good faith and without negligence in the course of his duties under the Act. This immunity corresponds with that given to fire control officers. Clause 45 amends the regulation-making power by providing for regulations to be made in relation to fire party leaders.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL
Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 10. Page 3136.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the Bill. It seeks to deal with the practices of a cult called "scientology", and it seems that two complaints are levelled at this cult. The first is that its practice may result in some mental disturbance to people who are vulnerable to

mental illness, and the second is that those who have been involved with it and who wish to dissociate themselves from it are subject to some unreasonable personal harassment. On that basis, the Bill seeks to prohibit, in effect, the practice of scientology—to make its practice, even by those who are not vulnerable to mental disability, who wish to practice the cult privately and who do not wish to dissociate themselves from it, prohibited in law.

Whatever complaints may be made about scientology (and I believe some are justified) this is entirely the wrong way in which to proceed. To proceed in the way provided for by the Bill is the grossest infringement of private liberties and a complete negation of the rule of law. This measure has been rushed into the Upper House, inadequately dealt with there, and is now sought to be passed in this House in a great rush also. I have had leading citizens in South Australia of authority and standing, who are not personally involved in scientology, express the view that the Government apparently considers this to be some form of necromancy which must be treated as though it were witchcraft. The Premier said in his second reading explanation, in relation to the Anderson report:

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

All that may be perfectly true. I must confess that I hold no brief for the writings of Mr. Hubbard; I think they are the greatest nonsense. But the same could be said by most people of numbers of other writings.

Mr. Clark: And speeches, too!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. What are we to say in relation to this subject of the writings of Judge Rutherford, because exactly the same might be said of him? There is nothing in the paragraph that I have quoted

which cannot equally be applied to the writings of the originator of the Watch Tower and Bible Society.

Mr. Hudson: And Mary Baker Eddy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of these things could be said about her, although I do not think she is quite in the same category. What about Joseph Smith?

Mr. McKee: What about Zara Holt?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, although I do not know that she has quite established her own dynasty. But what about the founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints? What is to be said of the elders of the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren? If we are to take Joseph Smith's writings, he also considered that he had had some transcendental experiences, discovered tablets of the same kind as those discovered by Moses, and established his own dynasty and a religion which brought great pressure to bear on people who subsequently sought to dissociate themselves from it. Are we going to ban the Mormons or the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren, or the Christadelphians?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: This is usually a symptom of crackpot religion, anyway.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We may all think those things are crackpot religions and disagree with them, but surely people in this community are to be allowed to practise what they believe to be right, even if we disagree with it. If they are in the minority, they still have the right to their own views and the practice of them, so long as those views do not interfere with others in society. Where they interfere, the interference should be proscribed by a general rule of law relating specifically to the harm involved and not to a system of belief or its private practice. The Premier also said:

Once the person attends such courses it is suggested to him, that by undergoing a "clearing process", he can increase his efficiency and develop greater intelligence and a more fully developed personality. At this stage all the techniques of high pressure salesmanship are applied and the subject is induced to sign up for a number of hours of auditing at a cost of the order of \$8 an hour.

There is no evidence in South Australia to substantiate charges of this kind: evidence of this does not come from South Australia. We are having in this explanation, as we have had elsewhere, a great many extracts of the report of the Anderson Board of Inquiry established a few years ago in Victoria, where the practices involved could not be shown to be widespread in Australia and of which, when I was

Attorney-General, I saw no evidence here. I have never been able to gauge it since in South Australia. Having had the opportunity to examine the file of the Chief Secretary before this measure was introduced in another place, I could find no more cogent evidence in that file than I could find when I was Attorney-General.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Why do you think similar action has been taken in other States?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that in Victoria certain people were involved in the scientology movement, some of whom are known to us in South Australia. One of the people involved in the Victorian inquiry took down the South Australian Labor movement for a considerable sum. We know that individual and we know the way things were proceeding in Victoria, but the people involved in South Australia have never been shown to us to be similar in kind. The Messrs. Wilkinson in South Australia, the Attorney-General ought to know, were prominent in the Aborigines Advancement League in South Australia and did a lot of good work in relation to Aborigines in this State. They were certainly not of the order of people described in the Victorian report. I must say that after a few complaints made to me about scientology in South Australia we investigated this matter, following the urging of the Victorian Chief Secretary. I had it drawn to my attention that there were numbers of prominent citizens of standing in South Australia who could not in any way be said to be mentally unstable or unsatisfactory citizens (they were the reverse being prominent in community organizations), who were involved in scientology and who claimed they had derived personal benefit from it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What you are saying is that scientology in South Australia is different in nature and practice from scientology in Victoria.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe it is different from the situation that existed in Victoria at the time of the Anderson inquiry, and I can see no adequate evidence that the various things that were referred to in the Anderson report in Victoria exist in South Australia.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Have you studied the evidence before the Select Committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been through the whole of the evidence, but I have certainly been through the report of the

committee and I have had related to me numbers of passages from the evidence.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you ignore them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not consider there is anything adequately established on the evidence there to justify some of the findings of the committee or to justify the statements in the second reading explanation which are not taken from the evidence before the committee but which are nearly all taken from the Anderson report.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you think that the Victorians are wrong to continue with this legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe that the Victorian legislation is wrong. I do not believe that was the right way to go about the thing, and I will outline to the House in a few moments what I think is the correct course.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It was the Labor Party in Victoria which first moved this.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Corcoran: Anything can happen in Victoria.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Even in the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As is usual, the Attorney-General is not training his attention to the gravamen of this matter or to the merits of the case: all he is trying to do is introduce a few political red herrings.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No, I am putting you on the spot.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney is not doing that at all. I may point out that similar action to the action I am proposing now was taken by the Leader of the Labor Party in Western Australia when the Liberal Party rushed through similar legislation in that State.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It was started in Victoria, where it all started, by the Labor Party. You are inconsistent.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For the Attorney to talk about inconsistency in the Labor Party shows the appalling gall the man has even to mention the word "inconsistency". Look at the record of his Government in the last few weeks! Look at the inconsistencies on the measure currently before the House on which the Attorney-General has completely and solemnly denied the course he took previously. Why, Sir, inconsistency? My mind boggles that the man should even mention the matter.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You cite examples.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were cited to the Attorney last evening and he admitted he had been wrong. He has not heard the last of that: he will hear plenty more about it.

Mr. Corcoran: The absolute hide and cheek of him to talk about inconsistency: he should be ashamed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier also said:

The progress of this subject through the audits is assessed, and tremendous pressures are placed on the subject to progress along the stages to his complete release from his alleged aberrations.

That is much denied by many people who have attended these sessions and who have given evidence to me. The Premier continued:

It must be remembered that further progress is contingent on further hours of auditing at \$8 an hour. The Anderson report—

not the committee's evidence—

suggests that these assessments are nothing more than spurious nonsense designed to ensure that the subject, often fully dominated by the organization, continues to take more and more hours of auditing.

I may say that a professor of the Adelaide University wrote to me after the introduction of the Bill and said that he was surprised to find, but that he did find, that, immediately after the introduction of the Bill, his best student (a student who, according to his faculty was the best student it had had in the course for 10 years and the student with the greatest ability; he was considered to be a most balanced and sound fellow) told him that he was a scientologist. He asked the professor whether he should reveal this publicly, because he feared for his future career if he revealed it, but he said that he had obtained much assistance from scientology. Why anyone of his intelligence should get assistance from this kind of thing, I do not know, but to say that people of this type are under psychological domination seems to me to be poorly founded, because many people are not. The Premier continued:

What then of a person who sees scientology for what it is and desires to break away from it and even to criticize its tenets publicly? Such a person, in the jargon of the cult called a "suppressive person", can expect considerable vilification from scientologists together with a co-ordinated campaign of poison pen letters and telephone calls, but must he live in fear of something far worse?

If people receive poison pen letters and nuisance telephone calls they can make a complaint

under the Post and Telegraph Act. It is an offence to send poison pen letters or to make nuisance telephone calls. What prosecutions have taken place in South Australia for an offence against the Post and Telegraph Act in relation to this matter? Can the Attorney-General cite to me one?

Mr. Hurst: Did the Select Committee find any?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Where is the evidence? This reference comes from the Victorian report, but where is the evidence that this is taking place here and, if it is taking place, why have not prosecutions taken place? The Premier continued:

In any case, the knowledge that the scientology centre possesses a complete record of a person's most intimate revelations places that person in a totally frightening degree of moral subjection. No responsible Government could be expected to tolerate this situation. Will we prohibit the making of private confessions? Will we ban other confessional?

Mr. Clark: To be consistent, one should.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Does the Premier say that organizations are not to know a person's intimate revelations? The mind boggles at how many prohibitions there will be in society in such circumstances, and I think of the Roman Catholic church. The Premier also said:

The Government has given earnest consideration whether it should adopt either or both the approaches adopted in the Victorian legislation. In this consideration, it has had the advantage of a view expressed to the former Attorney-General from the South Australian Branch of the Australian Psychological Society, an organization of trained professional psychologists, suggesting some opposition by that society to legislation controlling psychologists being linked with the suppression of scientology.

I received that representation and, because of it, I did not then proceed with a measure that I think should ultimately be considered. The Attorney-General must know what I said to the scientologists at their deputation to me, because there is a record of the deputation on file. I am sure the Chief Secretary has read it, and I imagine that the Attorney-General has also read it. I told the scientologists that I considered the proper course to be to register all psychologists in South Australia in due course and to prohibit psychological practices for fee or reward, except when carried out by trained and registered psychologists. I consider that that is the proper course and that the matter should not be tied up with the suppression of scientology.

It should be done by a separate and properly considered measure, introduced after consultation with the practising psychologists and psychiatrists in this State. Then, if any evil occurs through people with mental disabilities being involved in unauthorized psychological practices or psychological practices by the untrained for fee or reward, such as it is suggested are conducted by scientologists, the matter would be able to be dealt with. Any other persons who involved themselves in psychological practices for fee or reward would be stopped if they were untrained or unqualified and if mental instability could be attributed to their activity. That is the proper way to proceed: this Bill is not. The Premier continued:

The Government's thinking on this matter is that legislation regulating a legitimate profession should be introduced only after full discussion with the members of the profession concerned.

I agree that that should be done. As to the other complaints about scientology, I consider that there is little evidence in South Australia of personal harassment. Most of that evidence comes from the Victorian report. However, I consider it vital to place on our Statute Book a law prohibiting unreasonable personal harassment. That would apply to a whole series of practices and to all persons, not only to scientologists.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: How would you see the scheme of that measure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I see the scheme as setting forth a number of practices in fairly general terms. The International Commission of Jurists has made a list of cases of personal harassment, and the conduct of personal harassment found by the court, consistent with practices of the kind established on the list, would be an offence and the subject of an application for bond to make people find a surety as against a breach of the bond. In other words, it should be something like our peace complaints law. This class of personal harassment would be actions—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Which are not now unlawful?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Which are not now singly unlawful, yes. Poison pen letters and offensive telephone calls are already unlawful, but I am speaking of such actions as constantly following people about. Another form of personal harassment is picketing a person's property, not being an obstruction to traffic but causing personal distress. Indeed, in relation to neighbourhood problems, this

is often a real difficulty, as everyone must know. At present our law does not cater for many of the difficulties that neighbours can, by a consistent campaign, cause to one another. Lawyers and members of Parliament have had referred to them many cases of a series of actions being taken by a person simply to annoy his neighbour, yet keeping within the law.

There is no remedy at present, but people have been driven from their houses by such campaigns. The right to personal privacy ought to be maintained in the community and legislation should apply not to any private system of belief but to an open and general breach of the law. That has always been the basis on which we have proceeded in criminal law governing society. We have not banned a private belief or a private practice not involving other people. We have got at the principle of what harm is done to others. We should register psychologists in South Australia and prohibit unauthorized psychological practices for fee or reward. Further, we should have a law prohibiting personal harassment. Such measure would answer any complaints about this and many other organizations.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Could you give me the reference to the publication by the International Commission of Jurists?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but not at the moment. If we proceed as I have suggested, we will maintain the rule of law and at the same time obviate any difficulties that private citizens in our community have been having. I repeat that the way in which this legislation proceeds is wholly wrong. It prohibits private practices which in many instances, cannot be shown to harm other people. I know people of standing in this community who desire to continue the practice of private belief. However much we disagree with the writings of Hubbard or the practice of scientology as matters in which we would not be involved, we have not the right to prohibit such practices by those who gain some benefit from them. Consequently, I hope that the House rejects the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the second reading. I do not agree with the Leader when he says that this legislation was inadequately dealt with in another place. A Select Committee was appointed, and it did a very good job. That is one of the most important functions of another place: it has more time than we have in this Chamber, where we tend to rush legislation through. The other

place can be of tremendous value to Parliament as a whole. I do not necessarily agree with many things it does, but it performs a useful function, as it has more time to consider opinions on various matter. People had an opportunity, if they so desired, to place their opinions before the committee, as a result of which the original Bill has been improved.

I have an open mind on scientology. I have read much of the literature on scientology, but the extravagant language did not impress me. Someone approached me to explain scientology to me, and I said that if someone came along and explained scientology to me in plain language I should be only too pleased to listen. The Leader of the Opposition said that he had had no evidence of people being charged fees for being audited, whereas a man admitted to me that he had spent \$500 on it. He said that the charge was not as high as \$8 an hour.

Mr. Corcoran: The Leader didn't deny that people had been charged: he denied that they had been charged \$8 an hour.

Mr. McANANEY: He said there was no evidence that people in South Australia had been charged.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That wasn't said. You should get your facts straight.

Mr. McANANEY: None of us is perfect, but some of us are right more often than others. When another member of this House has proved to me that I have said something wrong, I have always apologized. If other members adopted the same policy, we would get plenty of apologies from the other side. The Leader distorts facts every time he speaks. I understood him to say what I said he had said, and I still believe it. The man to whom I have referred said he also made an annual subscription to the oversea body. He did not know the amount of the subscription, but he thought it was about \$20 a year. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you agree with the Premier's statement that \$8 an hour was charged?

Mr. McANANEY: The whole basis of scientology is that the electrometer is used as a guide to disclose truth to the individual who is being processed, thus to free him spiritually. Only in this way can man's spiritual self be regained. It will be seen that the electrometer, known as the E-meter, is actually an aid to confession of past misdeeds, in the absence of which there is no guarantee that the misdeed is actually located and

expunged from the spirit. That, to me, indicates that in the auditing process the electrometer is used, and all a person's past deeds are recorded. Admittedly, scientologists now say that this policy of security check lists has been abolished for various reasons, but that nothing in this policy letter alters the standard grade processing or rudiments. That was the basis of scientology, and now they say they will change it and not have these records. This seems to be one thing arguing against the other to make good public relations by saying this, yet it is against the complete basis of scientology. Evidence has been adduced in Victoria that, in the hands of the wrong people, this information could be misused.

Mr. Broomhill: This is not Victorian legislation.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for West Torrens is always saying that we should have one central Government, that we are all the same, and that we should have everything uniform, yet he is now saying that the Victorians have habits different from ours. I believe there is room for undue pressure to be placed on some people whose mental health may be below par.

Mr. Corcoran: Would you support a move to ban the Plymouth Brethren?

Mr. McANANEY: I have never come in contact with them, but if I found they were doing something that was dangerous to the interests of people who were not as fortunate as others, I would support a ban once this had been proved. I support the second reading and hope that the House will pass the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I oppose the second reading. I think the Bill is indicative of this Government's attitude toward such matters that it would wish to ban an organization or to prohibit the teaching, practice, or application of the system of study of scientology when, without interfering with people's rights to determine their own beliefs and to practise their own beliefs as they wished, the undesirable activities associated with scientology could be effectively controlled in other ways. After all, it is my reading of the Anderson report that he did not specifically recommend the banning of scientology, nor did he recommend the introduction of legislation specifically to prohibit anyone from partaking in the teaching, practice or application of scientology. What he did, first, was to suggest that, so far as public awareness is concerned, the public should be repeatedly warned of the dangers to mental health of psychological techniques practised by unqualified persons.

He recommended that psychologists should be registered and that a psychologists registration board should be established. The Anderson report states:

The system of registration of psychologists envisaged as a means of controlling the practice of psychology in Victoria in one which involves the establishment by Statute of a psychologists registration board and the prescribing of minimum standards for registration. The purpose of the proposed legislation should be to prohibit generally all persons who are not registered or who are not exempt from registration.

Surely, the basic approach to the problem should be whether it is a question of scientologists engaging in scientology practices for fee or reward, or of anyone else who is not properly qualified doing it and charging a fee for the purpose of treating someone psychologically. True, the Victorian Government introduced legislation that not only provided for the registration of psychologists but also banned scientology, but I do not think it can be claimed by the Attorney-General, by the Premier, or by any other Government member, that the Victorian legislation was completely in line with the report of the Commissioner.

When this is thought about in a simple and logical fashion, it should be clear that the great song and dance that the Government has made on this matter is unnecessary, in so far as there are or have been rackets associated with scientology that have arisen, in part, because some people have found it convenient to make money out of it. These rackets would immediately disappear if registration of psychologists was introduced, and those who currently wished to make money out of teaching scientology could not do so. Why is it necessary to take this further step, unless the Attorney-General is a "banner" and wants to start on the road to interfere in people's civil liberties? Basically, this is what the Bill does.

Mr. Lawn: And they say they believe in private enterprise and freedom.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but religion is different. It seems that this Government is starting on the road towards enforcing a standard of behaviour and of thinking in relation to what is accepted from a religious or spiritual point of view. Why does the Government approach this question by means of imposing a ban and by means of introducing the power of the Attorney-General to get a search warrant if he has reasonable cause to believe that a person has scientological records in his possession?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I hope you are not going to follow the line of the member for Wallaroo and say that I am trying to get personal glory and power?

Mr. HUDSON: I hope not, because the Attorney did not introduce this legislation: this is independent of his characteristics and character as Attorney-General.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I am glad of that.

Mr. HUDSON: Nevertheless, the power is being given to the Attorney to search for scientological records, to seize them, and to destroy them and, presumably, if we start on this road then we can go much further. I am not putting my faith in the Attorney-General even though at the moment he is a man of reasonably good character. He may turn bad.

Mr. Corcoran: How about as a legal man?

Mr. HUDSON: I did not say anything about his legal competence or whether I would have him as my counsel, but after yesterday's effort I would say that we would have great difficulty in accepting assurances given by any Minister in this Government. Cabinet Ministers have gone back on their word in one matter, and no-one in the community could be sure how far they will go in this matter. Not one Government member can really explain why it is necessary to ban scientology in the way it is proposed to do or why it is necessary to use this legal sledge hammer in order to crack this nut, when the undesirable practices that have occurred or may occur can be handled in other ways that will cope with the problem, whether it be scientology, or undesirable practices in relation to the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren or some other sect.

No-one in the Government, or any of those associated with the recent Select Committee, has considered that question. The report of the Select Committee was incompetent for that reason. Members of the committee were out to reach specific conclusions and to provide justification for its conclusions: they were not concerned to find an alternative way to achieve the desired result without going in for a kind of prohibition and the techniques that are involved in this form of legislation. Can the Attorney-General explain why it is not possible to provide legislation for the registration of psychologists?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Yes, we can do that.

Mr. HUDSON: Would not that mean that no scientologists could charge a fee for the practice of scientology?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It may, but to frame legislation would take time.

Mr. HUDSON: Would the registration of psychologists achieve the desired result?

The Hon Robin Millhouse: I do not know.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General does not know! Then the Government should withdraw the Bill and reconsider the matter. If the Attorney-General does not know whether the registration of psychologists would achieve the desired result, I suggest that he has not done his work properly on this matter. He does not know whether registration will produce the desired result, so he takes out the big sledge hammer and says, "We are going to ban these people and hold them up to public ridicule, whether they are respectable members of the community or not", and that no person (not just a person willing to teach scientology) is to be allowed to hold himself out to be willing to teach scientology or any stage, aspect or phase of scientology or to assist in the practice or application of scientology or any stage, aspect or phase of scientology.

It is not stated whether this applies only to someone holding himself out to do it for fee or reward. Clause 3(1)(b) applies to any person who decides that he wants to teach scientology free of charge, but he is prohibited from doing this. Why does the Attorney-General, the great protector of individual liberties (or so he held himself out to be when in Opposition), suddenly join the ranks of the "banners"? That is what has happened, and people in the community have every right to ask, "Who is next on the list?" Have there not been cases of personal harassment that have arisen in relation to the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren? Are there not cases of the breaking up of families and marriages that have occurred in South Australia and have been given publicity in the past? Why has not a Government member said that the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren should be banned? Perhaps that sect is next on the list and we may hear more about it.

What about the fact that Christian Science parents may prevent their children from being treated by a doctor? What about Jehovah's Witnesses who refuse a blood transfusion for their children? These incidents occur in the community: will we ban them as well? How far will the Government go once it starts on this road—once we get a taste of this kind of attitude, namely, "We who are properly established and who are in conformity with most of the community regarding the beliefs we hold, ban you, the other members of the community, who want to adopt a particular spiritual philosophy or religious approach"? I believe there have been people associated with scientology who have been out to earn money from it.

Mr. McKee: That doesn't apply only to scientology.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. The Attorney-General says he does not know—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Doesn't know what?

Mr. HUDSON: —whether or not the registration of psychologists will solve the problem facing him. I suggest that scientology, on the scale in which it has been indulged, would disappear once we required only the registration of psychologists, so that the scientologists, in practising their point of view, could not charge a fee, and so that they would be similar to any other religious group that has to support its particular religion in the normal way. There would be no opportunity of sucking in the public with advertisements, presenting courses, and charging excessive fees for those courses. This would disappear just through the simple step of registering psychologists, without having to ban anyone. Why go further? I think the Government on this matter has been sold a pup; either that, or certain members of the Government Party just are not Liberals in any sense of the word. Members on this side have suspected that for a long time, but we have always classed the Attorney-General as a Liberal.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You have never admitted that before.

Mr. HUDSON: I have always thought of the Attorney-General as a Liberal, although that does not apply to many of his colleagues.

Mr. Virgo: I thought he was a Tory.

Mr. HUDSON: A Liberal Tory, perhaps.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: I believe this measure involves an interference with civil liberties in the community. Only with those State Liberal Parties that are extremely right wing have State Governments been willing to go ahead with this. New South Wales certainly has not been willing.

Mr. Corcoran: You can imagine the tolerance of Sir Henry Bolte.

Mr. HUDSON: He is renowned for his tolerance!

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What about Western Australia?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not think the Western Australian Government's record in this matter stands up to any examination, either.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You are splitting with the Deputy Leader.

Mr. HUDSON: I am talking about the Western Australian Government. If Mr. Brand has been sold a pup by some of his colleagues, he has something to answer for as well. Both Tasmania and Queensland have refused to proceed with this matter and, as I have already said, the Victorian Government, in banning scientology, was going further than the recommendations of the Anderson inquiry. I think it is necessary to make the strongest possible protest. While the Government may disclaim any intention to interfere with what people wish to believe, nevertheless this is what it is doing; it has started on the road to proscribing certain beliefs, saying, "If you try in any way to practise these beliefs in public, you are guilty of an offence, and any records that you have in relation to this matter will be seized and destroyed."

I do not know whether we are to see any book-banning episodes and any nice bonfires such as those that marked the start of the Third Reich in Germany. I do not think at this stage, despite the sins of the current Government, despite its unreliability, and despite its incompetence, that we are entitled to accuse it of Hitlerism. But certainly this is a first step towards Hitlerism, and particularly is that the case where the problems with which it wishes to deal could have been handled in another way.

Mr. Lawn: They have a little corporal in the front seat.

Mr. HUDSON: I would have said the Attorney-General had already reached a rank in the Army greater than that which Hitler ever achieved. In order to get an example of alliteration, we may have to describe him as the "mad major".

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: I am discussing the right of individuals to believe what they wish to believe. Freedom of religion is one of the basic four freedoms. It is part of our basic civil liberties and should not be tampered with in this way, particularly when there are alternative ways of handling the problem. The member for Stirling has given us no answer on this matter at all.

Mr. McAnaney: You wanted to force people to use the railways; that's interfering with their civil liberties.

Mr. HUDSON: I think the member for Stirling has a rather peculiar notion of the meaning of civil liberties. When we are talking about civil liberties, we are, in my view, dealing with the basic four freedoms: freedom from fear, freedom of religion, freedom

of speech, and freedom from want. It is this area with which we are basically concerned when we are discussing civil liberties.

Mr. McAnaney: Well then, how do you explain your actions in the past?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling is indulging in an argument *ad hominem*; he is saying, "There is no point in accusing us of doing something crook, even if it is crook, because you are crook, anyway." That is no substitute for argument at all. The member for Stirling has singularly failed to demonstrate why it is necessary to produce the sledgehammer of prohibition in order to crack a couple of nuts.

Mr. McAnaney: You want to be careful.

Mr. HUDSON: Why?

Mr. McAnaney: You are talking about nuts.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation across the Chamber. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader made it clear that we on this side would support legislation to provide that personal harassment of a certain kind against an individual was an offence and that people could apply to the court, and the court, either by injunction or by requiring a bond, could prevent such personal harassment from recurring. Many of the offences that scientologists are alleged to commit would be completely catered for in this way. Again, the Attorney-General is unable to say that this would not be a satisfactory alternative. What about the undesirable practices that have been associated with the exclusive order? What about the breaking up of families associated with that? We do not think the Government should act against these things but that it should provide against what can be defined in specific terms.

If there is a class of personal harassment that can be dealt with in a general way so that it does not matter whether the thing is being done by a scientologist, a member of the exclusive order or any other member of the community, surely that is the appropriate way to handle it if such an action becomes unlawful. If it is handled in that way it is no longer necessary to ban people's beliefs. We know that the Government has little respect for people's beliefs. It does not place equal value on the views of citizens in relation to political matters. It is pretty clear that, in trying to convert any member of the Government on this matter, we are speaking to closed minds that are incapable of appreciating that they do not have a divine right to judge other people's beliefs. These members say, "There

is nothing wrong with my religious views but yours are crook and we are going to ban them." This is an anti-libertarian approach which smacks of the beginnings of Hitlerism and, after all, it is simply unnecessary.

We have already had the most damaging admission from the Attorney-General this afternoon that he does not know whether registration of psychologists would produce the desired result but that he will ban the scientists anyway. That is the kind of incompetence that shows a complete lack of respect for individuals in the community and it comes from a Minister who claims that he believes in the freedom of the individual and in the individual's right to undertake business in any way he pleases, to own property or to grade oranges. He believes in those things, but what about the right of the individual to have his own beliefs? Surely the criterion that should be applied is that it is not the individual's beliefs that have to be made unlawful but any practices of an individual that interfere with the rights of others. If this can be achieved by relatively mild legislation then that mild legislation is much to be preferred to the "across the board" prohibition, and it is that type of prohibition which the Government has provided for this matter and which is the subject of protest on this occasion. I make it clear that I hold no brief for the views of scientologists, as I think those views are nonsense, but that does not mean that I have the right to stop other people from holding those views.

I also want to make some comments on the matters which have led up to this, because they are also indicative of the Government's attitude on the matter. I refer in particular to the procedures adopted in another place in bringing a member of the public before the Bar of the Legislative Council and condemning him without giving him a chance to have his say or to put up any defence. Not only that, but that person (Mr. Klaebe) was condemned in circumstances where the Select Committee subsequently refused to take action against any other person who did a similar thing. If Mr. Klaebe was condemned, then so should Mr. Harrison and some other people who wrote into the committee charging bias have been condemned. Yet Government members have tried to tell us that the Select Committee did a good job.

Mr. Lawn: It backed down.

Mr. HUDSON: I hope it did. Nevertheless, we had the spectacle in the Legislative Council of the "banners", the prohibitors, bringing a

member of the public before the Bar, charging him, not allowing him the right to state his case, not even bothering to consider whether there were any grounds for the complaint he had made, and censuring him for his action. What a disgusting spectacle that was, but it is consistent with the attitude of this Government and its approach to the Bill. It is entirely in line with the doctrine that states, "Let us ban this and that; we do not like it, let us ban it." I think members should make the strongest protest on this matter. After all, many religious beliefs are held throughout our community. True, most people are in the mainstream and hold religious beliefs that are in conformity with the doctrine handed down to us over the centuries. Bearing these considerations in mind, I am not sure at this stage whether this Bill is unconstitutional so far as the Commonwealth Constitution is concerned. We have the judgment of Latham, C.J., in the Jehovah's Witnesses case, in which His Honour said:

It would be difficult, if not impossible, to devise a definition of religion which would satisfy the adherents of all the many and various religions which exist, or have existed, in the world. There are those who regard religion as consisting principally in a system of beliefs or statement of doctrine. So viewed religion may be either true or false. Others are more inclined to regard religion as prescribing a code of conduct. So viewed a religion may be good or bad.

Later, His Honour said:

The scope of religion has varied very greatly during human history. Probably most Europeans would regard religion as necessarily involving some ideas of doctrines affecting the relation of man to a Supreme Being. But Buddhism, one of the great religions of the world, is considered by many authorities to involve no conception of a God. For example, Professor Gilbert Murray says: "We must always remember that one of the chief religions of the world, Buddhism, has risen to great moral and intellectual heights without using the conception of God at all; in his stead it has Dharma, the Eternal Law." (*Five Stages of Greek Religion*, ch. 1). On the other hand, almost any matter may become an element in religious belief or religious conduct. The wearing of particular clothes, the eating or the non-eating of meat or other foods, the observance of ceremonies, not only in religious worship, but in the everyday life of the individual—all of these may become part of religion. Once upon a time all the operations of agriculture were controlled by religious precepts. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that each person chooses the content of his own religion. It is not for a court, upon some *a priori* basis, to disqualify certain beliefs as incapable of being religious in character.

In view of that judgment, I think there is doubt whether a challenge to this legislation, if it passes this House (and I hope that it does not) would not succeed. Nevertheless, Chief Justice Latham makes important points about the nature of religion and religious belief. I add by own view that, where the element of faith is involved in the holding of a particular belief or set of beliefs, it is not possible to argue on any rational basis with that confrontation. It is a matter supremely for the individual. Because it is not possible to develop logical arguments about whether items of faith are true, it is not possible to properly analyse what is or is not religion or what is or is not religious in nature. It is because of this element of faith in particular that religion is peculiarly an individual matter, and the right to worship is one of the fundamental civil rights of the community, not just the right to worship a God but the right of the individual to worship generally in the way he sees fit.

The community becomes interested in the matter only if a person's beliefs lead him to behaviour that adversely affects the rights of others. That is where our attitude on personal harassment comes in, because it is clear that personal harassment can be and has been involved in areas other than scientology. Therefore, the appropriate way to deal with these problems is not by a specific law prohibiting one religious or semi-religious sect and holding the beliefs of that sect up to public ridicule. What is appropriate is the introduction of a general law that can be applied universally whenever these undesirable practices occur. Because that can be done, there is nothing to stop the scientologist from engaging in his own beliefs. He is simply prevented from indulging in practices that affect the basic liberties that apply in a community. In those circumstances, the community does not demand that the scientologist shall cease to practice his religion or what he regards as being a religion. I regard this matter as tremendously serious. It puzzles me greatly to understand how it has come about in Australia that the business of scientology has been considered in every State. Apparently, it has come about through the conferences of Health Ministers, and through certain Governments being dominated by people who are not liberal but dictatorial people who have seen fit to support legislation that excessively interferes with civil liberties in the community.

I find it difficult to understand the attitude of the Attorney-General, in particular, and I should like again to press certain points on him. In past years he has taken a stand on the freedom of the individual and the individual's rights not just to believe or speak as he pleases but also to work as he pleases and to do as he pleases in business, not being subject to interference in price control and not subject to Government interference in any other way, even though that sort of prohibition imposed by the community can be more readily justified. Yet, the Attorney-General here contemplates legislation that drastically interferes with a basic civil right, with something that we, as a community, accept as basic to the human being, namely, a desire to be religious and have some set of beliefs governing a person's attitude to life and the things around him.

I do not care how one looks at this Bill: it interferes with a group of people in the community who have a particular attitude toward life and others around them. I could perhaps understand the Attorney-General and others in Cabinet agreeing to this legislation if there were no alternative but, as I have already stated, there is an alternative that will almost certainly work: the registering of psychologists, coupled with laws in relation to personal harassment, will prevent anyone from making a financial racket out of the teaching of scientology. That is what it will effectively mean: once we prevent the racket occurring, once we prevent someone getting involved in a particular creed (not because of his religious beliefs, but because there is a financial gain to be had), there is nothing to be made. Once we have done that, we will have overcome the greater part of the difficulties.

I think there is a clear analogy in this matter with the banning of Communism, although the banning of Communism is a subject of much greater importance in general than the banning of scientology. One of the features of Communism is its own totalitarianism and its own demand on individuals within the Communist Party to adhere strictly, not just to a particular view of the world, but to the interpretation put on that view by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. This attitude is completely foreign to the basic principles of life that we in Australia believe in. Because it is completely foreign, the question arose as to which was the most appropriate way of dealing with Communism: keeping it legal and out in the open, and exposing its doctrines for what they were, or banning it. The reason why the Australian community refused to agree

to the banning of Communism was simply that it saw that if Communism was banned it would lead to some of the forms of totalitarianism that were objected to in Communism itself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it the honourable member will connect his remarks to the Bill?

Mr. HUDSON: I hoped that you, Mr. Speaker, would see that the analogy was obvious: I think it is clear. The same principle is involved in relation to scientology. We are really objecting to the practices involved in scientology rather than to the characteristics of totalitarianism in the structure of the administration of scientology. This is one of the facets of the matter: when a community sets about banning in order to stop those practices, it is starting to indulge itself in those self-same practices; it is starting to demand a greater degree of conformity of its citizens than has ever been demanded in the past.

I am disturbed that not more of the religious leaders in the community have protested against this measure, because it seems to me that they, of all people, should be basically interested in the individual rights of our citizens to believe what they want to believe as long as they do not interfere with the basic rights of others. We have made it clear that we strongly oppose this measure and make the strongest form of public protest, because we do not think it is necessary. We believe that the practices that are objectionable and carried out by scientologists can be handled in another way, namely, by the Government registering psychologists and at the same time providing an individual civil remedy against personal harassment. If this were done there would be no need to ban scientology or, indeed, to start banning anything else. We on this side believe that this Government is not to be trusted if it gets the taste of banning into its collective mouth, because it may like to go further and start considering other organizations. The principle in relation to scientology once having been established, what is to stop the same principle of banning being used in relation to other religious sects?

Mr. Lawn: They would like to ban the Labor Party.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): As I understand it, the line of attack on this Bill by Opposition members is that, although they do not like scientology and regard it as something—

Mr. Lawn: Like the Liberal Party.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —that is not desirable, they do not like the way in which the Government is approaching the problem of curbing the undesirable aspects of that cult. I must admit, and do so frankly, that the scheme of this Bill does, to some extent, infringe on the liberties of individuals (and this is undesirable in itself), but I believe that the evils (and I use that word advisedly) of scientology and its undesirable features are so great as to justify the way we are approaching the problem.

Mr. Broomhill: Would you outline the undesirable features?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have just been handed a copy of the Anderson report.

Mr. Broomhill: What about in South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I believe that the evils and undesirable practices that we seek to control by this Bill justify the approach we are making. We were reproached by the Leader and by the member for Glenelg, who said that we had not examined other ways of tackling the problem but, unfortunately, we have not been able to find, in the short time available (and we considered that this was a matter of some urgency) any more satisfactory approach than this, and no other State has been able to find any more satisfactory approach, either. If the alternative suggested by the member for West Torrens was practicable I should be happy to adopt it, but it has not been brought to my attention before and has not commended itself to any State that has taken the step we are taking.

Mr. Hudson: Would you adjourn the debate and consider it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No.

Mr. Hudson: Then you are not genuine.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Opposition members who are making the suggestion know as well as I that if we do not press on with the matter now we cannot do anything for two or three months, and the Government regards this as an important and urgent matter. Between now and the time the House resumes I will consider these suggestions.

Mr. Hudson: The damage will have been done by then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg has made his speech.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, and it was a long one, too, and towards the end it began to get tedious.

Mr. Broomhill: What is the immediate urgency that faces the Government?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We regard the practices and activities of scientology as being undesirable.

Mr. Broomhill: It can't wait for another two months!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We think it better not to. I am making the point that no other State that has taken this step has been able to devise any other approach to this problem.

Mr. Broomhill: Their problems may have been different.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, they are just the same.

Mr. Hudson: Why don't you read Anderson's recommendations?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: They were not the same as provided by the Victorian Bill, for a good reason: the Victorians with much effort could not translate his recommendations into legislative form, and that is why the legislation that was passed in Victoria is in the form it is, and why our Bill is modelled on the Victorian legislation. They are plain facts: members opposite may scoff—

Mr. Hudson: We do.

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

Mr. Clark: You could hardly blame them.

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

Mr. Hudson: But you ban scientology first?

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

Mr. Hudson: Why not try it first?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because it is not—

Mr. Hudson: You love power.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of honourable members to Standing Order 158, which provides:

No member shall interrupt another member whilst speaking, unless (1) to request that his words be taken down; (2) to call attention to a point of order; (3) to call attention to the want of a quorum; or (4) to move a motion in pursuance of Standing Order 62 or 155.

There are far too many interjections and interruptions. I know members want to hear what the Attorney-General's defence is to the attack of the Opposition, an attack its members are entitled to make, but I think he should be heard uninterrupted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The interjections were becoming rather persistent. It takes time to work out a system of registration which is acceptable to the profession to be registered, and we do not want to force any particular system on the psychologists of this State. We think it should be done with agreement and with the psychologists' support, and that is why the scheme in this Bill has been adopted and brought into the House first. But we hope in due course that there will be a measure to register psychologists. We have also been reproached by members opposite with basing our Bill and our assertions on scientology on the Anderson report. I, for one, am content to accept the fact that we have largely relied on the evidence and the report itself.

Mr. Broomhill: I would be ashamed to admit that if I were you.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether or not the member for West Torrens agrees to the contention in the document *Kangaroo Court*. I am prepared to accept the Anderson report as a genuine attempt to describe what was going on in Victoria.

Mr. Broomhill: We can accept that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I presume the honourable member's Party accepts the Anderson report as a fair document. I am glad to have that assertion from the honourable member, because it has not come out very clearly from the speeches of the Leader or the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Broomhill: I am speaking for myself.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is resiling, because he said "we" a little while ago. He says he is prepared to accept the Anderson report. Scientology is, as I understand it, a world-wide movement. It is not a movement which is peculiar to Victoria or South Australia or which is different in one place from another.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you certain of that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is my understanding. Apparently, the member for West Torrens thinks it is different in nature from place to place but, as I understand it, Mr. Ron Hubbard regards himself as the leader of a world body, and he leads it from somewhere in Britain when he is allowed to go into the country.

Mr. Clark: Is he still allowed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No. He was denied entry by the present Labor Government. Scientology is a world-wide movement; it is not one which is different in Victoria or in South Australia. Scientologists all over the world apparently look to the writings of Mr. Hubbard himself as their authority for what they do and preach. Those writings are the same, whether one reads and acts on them in South Australia, Victoria, Britain or the United States. What was found in Victoria and what was said about scientology in that State has much force everywhere where scientology is practised, because it is the same movement, and the same beliefs and practices are indulged in.

Mr. Clark: Would you say the Victorian legislation has been effective?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In reply to the member for Gawler, yes, I think it has been effective. We believe many scientologists left Victoria and came here as a result of the passing of that legislation, and that is one reason why we have been faced with the problem in South Australia. The writings of Mr. Hubbard have not changed since the Anderson report was produced in 1965 and the Premier, in introducing this Bill, has already referred to some of the more bizarre of the beliefs of scientologists as set out in those writings, although I do not wish to go over that again. We have been chided with not bringing forth any evidence in South Australia concerning the evils of scientology. I had complaints about the activities of individual scientologists before this Government came into office.

Mr. McKee: Was it confined to scientologists?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. These are complaints related to the activities of scientologists towards individuals. I had these before we came into office, and we have had them since we came into office. But in the very nature of these things it is not the desire of those who make the complaints that there should be publicity for them. We know much more, unfortunately, than it is possible to make public, and I venture to say that the last Government was aware of many of these things. A particular pamphlet was handed to me by a constituent about two years ago; I do not have the actual pamphlet here now, but I have a photostat of it, and I have seen a copy of the original, which is held by the police, actually. Whether it is the same copy as I was shown I do not know, but immediately I saw it I recognized it as something I had seen before. The pamphlet, entitled *Critics of Scientology*, is by L. Ron Hubbard, and it is No. 3 of Volume 9 of the publication known as *Communication*. We may not be able to put before the House definite complaints, but if this line of conduct is being followed by scientologists, in my mind it abundantly justifies the action that we are taking. I believe the writings of Hubbard are disseminated by scientologists and among scientologists and that they follow what they are asked to follow by Mr. Hubbard himself. Let members see what they think about scientology after having heard the following:

If Aunt Ermiltrude each night went through your change purse and extracted divers coins without your knowledge, and then if she found you had joined a group that could discover secrets, her immediate and passionate reaction would be to damn the group and you as well. If the wife were stepping out with your best friend behind your back and one day she found you had thoughts of joining a group that taught you people's motives and reactions and made you understand them, she would throw a mad dog fit to prevent your progress. If a government were busy making capital out of people's ignorance of economics and world affairs and were playing a double game and a group came along and started to make its people smarter and more knowledgeable of true motives, that government would try to shoot every member of that group on sight. If a group of "scientists" were knowingly raising the number of insane to get more appropriation and "treatment" fees and somebody came along with the real answer, that group would move heaven and earth to protect its billions of rake-off. And so individuals, governments and "scientists" attack scientology. It's as simple as that. We do not treat the sick or the insane. We break no laws. We do more good in any 10 minutes of this

planet's time than the combined efforts of all social ministries on earth to better mankind. Stated that way, however, it looks pretty hopeless and even dangerous to be a scientologist. Except it is totally hopeless and fatal not to be a scientologist. Those who are not scientologists are left in complete ignorance of the motives of the dishonest. And they have no chance of personal immortality.

Here is a group of people who say they are a religion and put on dog collars to show that they are ministers of religion, yet they say that no-one who is not a scientologist has any chance of immortality. How on earth that makes scientology a brother or sister religion of the Christian religion, or any other religion, I do not know. But this is one of the claims scientologists have been making in the last few months. The publication continues:

It is as simple as that. It is better to be endangered but with a chance than to be condemned utterly and without one. Those who criticize one for being a scientologist or make snide remarks cannot stand a personal survey of past actions or motive. This happens to be a fortunate fact for us.

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

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The pamphlet continues:

The criminal abhors daylight. And we are the daylight. Now get this as a technical fact, not a hopeful idea. Every time we have investigated the background of a critic of scientology we have found crimes for which that person or group could be imprisoned under existing law. We do not find critics of scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we prove this. Politician A stands up on his hind legs in a Parliament and brays for a condemnation of scientology. When we look him over we find crimes—embezzled funds, moral lapses, a thirst for young boys—sordid stuff. Wife B howls at her husband for attending a scientology group. We look her up and find she had a baby he didn't know about. Two things operate here. Criminals hate anything that helps anyone instinctively. And just as instinctively a criminal fights anything that may disclose his past. These are the people that members opposite are defending.

Mr. Virgo: We are not defending them at all.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The pamphlet continues:

Now as criminals only compose about 20 per cent of the race, we are on the side of the majority. This is quite true. In one country we have almost exactly 100 scientologists for every member and supporter of psychiatry. They make the noise because they are afraid. But we have more general influence and more votes. The way we handle the situation now is simplicity itself and we are winning. We are slowly and carefully teaching the unholly a lesson. It is as follows:

"We are not a law enforcement agency but we will become interested in the crimes of people who seek to stop us. If you oppose scientology we promptly look up—and will find and expose—your crimes. If you leave us alone we will leave you alone." It's very simple. Even a fool can grasp that. And don't underrate our ability to carry it out. Our business is helping people to lead better lives. We even help those who have committed crimes for we are not here to punish. But those who try to make life hard for us are at once at risk.

We are only interested in doing our job. And we are only interested in the crimes of those who try to prevent us from doing our work. There is no good reason to oppose scientology. In our game everybody wins. And we have this technical fact—those who oppose us have crimes to hide. It's perhaps merely lucky that this is true. But it is true. And we handle opposition well only when we use it. Try it on your next critic. Like everything else in scientology, it works. Sample dialogue:

George: Gwen, if you don't drop scientology I'm going to leave you.

Gwen (savagely): George! What have you been doing?

George: What do you mean?

Gwen: Out with it. Women? Theft?

Murder? What crimes have you committed?

George (weakly): Oh, nothing like that.

Gwen: What then?

George: I've been holding back on my pay . . .

If you, the criticized, are savage enough and insistent enough in your demand for the crime you'll get the text meter or no meter. Never discuss scientology with the critic. Just discuss his or her crimes, known or unknown. And act completely confident that those crimes exist because they do. Life will suddenly become much more interesting—and you'll become much less suppressed!

The pamphlet is apparently signed "L. Ron Hubbard". That is the outlook and mentality of the founder of scientology who is writing in the journal which, I understand, is circulated amongst scientologists. If that is not enough, at least to raise suspicion—

Mr. Corcoran: To ban them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I said "at least to raise suspicion", and if that is not enough at least to raise suspicion I do not know what is. I now turn to what was said by Mr. Anderson in his report.

Mr. Virgo: The Victorian report.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, what the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) was good enough to say before dinner that he would accept.

Mr. Virgo: That's a lot of rubbish.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Edwardstown disagrees with the member for West Torrens. The member for

Edwardstown says that the Anderson report is a lot of rubbish.

Mr. Virgo: We are free to vote as we want to.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wish to quote a few paragraphs of the report in chapter 30, under the heading "Conclusions", as follows:

If there should be detected in this report a note of unrelieved denunciation of scientology, it is because the evidence has shown its theories to be fantastic and impossible, its principles perverted and ill-founded, and its techniques debased and harmful. Scientology is a delusional belief system, based on fiction and fallacies and propagated by falsehood and deception. While making an appeal to the public as a worthy system whereby ability, intelligence and personality may be improved, it employs techniques which further its real purpose of securing domination over and mental enslavement of its adherents. It involves the administration by persons without any training in medicine or psychology of quasi-psychological treatment, which is harmful medically, morally and socially.

Yet members opposite say nothing should be done about it.

Mr. Corcoran: That's completely untrue and you know it is. You are telling lies again and that statement is a complete lie. You know it is, now isn't it?

Mr. Clark: Correct what you've said.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For the benefit of the vinegary old member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) who has a smile on his face, the report continues:

Its founder, with the merest smattering of knowledge in various sciences, has built upon the scintilla of his learning a crazy and dangerous edifice. The Hubbard Association of Scientologists International claims to be "the world's largest mental health organization". One member opposite (and I hope I am correct in saying this) has said that it is different in Victoria from what it is in South Australia, but it claims to be the world's largest mental health organization.

Mr. Virgo: There's no evidence of that here, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! We cannot have more than one speech at a time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The report continues:

What it really is, however, is the world's largest organization of unqualified persons engaged in the practice of dangerous techniques which masquerade as mental therapy. No acceptable or recognized standards are prescribed for its practitioners, whose ignorance of orthodox medicine and psychology make them each a menace to the health of the community. They are the more dangerous because of their spurious air of competence and the

tremendous amount of mis-directed energy which has gone into promoting the organization and devising techniques, the mentally crippling qualities of which are cleverly concealed. That many scientologists sincerely believe in the virtues and the efficacy of scientology is apparent from the evidence. Some have become so dedicated to it and have served it so faithfully that their sacrifices cannot but excite compassion. These ardent devotees, though quite rational and intelligent on other subjects, are possessed of an invincible impediment to reason where scientology is concerned.

The report continues:

The overall picture of scientology is thus one of grave disquiet.

Mr. Virgo: What about the South Australian report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will come to that.

Mr. Virgo: I hope you do.

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

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The report continues:

The inquiry has revealed the real nature of scientology and its serious threat to the mental health of the community, and it is evident that its continued practice should not be permitted.

Mr. Corcoran: Is that a recommendation or a comment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is a recommendation in the first paragraph in chapter 31, under the heading "Recommendations".

Mr. Virgo: The recommendation of one man.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) has canvassed the Jehovah's Witnesses case, I think I should speak on scientology and religion, which is also dealt with in chapter 31, as follows:

In considering the nature, extent and effect of recommendations which it deems proper to make, the board has constantly kept in mind the distinction between the holding of beliefs on the one hand and harmful practices based on such beliefs on the other. Such a distinction assumes added importance when the body of beliefs under consideration may reasonably be described as a religion. It is quite clear, however, that scientology in Victoria does not remotely resemble anything even vaguely religious, and no serious claim was made that it did.

Then there is a discussion of the Jehovah's Witnesses case. That is all that I intend to quote from the report. The member for Edwardstown has been chiming in and saying that members have read it. If they have, I hope they are well informed.

Mr. Virgo: We have read it all, not only the passages you have quoted.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, I invite the honourable member to quote any other passages he wishes to quote. I hope he does, because it was a damning indictment of scientology, made in Victoria a few years ago. As I have said before the dinner adjournment, my conviction on scientology is the same now as it was then. Members on this side are not alone in this matter, because the Labor Party's Minister of Health (Hon. A. J. Shard) attended conferences when he was in office and supported resolutions on this topic.

Mr. Virgo: We've heard this, too. We aren't bound, like you blokes are, though.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg has said that only a few reactionaries who happen to be in office have influenced the Government to take action on scientology. I do not know whether Mr. Shard has had an influence.

Mr. Virgo: He hasn't influenced you to take action.

Mr. Corcoran: The Government of which he was a member didn't take any action.

The SPEAKER: Order! This conversation must cease.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The resolution is as follows:

That this conference deplores the activities of those responsible for the cult of scientology and considers that a close watch should be maintained to prevent its spread. The conference further believes that States should take action against this harmful cult if it appears to be spreading.

Mr. Corcoran: Not to ban it, though.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was the member for Glenelg who said that reactionaries had influenced the Government to take action. I have said almost as much as I need to say (in fact, more than I need to say) to convince all members of the virtues of the Bill to ban scientology in South Australia. I remind members opposite of the actions of their own colleague, when he was the Minister of Health, in considering and supporting a resolution of Australian Ministers on this topic.

Mr. Virgo: We could remind you of what you have done, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will read that resolution again.

Mr. Virgo: You needn't worry.

Mr. Corcoran interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader is inviting me to read it. As he is still senior, although just senior, to the

member for Edwardstown, I think I will give it. The resolution is as follows:

That this conference deplores the activities of those responsible for the cult of scientology and considers that a close watch should be maintained to prevent its spread. The conference further believes that States should take action against this harmful cult if it appears to be spreading.

Mr. Corcoran: Would that be considered to be a recommendation back to the Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is not outside; he is inside the Chamber.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader should behave as though he were. That was the resolution which was passed and in which the Minister of Health in the late Labor Government participated. At the conference held in Darwin last June, a resolution on this topic was passed, and I am informed by the present Minister of Health that it was a unanimous resolution. There is still one Labor Minister of Health in Australia (in Tasmania), and he apparently concurred in this resolution, so it is not only reactionaries who feel as we do that action should be taken in this matter.

Mr. Virgo: Has the Tasmanian Government banned scientology?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister concurred in this resolution. The resolution states:

The Ministers deplored the continued activities of the cult of scientology in some States. They described the activity of the cult as insidious. They said it was a matter of some concern that the teachings of the cult cut right across the accepted mental health treatment methods. The Ministers reaffirmed the view of the Victorian board of inquiry report in 1965, which described the cult as perverted, debased and harmful.

It is significant that members opposite are now saying that this relates only to Victoria and that things in South Australia are quite different three years later, but all the Ministers of Health throughout Australia only a few months ago reaffirmed what was said in the Victorian inquiry in 1965.

Mr. Lawn: There is no difference between them and the Liberal Party. They are all rotten and corrupt.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know how the Tasmanian colleague of the member for Adelaide would take that.

Mr. Lawn: I meant the Liberal Party and scientologists were all the same.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The resolution continues:

The Ministers said that a close watch would be kept on the cult.

Mr. Lawn: You have repeated yourself several times.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not read it at all before.

Mr. Lawn: You have.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The resolution continues:

The Ministers said that a close watch would be kept on the cult to prevent its spread and that if it showed any signs of developing further they would recommend that their States act individually to take legislation against it. That is, of course, what we are doing and what has been done in Western Australia. Members opposite are rather silent now, but that is a resolution, and I think it reinforces the arguments we have already put. I have been chided by members opposite for not saying anything about the situation in South Australia. In answer to that chiding, I invite all members to look at the evidence of the Select Committee in another place.

Mr. Virgo: We have.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the member has, the only reason why he is not taking notice of it is that he does not want to, because any member who has had a look at that evidence with a clear and open mind will be convinced, I am sure, of the necessity in this State to take action in the matter. Even scientologists themselves apparently are prepared to admit, at least by implication, that they should do something about their previous activities. I have here a letter addressed to a member of another place and dated December 4 (so it is reasonably up to date) from the body known as the Church of Scientology of California, the Guardian Office of which is apparently at 21-3 Peel Street, Adelaide. It states:

Dear Sir, As the official representative of the Church of Scientology, I am instructed to inform you that the Church of Scientology in Adelaide is completely willing to reform any and all abuses if, in fact, any are clearly established to exist. Please note that we have already abolished disconnection letters and no longer keep records of confessions.

These are two of the matters about which complaints have been made. The letter continues:

The Bill before Parliament takes no account of the fact that we are willing to reform.

Mr. Clark: They are admitting there is a need to reform.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is right. The letter continues:

In the light of this, we feel it is quite unnecessary.

That, I suggest with respect, is an admission on the part of scientologists that at least some action is necessary because of their activities in the past. So far as I and the Government are concerned, it is rather too late for letters such as that to come now.

Mr. Corcoran: What is your view of the Leader's proposal?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have already given those views in answer actually, I think, to the Deputy Leader. I said earlier that I was more than interested to look at the suggestions of the Leader and that, if there was anything in them, perhaps we could do something about them.

Mr. Clark: Won't you have already passed the Bill?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope it will have been passed by then, but it is always possible for Parliament to review these things. It is no good going over that again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interruption.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am interested in the Leader's suggestions, and I will certainly have a look at them and, if necessary, make recommendations to the Government on them. But I point out, as I pointed out before, that this form of legislation is the only form which it has been possible and practicable to introduce in other places. It is the only one which so far we have found practicable. I do not intend to say any more; it is obvious that the members of the Opposition are not prepared to listen. They are not prepared to accept any of our arguments on this. Whatever we say they will ignore, because they do not want to listen to what we say, accept any arguments or, indeed, to depart from the position which has been dictated for them by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe this Bill is justified; I believe that in the interests of the whole community it should be passed, and I hope it is accepted by the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that, when I call on the honourable member for Whyalla, he will be heard without any interruption. The honourable member for Whyalla.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I think that, when any Government talks about banning an organization, it must do so for one of two reasons. Either it must be so

concerned about the beliefs of that organization that it wants to try to cramp its style and prevent its beliefs being promulgated, or it must consider that a certain amount of harm is being done to various people in the community and that, on that account, the organization deserves to be banned. The Leader has rightly pointed out that, when it comes to a question of banning an organization because of its beliefs, we are on dangerous ground. We have only to look back in history to see the number of cases when attempts have been made from time to time to destroy new ideas. It is only necessary to examine these instances to see how fallacious is the idea to ban an organization that happens to be promoting a new idea. An idea is not destroyed in that way. In fact, often it is promoted, because it excites curiosity, and many people take much more notice of that idea simply because it is being banned. We have the example of banned books; a book has only to be banned for it to become one of the most popular books in circulation. I believe the Leader was right when he said that it was a serious infringement of liberty to try to ban a belief. I think that this disposes of the main part of the argument in relation to banning Scientology.

All that is left is the question whether the promotion of Scientology is doing harm to people in the community sufficiently to warrant the banning of this organization. So far this House has not had sufficient evidence, in my opinion, to warrant the banning of this organization. Furthermore, as the Leader pointed out, there are alternative ways of dealing with the particular ills said to flow from Scientology. It has been pointed out that, if it is a question of personal harassment of persons who have been influenced by this organization, there are ways of dealing with that through existing legislation. If any area is not covered by existing legislation, surely it should be possible to produce legislation to deal with that aspect rather than to strike at one organization. Surely the law should be general in this respect and should deal with the matter in a general way; it should not single out one particular organization. It is obvious that, if we had the registration of psychologists and the control of their operation, and if we licensed qualified people who wished to act as psychologists for fee or reward, we could exercise a general control of the field at which we are looking in this case, because this is purely and simply a psychological field.

I cannot see any sound grounds for the Attorney-General's telling us that there is some special difficulty in framing legislation to deal with these points. During this session we have had legislation framed here to deal with most difficult and intricate subjects; we have had long Bills with all sorts of ramifications. When it comes to collecting finance, the Treasurer is never in difficulty in producing a Bill of 20 to 30 pages, dealing with every conceivable ramification, in order to collect that finance. Surely it is not beyond the bounds of possibility to frame satisfactory legislation to deal with this matter in a general way. I concur entirely with the Leader's views, and also with those of other members of this side who have spoken, to the effect that there are other organizations of a similar character that we could look at just as firmly as we are looking at the Scientology movement. Of course, one of the reasons we do not look at these organizations in quite the same way is that perhaps they might, shall I say, fit in a little more closely with our accepted ideas. It is seen throughout history that people have always tried to condemn that which was most remote from their accepted and orthodox ideas.

One has only to think back to some of the world's greatest innovators who were condemned for their ideas and innovations. In this connection I have in mind Galileo. Those members who know the history of that man know how he was condemned for his valuable ideas simply because they were too advanced for the times. This Bill savours far too much of dictatorship and of complete intolerance to satisfy me. What is more, no real evidence has yet been produced to the House to show that the evils mentioned are of sufficient magnitude to warrant barring this organization. This should be the very last resort. I think we were all struck by the fact that the Attorney-General was not very happy in trying to defend the Bill. He said that the Bill did, to some extent, infringe the liberty of the individual. Of course, he had to defend the Bill but, knowing his past form, I know that, had he been in Opposition and had we introduced this Bill, he would have condemned the Bill hook, line and sinker because of the infringement of the liberty of the individual.

The Bill is being introduced in what I call panic fashion, simply because similar legislation in Victoria has caused these people to come to this State. With great haste, the Bill has been promoted in another place and brought down here and, despite the setting up of a Select Committee to inquire, it is noticeable that the committee has mainly relied on

the Anderson report for its conclusions. While we were in office, the file on this matter showed there was insufficient evidence to warrant banning the organization. In any case, the right approach is to promote the law in a general way to deal with what are called evils arising out of this organization.

As the Leader said earlier, he has personally come across people of the most excellent character who have derived great benefit from this organization. So, although there may be some evidence to the contrary in respect of other people, this shows that some people of unblemished character have said distinctly and firmly that they have received great benefit from the organization. It seems to me that it is very much along the lines of some other organizations which have tried to instil confidence into people of somewhat weak character who have needed concentrated psychological work to establish confidence in themselves. Doubtless, this has been done in many cases. I have little time for much of the claptrap in the literature issued by this organization, but I could be just as critical of much of the literature issued by some other organizations. If many things that we accept as being part of every-day life were analysed thoroughly, they could be shown to be quite fallacious, but we do not impose bans simply because of that. The Attorney-General, whilst admitting that the Bill to some extent infringed the liberty of the individual, was not prepared to take up seriously the Leader's suggestion or say that the Government would put the Bill aside and consider the matter further. Because of the seriousness of what is being done, the right course would be to abandon the Bill now and set about framing the legislation necessary to curb the alleged evils arising from the activities of this organization.

The Attorney read much from a document issued by this organization and implied that what he read were serious and terrible things. However, I thought that few people with balanced minds would take seriously that sort of rubbish. In fact, it would not convince anyone who read it to join the organization. Many of the sentences were so far-fetched and ridiculous that they would not convince anyone with a logical mind, yet the Attorney-General held out this document as a reason for banning the organization. The Government's approach to this matter is wrong, and I hope that the Bill will be withdrawn and that the Government will draw up legislation to deal with the two points that have been mentioned tonight, namely, any area of

harassment of the individual that cannot be dealt with by existing legislation, and the registration of psychologists so that this professional work can be done by people who are fully qualified and who can be relied upon to deal with this matter properly and honestly. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I strongly support the Bill, for various reasons. When the matter of scientology was first raised, I had an open mind about whether it was an advantage to a community. At that time we commenced receiving much literature from Leigh Street, where the headquarters of scientology in South Australia is located, and I consider that the organization condemned itself by its own writings. First, we were told that scientology was a religion. Possibly it is: that depends on one's definition of religion. However, I consider that it was termed a religion so that it could be tied with Christianity, which South Australians believe in and consider good.

Mr. Hudson: Would you ban Buddhism?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILES: Many scientologists honestly consider that scientology benefits them, and it may do that: I do not know. I can only accept the word of these people on that. Although the evidence has not been placed before this Chamber, anyone who likes to read the evidence available will see that many people are disadvantaged by being members of the organization. The fact that scientology was banned in Victoria showed that a group of people who gave evidence before Mr. Anderson considered the organization undesirable, and necessary action was taken to ban it. I understand that the scientology organization is governed by the central organization at St. Hill Manor, Sussex, England.

Mr. Virgo: Why don't you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILES: Our Prime Minister rules the whole of Australia and, by a simple analogy, one man, Mr. Hubbard, is ruling scientology from Sussex. The operations of scientology in Victoria would be similar to those in South Australia. When the Bill to ban the organization was introduced in Victoria, the scientologists decided to change their code so that they could continue to operate. If an organization has strong foundations, there is no need for it to make such a change, particularly in some of the basic things it believes in.

Mr. Broomhill: It's a pity the L.C.L. didn't follow that code.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILES: I have a document dated November 29, 1968, entitled *Code of Reform*, and it has four cancellations on it. I understand, from what I have heard of the organization, that two of these matters are major parts of the foundation of the organization but that these are to be altered simply to make the organization legal here or in any other State. An organization that so changes its code is not built on a sound foundation. We do not change our basic beliefs in Christianity simply because someone raises an objection. The first change is the cancellation of disconnection as a relief to those suffering from familial suppression.

Mr. Virgo: What are they suffering from?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Virgo: Tell me what they're suffering from.

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

Mr. GILES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He is regularly out of order.

Mr. Virgo: I want to know.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask honourable members to restrain themselves. I have often heard in this and several other Parliaments about the right of freedom of speech, which is a fundamental freedom of democracy. Whether one member agrees with another or not, any member has the right to be heard.

Mr. GILES: The second cancellation cancels security checking as a form of confession. The third refers to the prohibition on any confessional materials being written down, and I understand that was one of the major operations of the organization. The fourth is the cancellation of declaring people fair game. It is obvious what that means. This code of reform was brought in after the Bill had been introduced in the Victorian Parliament to ban scientology in that State. I consider that the change was made so that the organization could operate in South Australia. Members of the Opposition have spoken about the rights and freedom of the individual. I believe that in Parliament we should preserve those rights, and when an organization affects them we should act.

Mr. Broomhill: What examples have you got?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILES: We try to preserve a State in which we are allowed to say what we wish, speak freely, and work where we want to, but we must not adversely affect our fellow man. If members of the Opposition are honest Australian citizens they will agree with that state-

ment. If they read the evidence available to all members they will realize that this organization does affect the rights and freedoms of other people.

Mr. Corcoran: Give us an instance.

Mr. GILES: The hour is too late. Evidence is available for Opposition members to read if they so desire. I should like to know why not one person in this place has heard a minister of the Christian religion supporting the free practice of scientology. The ministers of many and varied religions are sound men, and should be listened to. We can feel secure in what they say, but they do not support scientology from a religious point of view. The pamphlet, read by the Attorney-General, described a subtle form of blackmail (perhaps it is open blackmail), and members have received similar material. I illustrate my point by reading from the pamphlet *Virtues of Scientology*, written by L. Ron Hubbard, which states:

Those who criticize one for being a scientologist or make snide remarks cannot stand a personal survey of past actions or motive. This happens to be a fortunate fact for us.

Mr. Clark: That is the same as the Attorney-General read.

Mr. GILES: I am using it to emphasize my point. It continues:

The criminal abhors daylight. And we are the daylight. Now get this as a technical fact, not a hopeful idea. Every time we have investigated the background of a critic of scientology we have found crimes for which that person or group could be imprisoned under existing law. We do not find critics of scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we prove this.

I am a critic of scientology, but I do not think I have a criminal past. Many years ago I was fined for riding a bicycle at night without a light, but I do not know whether that would constitute a criminal past. The pamphlet continues:

Politician A stands up on his hind legs in a Parliament and brays for a condemnation of scientology. When we look him over we find crimes—embezzled funds, moral lapses, a thirst for young boys—sordid stuff.

When a group of people is willing to print a pamphlet with such material they should not be allowed to operate freely in a State. The member for Whyalla said that legislation could be introduced to ban the harmful sections of scientology. If a person was embarrassed by being a member of scientology, the last thing he would wish to do would be to produce evidence to the police, because the evidence collected under the present system of scientology would be most embarrassing, particularly

if the person had committed a crime or something that was, perhaps, morally wrong. The idea that people will seek the protection of the police under different types of law is false, and I cannot agree with it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You must believe that most people are undiscovered criminals.

Mr. GILES: I most certainly do not: scientologists would like to think this and if it were so they would have some solid members, because they would have a means of keeping people within the organization and would be able subtly to blackmail them. Opposition members are speaking with their tongue in cheek about this organization: they should realize that it is not for the benefit of the average citizen in South Australia and, in opposing what they have said, I support the Bill.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I was interested to hear you, Mr. Speaker, say about 10 minutes ago, when attempting to restore order in this place, that we had a cherished and valuable freedom of speech in this place and in this State. This is what the Labor Party is trying to protect, and is the very thing that the Attorney-General and his cohorts are trying to destroy. I hope that you, Sir, will believe what you said when we come to a vote. I believe in freedom of speech and I wish that more Government members did. I also believe in the Atlantic Charter. The *World Almanac*, a book of facts available in the Parliamentary Library, shows that the four freedoms, termed essential by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a speech to Congress on January 6, 1941, are freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. What is the Liberal Party doing with them? It is throwing them right out of the window. I remind members opposite of the joint declaration of President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill (the Tory Prime Minister of England) on August 12, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, which endorsed those freedoms. These, Mr. Speaker, are the freedoms to which you drew the attention of the House tonight. The member for Gumeracha has said that scientology is possibly a religion. I do not know whether or not it is. I see a great deal wrong with scientology, as I do with many other things, but I am not so frightened of it that I would ban it.

Mr. Lawn: Even the Liberal Party?

Mr. VIRGO: I see a lot wrong with the Liberal Party but I would not ban it, either. It should be allowed to continue, to amuse the people of South Australia.

Mr. Lawn: What about the Legislative Council?

Mr. VIRGO: It should be allowed to continue as well, for that reason.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: To ban an organization merely because we do not believe in it is a complete show of fear. The member for Gumeracha said that we were here to protect the rights of individuals.

Mr. Clark: Then he proceeds to take them away.

Mr. VIRGO: Then he says we must ban this organization. That is how we protect those rights—just like getting hold of a sick person and saying, "Let us stop him from suffering by shooting him." The member for Stirling, who is interjecting, may like that but at least I am here as a representative of the majority of people in my district, which is more than any member opposite can say. I suggest that the mathematician from Stirling look at the results of the election. Before this night is out he will know a little more about the facts and figures of that election. However, that has nothing to do with this Bill, and if the member for Stirling does not mind I will return to this Bill.

Mr. McKee: He thinks he is of the governing class.

Mr. VIRGO: He may think he is anointed and not appointed; that is his privilege. I have looked at the Premier's second reading explanation and find there are two paragraphs, out of some 2½ *Hansard* galleys, that are relevant to the present position. We should now refresh ourselves on the points that are relevant. The Premier's opening words are as follows:

Few honourable members will be unaware of the growing public disquiet engendered by those associated with the spread of the studies of the so-called sciences of dianetics and scientology.

When are we going to hear something from members opposite about this "growing public disquiet"? I have heard nothing. I have had a lot of material sent to me by the Church of Scientology. We have been provided with a report from Victoria, but I know of no public disquiet in this matter in South Australia—certainly no growing public disquiet. No instance of this has been mentioned by members opposite. All we have had is a lot of claptrap from the Attorney-General. In fact,

it was a repetition of last night, when the Premier came up with a pathetic story of how he had been dictated to by the Legislative Council and, when he was in such a terrific mess (I nearly said something out of order then), the Attorney-General tried to get him out of it—but he put him deeper into it; and we have had this repeat performance tonight. The remainder of the Premier's speech relates to the board of inquiry conducted in Victoria in 1963 by Mr. Kevin Victor Anderson. What has that to do with us? If scientology was rife and causing trouble in Victoria, it was a problem for Victoria to resolve, and it did so. Whether it has done it rightly or wrongly is its affair, not ours, but the fact that it has done it does not mean that we have automatically to follow like woolly goats. No evidence has been adduced, and members opposite know that. Our Leader gave the proper answer to this problem.

Mr. McKee: I am sure Sir Henry Bolte has something over them in connection with the Chowilla dam.

Mr. VIRGO: I am sure he has: I do not think we shall get the Chowilla dam from Sir Henry Bolte, anyhow. The only other relevant paragraph is the concluding one. The Premier said:

In introducing this measure the Government does not impeach the good faith of numbers of adherents of scientology, but it does suggest that their beliefs are misguided ones and it believes that the system is essentially ill-conceived and as such it has inflicted and is capable of inflicting untold distress and harm to the mental health and social fabric of the community.

Mr. McKee: I think it has affected the Attorney-General in that way.

Mr. VIRGO: It could well have, but on what basis does the Government state that it believes that the system is essentially ill-conceived, etc.? It believes it! Let us get some facts before this Parliament before we start banning scientology. The whole second reading speech of the Premier is based on the Victorian report and does not apply to South Australia. If any decent citizen of this State or member of this Parliament had ever had any doubts and had approached this matter with an open mind, he would have got a complete answer on this about three weeks ago when we had the fiasco of the Legislative Council bringing before the bar of that Council a person who had written a letter saying that the Chairman of the Select Committee was biased, when the chairman had already made a statement in the press expressing his views. The whole of that Select Committee was a cooked-

up affair. I am also convinced that the Attorney-General, if he had been honest with us tonight, would not have said (I think these were his words) that this was the only form of legislation suitable to meet the situation. If he had been honest, he would have said that this was the only form of legislation that the Legislative Council would allow him to bring in. That is the situation. We are being governed not by the members who adorn the front bench in this Chamber but by a group of people in the Legislative Council who, in turn, are dictated to by the Adelaide Club. They are the people who are making the rules of this Parliament at present. The members of Cabinet are weakly following their dictates, and back-bench members do not have the guts to fight against them.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the new issue of orders last year.

Mr. VIRGO: I was not issuing orders last year. No orders are ever issued. That is just a figment of the imagination of members opposite. Unfortunately, they have warped minds. I presume that all members have looked at the report of the Select Committee, such as it was (it is disgraceful to call it such). Two members of the Legislative Council—all power to their elbows—expressed in the only way they could (by resigning) their disgust at the way the committee was conducting its business, and I commend Mr. Bert Shard and Mr. Stan Bevan for showing publicly their disgust at the attitude of the autocratic Legislative Council in bringing Mr. Klæbe before the Bar of the Council. The Legislative Council did not have the courage to do more than to say to Klæbe, "Do not be a naughty boy again".

Mr. McKee: I believe they rushed to the bar afterwards.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, to a different bar. When the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) was reading from a pamphlet and saying how terrible it was that people could be imprisoned, my mind immediately went back to Klæbe. What could have happened to him? He could have been imprisoned, I understand, for life. What is worse, he had no right of appeal. This is the freedom that members of the Liberal and Country League are trying to protect! Freedom for whom?—freedom for themselves.

This report is disgusting; clause 7 states, "Your committee finds that scientology is being practised in South Australia with some undesirable results." What are they? Do we have to guesstimate at them? Do we have to accept

the committee's word? Let us consider the committee's membership and its chairman. How can we accept their word? After what they did, we cannot accept the word of the Ministers on the front bench here, so surely we are not expected to accept the words of these people in the Upper House, when two members of the Legislative Council, to whom I have previously referred and who have a more intimate knowledge of the position than we have, expressed their disgust in the only way possible—by resigning from the committee. However, we must accept the committee's word that scientology is being practised in South Australia with some undesirable results.

A lady spoke to me this afternoon, and I expect other members have at some stage interviewed people who practise scientology. I said, "I am amazed that anyone would practise scientology. Do you find that you are getting something out of it?" She assured me that she was getting something out of it, and it is not for me to criticize her statement. Many people go to various churches and get something out of it. Are we to criticize them, too?

Mr. McKee: The Attorney-General gets something out of training mothers' sons to be sent to Vietnam.

Mr. VIRGO: We do not know how much he gets out of it.

Mr. McKee: He gets a lot of satisfaction.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: A further reference in the report states: "Scientology has been harmful to family life in this State and has caused financial hardship to some citizens." Who are they? What harm has been done to family life, or is this a figment of the imagination? Unfortunately, the Attorney-General will, in his usual evil way, construe everything that has been said against the Bill as support for scientology, yet he knows, if he ever becomes honest with himself, that that is not what we are supporting: we are supporting the basic freedoms for which our fathers, forefathers and some members in this House fought. These are the things which are dear to us and which we must protect at all stages. He also tried to make great play of the resolution that was carried at a Ministers' conference, at which the former Minister of Health (Hon. A. J. Shard) represented South Australia as Minister of Health. As I took down the resolution (unfortunately, I am not a shorthand writer of any description, let alone as proficient as the *Hansard* reporters), I understood it to be (and if the member for Stirling will listen instead of interrupting, he can tell me whether

I am right) that, if scientology showed signs of spreading, action should be taken by the States. But when will we be given some evidence to show that scientology is spreading? Neither the Premier nor the Attorney-General has given any such evidence, and this rotten Select Committee has not given any. Where are we to get it? Where is the justification for proceeding with the Bill? Some members are keen to use other States as an example: the whole of the Premier's speech was based on the Victorian report. Let us look at what has happened.

Mr. McKee: I think Sir Henry Bolte has something on them.

Mr. VIRGO: He may have. I have the *Hansard* publication from Western Australia covering the debate when the Government of that State introduced a Scientology Bill. Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister of Works) moved the Bill and at page 1700 of the Western Australian *Hansard* of October 15 appears the following:

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It appears quite obvious from the interjections of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that, had the Labor Party been in office as a Government, this Bill would not have been forthcoming.

Mr. Graham: You are so right!

Mr. Jamieson: You are very right!

The Government should not blame the Labor Party for the Bill's introduction in Western Australia, as that State has a rotten Tory Government, just as we suffer. If the Government wants to blame Western Australia, it should take blame itself. What has happened in other places? The United Kingdom Government has now decided not to ban scientology, and the U.K. is scientology's home, as the member for Gumeracha said a little while ago. If scientology is as rotten as members of the Government would have us believe it is, why is the British Government not banning it? Is scientology so bad, or is the poison only outside the cult? We find that the New Zealand Select Committee has adjourned *sine die* and that the New South Wales Government has declined to ban its practice, while the Tasmanian and Queensland Governments right from the outset have declined to ban scientology. However, if the Government has its way, we will be in that select band comprising at the moment Western Australia and Victoria.

Mr. Corcoran: They don't believe in democracy.

Mr. VIRGO: That is right. If this cult is as bad as members opposite would have us believe it is, and if it is causing the trouble they say it is causing, why are Government

members not making a move through the Commonwealth Government? Government members are saying it is wrong to practise scientology in South Australia but a person can go over the border if he wishes. I can imagine what the position will be in the district of the member for Frome (Mr. Casey): in, say, Cockburn scientology might be illegal in one house and legal in the next. Surely the members who in a previous debate were saying it is wrong to have 18-year-olds voting in South Australia until it is on a Commonwealth basis—

Mr. Langley: Every State or nothing!

Mr. VIRGO: That is right. If it is all right to ban scientology, it ought to be banned in Australia. If Government members feel so strongly that scientology should be banned, why do they not have their Commonwealth colleagues convince Gorton that it should be banned? My attitude to scientology is exactly the same as it was to Communism a few years ago when a Bill was introduced and a referendum held on the subject of banning Communism. I do not believe that scientology is a desirable thing; it is something in which I would have no part. Nor do I believe Communism is a desirable thing, and it is something in which I would have no part. However, I much prefer to have these organizations where I can watch what they are doing and take such steps as are necessary to protect the people should those organizations step out of line. We are only fooling ourselves if we think that by banning scientology we will do away with it, for we will actually strengthen it, just the same as when we ban a book we make it a best seller; or when a film has been banned people will be waiting at the theatre in queues to see it.

Mr. McKee: Prohibition!

Mr. VIRGO: That is another example. Right down through history, whenever something has been banned it has flourished. The strength in Europe in the last war was in the underground movement; is that what we are trying to do here? I hope Government members do not intend to deny the people of South Australia their basic and fundamental rights and civil liberties, but that is what the Bill seeks to do. The vote on this Bill will adequately prove to the people of South Australia whether or not Government back-benchers are tied to and obediently follow the dictates of their masters.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): Much of what has been said in this debate is worthy of being placed on the record, but

much of it I do not think so qualifies. If members desire to attempt to reinforce logic with abuse, that is their prerogative, as provided in Standing Orders. However, in approaching this matter, I have asked myself what I think are a few pertinent questions. First, why has scientology attracted such widespread and expert criticism? Many other sects, religions and groups of people carry on their activities in this community, although many people may not agree with them, but they are not considered offensive or damaging to the public morals or private mind. However, somehow or another, scientology seems to have attracted from a wide sector of the community much real criticism, some of it no doubt arising from fear of what this organization may do. After all, any organization which has as the basis of its operations an attraction for or an attack on the minds of individuals is viewed with some concern and, I think, with some abhorrence. I think it is acknowledged by all of us that scientology is an organization of a psychological nature, and that may be one of the reasons why such widespread criticism and condemnation of this organization has arisen.

I ask myself a second question: Why have various specialist inquiries reported so adversely on the activities of this group? So far as I know, every inquiry set up at Government level to investigate the activities of scientology has reported adversely on it. In some cases, the criticisms in the reports have been trenchant. Had an investigation been conducted by a person who might have been biased, one might naturally discount the findings made. However, as far as I can ascertain, the various bodies inquiring into scientology have reported adversely upon it. That, to me, is further evidence that there is something suspect and that something is perhaps concealed, dangerous and seductive about this or that it could develop and has developed to a stage where it could endanger the mental outlook and social circumstances of many people.

I ask myself why individual experts, apart from ordinary statutory or other types of inquiry, have criticized it. I have great respect for one of the leading psychologists in this State, namely, Dr. W. P. Salter. I know much of his work and have a high regard for him personally and for the work he is doing. When he criticizes this organization in the terms he has seen fit to condemn it, I sit up and take notice, and I think that possibly other members do, too.

I also ask myself why the newspapers have written such trenchant articles about the organization. Traditionally, newspapers in the English speaking world have always set themselves up as the champions of free speech, writing, and expression of opinion. Whatever one may sometimes think of newspaper reporting, I think that this has been the traditional and basic policy of the press, at least of the press in Australia. Whatever opinions newspapers may express from time to time on political or other matters, I still maintain that it has been a tenet and basic principle of the newspaper fraternity in Australia to stand for freedom of expression and speech. Therefore, when I find that the press comes out and speaks with one voice about this organization, again I am somewhat impressed.

I am at a bit of a loss to know how it is that the tenor of this debate has tended to develop along political lines, but obviously it has. In the debate today, Opposition members have used at the forefront of their arguments the matter of personal freedom. I think that Opposition members and the organizations which send them here and decide whether they shall be here should be considered in connection with personal freedom, about which so much has been said this afternoon. I think that this freedom is exercised to a somewhat limited extent in the ranks of the Opposition Party. I think that Opposition members use that argument about personal freedom when it happens to be suitable, and not always.

Mr. Broomhill: What does that mean?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: What I mean is simply this: that the personal freedom of individuals is restricted by the activities of many of the organizations which support Opposition members. I pose as a simple illustration the fact that, unless one is prepared to subscribe to a union, one is not free to work in this State where one wants to work.

Mr. Broomhill: What nonsense!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Of course, I was aware that Opposition members would come in when I made this comment, but they cannot deny what I have said.

Mr. Casey: We can deny it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Members opposite cannot. It is the Opposition's policy not only to support this principle, but to widen it.

Mr. Langley: We support it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is what I said, but the Opposition supports a policy which is, in itself, a restriction of personal freedom yet, when it suits Opposition members

to get on the bandwaggon, they speak in this place for the whole afternoon about the invasion of personal freedom. What is this facade of civil liberties about which we have heard so much this afternoon? The Leader of the Opposition (and I believe the member for Glenelg and other members have spoken in a similar vein) has said that the objects of the Bill could have been achieved in another way, without banning anyone. My point about this banning business is that, although possibly the rules of the Australian Labor Party do not ban anyone, at least they bar plenty, and I do not think there is any practical difference when it is all boiled down.

The Leader made two points: that we could have legislation to register psychologists and that we could have introduced legislation on the basis of personal harassment, making it an offence for one person or group of persons to harass unduly another person or group of persons. I wonder why the Leader was not active in this matter while he was Attorney-General. I know that there was brought to his notice a case, which I should have thought would stimulate him to take this action, of a family living in a suburb of Adelaide that was subjected over a long time to just this type of treatment. I should have thought the Leader would seize the opportunity to bring down this type of legislation in that case, but it did not happen. Be that as it may, the scientology group set itself up as being a religion of some form or another. I have heard much said about what is and what is not a religion. My dictionary, at any rate (and I had reason to look at it in respect of another address I gave some time ago), states that a religion is some form of worship. It might be worship of God, as we understand Him, or of a prophet, or of one's ancestors or of a mountain or something like that (an outstanding feature), or of a symbol, but at least it is a worship. The statement of principles issued by the scientologists makes only a passing reference to the Almighty, and it refers to Him only once.

One appreciates when reading the document that this reference is purely a matter of convenience and is inserted only as a front to add some flavour. Recently I discussed scientology with a man who is well known to members of this Parliament, and we had a lengthy and amicable discussion. He was a capable young man, able to express his point of view and his feelings adequately. He said that the organization could and would make some reforms, and the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles), who has spoken so

ably this evening, has given the facts about the kinds of reform that the organization has undertaken recently. When a person tells me that he is willing to reform, the obvious inference is that within him or his organization there is something to reform, and the statement was an admission that the practice of scientology, if not now at least hitherto (and I strongly suspect that it still has) had some features to which the people of this State might well object. Otherwise, why would the man mention reform? It is a recognition that they have been exceeding the bounds of proper conduct, and that they need to change.

It has been said that this group is not active in South Australia at present, but I remember reading that one of the prominent members of the organization in Victoria, in a mood of defiance against the banning of the organization by the Victorian Government, said that the organization would continue its operations in Victoria notwithstanding the banning and would move the headquarters to South Australia. This sort of statement indicates to me, if not to some Opposition members, the need to act now, and that is why the Bill has been introduced. The Government has no reason for introducing it other than the public interest. I know only one scientologist personally and I have no reason to be at enmity with him or with anyone else on the matter. I have no axe to grind and my only concern is the public interest, which should be the concern of other members of this Parliament.

I have not read all the stuff that has been published in the newspapers: my attitude to scientology has developed from the contents of literature that the organization has sent to me. One would have thought that one could at least regard as valid the literature that the organization printed for its own propaganda purposes and sent to people such as members of Parliament, who sit in judgment of its activities. This is not a carping criticism or small-minded stuff, but the organization's own literature. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) has said that he has never read such utter gibberish, and that literature gave me a clue to what the organization was doing, its worth to the community, and how dangerous it could be if it thought it could attract ordered and sensible minds to its ranks.

I do not consider scientology to be what it claims to be. I consider it to be a form of exploitation of people, particularly mentally distressed groups, for the purpose of a

vested interest, and that interest has been described as being nothing else but a racket. The Government has made its choice after full and careful consideration over a long period, with no personal animus against this or any other organization. I support the Bill.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I oppose the Bill because it interferes with the civil liberties of the people. The community comprises persons of many and varied beliefs and we respect the right of people to practise those beliefs, provided that they do not harm other people. Of course, action can be taken if persons do harm others, but that action is taken because of the harm done, not because of a religious belief.

No-one who believed in democratic principles could tolerate this Bill. Indeed, no Government member has made out the slightest case to justify it. There is no significant evidence of the need for the Bill. When matters of this kind are being considered, members receive much correspondence, both from those who support what is being done and those who oppose it.

Mr. McKee: You usually get some objections.

Mr. HURST: Yes, for and against.

Mr. McKee: Have you had any in your district?

Mr. HURST: I represent a fairly large district.

Mr. McKee: And represent it well, too.

Mr. HURST: I am proud to represent it. I have not received even a single letter requesting me to support this measure. On the contrary, I have received letters from individuals and constituents of mine informing me that they have benefited by scientological teaching and pleading that I, as their representative, oppose the Bill. Not a single Government member has produced evidence of any public demand that this Bill be introduced: all the Government has relied on is what happened in Victoria. Indeed, the leading Government spokesman, the Attorney-General, tried to make us believe that he would put forward a case, so far as South Australia was concerned, to support this measure, but what did he do? He merely quoted from the Anderson report, which has nothing to do with this Bill. We are the body responsible for making law in South Australia.

Mr. Langley: We should be the Government.

Mr. HURST: We should be, and we will be, on the performance of the Government, which is holding office against the will of the people.

Ever since the Government has been in office it has thrust measures on the people of the State against the will of the majority of the people. The people will not tolerate this line of action and the actions of this Government in introducing this Bill, which will take away the rights of those individuals who wish to worship as they desire. I do not profess to be an authority on religion. No-one on the Government side has attempted to define religion: they are avoiding all arguments. If the Government had decency and respect, it would withdraw the Bill. The Attorney-General admitted that, with all his learned knowledge, he did not know how to overcome this situation, but the Leader made the position clear: the registration of psychologists would go a long way to obviate the necessity for this legislation. If, as members opposite have said, scientologists are harassing people and intruding on their personal liberties and freedoms, there are more people in South Australia who do more harassing of and encroaching on the personal liberties of the people of the State than do the scientologists. From time to time every honourable member has raised numerous complaints about this sort of practice, but why should we single out one particular section? The matter should not be dealt with on this basis: if there is to be any banning the Government should ban all these practices, not isolate one small section. Whether or not we agree with scientologists, they believe in what they are doing and practising. Reference has been made to the Select Committee that investigated this matter. The committee met on 15 occasions, but it does not say for how long it met on each occasion. The committee examined 14 witnesses.

Mr. Clark: I thought it was 15 witnesses.

Mr. HURST: It may have been 15 witnesses, but I think it was 14 witnesses.

Mr. McKee: Why are there young Australians fighting in Vietnam?

Mr. HURST: They are fighting for freedom. I am surprised at members opposite allegedly telling us that they believe in the rights of the individual. The basis of the Bill is that the Government fears that the scientology organization will make sufficient inroads to annihilate the Government as a political Party and, before scientologists get too deeply entrenched, the Government should introduce a Bill to ban their operations. The Government knows very well that its actions over the last few months have demoralized the people of South Australia. It has the people thinking about its actions and it knows that, at the first oppor-

tunity, it will no longer be in office. The Bill is window-dressing and contrary to the practices the Government preaches. I was appalled to hear the Attorney-General, with all his training and background, ask our Leader where the report was and where he could get information. I admire our Leader for co-operating and for trying to raise the standard of Government in this State, particularly by enlightening the Attorney-General in regard to obtaining the information required.

If scientology is as bad as Government members try to make us believe it is (and they have not produced any evidence to substantiate their argument), the Attorney-General can deal with the matter democratically. Unfortunately, however, Government members have not the foggiest idea of democracy. For the last 37 years we have seen nothing but bureaucracy on their part. There were 14 witnesses before the Select Committee, 12 having requested the opportunity to appear, and two having been invited by the committee to attend.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think members of the Select Committee ought to have been examined also?

Mr. HURST: Reference has been made to an E-meter, but I believe a "fluxometer" would give us a true indication of the performance of the members in another place. Surely the Government should be able to produce evidence of the "fear of repercussions" referred to in the Select Committee's report. If members opposite had had one meagre piece of evidence, that evidence would have been trotted out; but they do not have a case and certainly have not made one out. I believe more fear has been engendered in backbenchers opposite than scientologists could ever engender in the public.

Government members in another place hold themselves out as people who can do no wrong, but their handling of the Select Committee shows that they do not do justice to the august position they presume to maintain. We are being asked to vote for a measure in respect of which members in another place never had the insight to act themselves. Members in another place merely tried to pick on one individual: they were not prepared to complete their task. We do not agree to what has been done in Western Australia and Victoria, but at least the people in those States have a democratic right to vote for their respective Upper Houses, a right that does not exist in South Australia. The very fact that

this measure originated in another place suggests that one should look closely at its contents. I do not think there has ever been a Bill as vicious as this one. Clause 5 (2) provides:

A warrant under subsection (1) of this section, by virtue of this subsection, authorizes the person named thereon to enter the premises or place specified in the warrant at any time of the day or night with such assistants as may be necessary and to use force by breaking open doors or otherwise and also authorizes the person so named or any such assistant, by means of any device for reproducing recorded words or sounds which the person so named or such assistant has in his possession or finds on those premises or in that place, to reproduce the words or sounds recorded on any gramophone record, wire, tape or other medium of recording information found on those premises or in that place.

[Midnight]

This is a wide, sweeping provision. It even goes as far as to authorize the breaking of doors and windows so that people's properties can be entered and a search made for these records. I find it difficult to understand the Government's attitude. We have heard Government members object to Government employees being given permission by special Act to investigate, during the course of their work, certain matters, and that was not permission to enter houses, but merely to enter premises.

Mr. Ryan: What did they say about the inspection of meters?

Mr. HURST: They said that permission to enter for that purpose was a gross infringement of the rights of the householder.

Mr. Langley: That was the Attorney-General.

Mr. HURST: Yes, he made those statements. However, all these rights are completely forgotten when members opposite want to establish some form of police state in South Australia. The Treasurer said that inquiries into this matter in various places had reported adversely on scientology. If the investigations of other authorities were of a similar standard to the investigation in this State, then we can attach little importance to that point made by the Treasurer. The Treasurer said that he suggested there was something suspect that would endanger the mental health of people. What a vague word "suggest" is. One would have thought Ministers would make more than vague suggestions to substantiate what they put forward. I have received letters (although I admit not in great numbers) from people who have said they get a certain amount of satisfaction from scientology. We know that many other religions provide for confession

and that some people benefit from it. Nearly all members of Parliament find that occasionally their constituents want to speak to them in confidence. Although members are not qualified psychologists, these people get some relief from talking to us. That is one reason why I can believe that some people get relief from scientology, but they should not be exploited through this means. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Semaphore has moved that he have leave to continue his remarks. Is leave granted?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave having been refused, the honourable member must continue.

Mr. HURST: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Treasurer also referred to what the newspapers had said about this matter and he talked about the freedom of the press. The press has freedom to advertise the propaganda of the Liberal and Country League. Everyone knows that the newspapers are a commercial proposition and, if they can excite the public by their headlines and sell a few more newspapers, they do not consider whether everything they print accords with fact. We have often encountered the *Advertiser's* attitude in this respect. Only this morning, we saw the *Advertiser's* attitude in relation to what the Leader of the Opposition had said about the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill, which is a vital issue in South Australia. The Leader's reference to this was tucked away, under small headlines, on page 9. Yet the Treasurer talked about the freedom of the press and said he was impressed by the fact that the newspapers opposed scientology. They would oppose anything, provided that they did not contradict the L.C.L.'s policy and were not against the undemocratically-elected Government in South Australia.

To try to build up a meagre case in support of this vicious Bill, the Treasurer attacked the trade unions. What he said showed his lack of knowledge of the trade union movement: he does not have the foggiest idea of their constitution. Indeed, the laws throughout the country provide that unions must accept anyone who applies for membership, as the Treasurer knows well. He was merely trying to introduce a red herring to cover up for the Government's inability to present a case in support of the Bill.

Mr. Edwards: Would they accept me? I'm a worker.

Mr. HURST: The member for Eyre is in a strong and vicious union and, if he wants to test that union, I suggest that he vote with the Opposition and see how long he stays in his democratic union. The reference to the vested interests of scientology has been laughable, particularly because of what has happened in the Legislative Council regarding electoral boundaries. If that is not a protection of vested interests, I do not know what is. There is more democracy in scientology than in the Legislative Council, which tries to control all the laws and thrusts on the people intolerable measures that transgress civil liberties. However, we on this side want to protect those liberties, and we oppose the Bill.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order in moving the adjournment at this stage. A request was made by the previous speaker, the honourable member for Semaphore, for leave to continue his remarks and that leave was refused. No further application for leave to continue can be made and no adjournment motion can be moved until the expiration of a quarter of an hour after a request is made. I refer to Standing Order 180. The honourable member for Barossa.

Mrs. BYRNE: I, with other Opposition members, oppose the Bill, principally because I consider it to be against the freedom of the individual. This Bill is in line with the Government's action to fluoridate the water supplies in South Australia.

Mr. Virgo: They're all dictatorial actions, aren't they?

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. Fluoridation is an interference with the freedom of the individual. Further, I consider that it would be wrong for me, as a member of this Parliament, to support this Bill without having sufficient evidence to warrant doing so, and the Government has not provided sufficient evidence. The Select Committee reported that 14 witnesses were examined, 12 having requested the opportunity to appear and two having been invited by the committee. Advertisements were inserted in three issues each of the *Advertiser*, the *News* and the *Sunday Mail* over a period of about three weeks. Therefore, people interested in the subject had ample notice of the opportunity to give evidence.

The report admits that several prospective witnesses contacted the secretary but, as no complete assurance that their identity would be kept from the records could be given, they declined to give evidence. As several usually means three only, 17 people replied to the advertisements and were sufficiently interested to appear. The report of the committee states that it examined documents and papers received by the Chief Secretary's Department and 27 exhibits tendered by witnesses. It is not clear from the report how many papers were tendered direct from the Chief Secretary's Department and how many were tendered by witnesses.

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

A quorum having been formed,

Mrs. BYRNE: Obviously, 27 exhibits do not represent much evidence against scientology.

Mr. Virgo: Probably much of that was cooked up, anyway.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. It is obvious that insufficient evidence to warrant the banning of the movement was presented to the Select Committee. I am interested in and guided by what the people in my district think about the matter, and I have received much literature from people who practise scientology. I have received two letters from people living in my district who have benefited as a result of scientology, but I have not received any letters from people living in my district who are opposed to scientology or who feel that they have suffered adverse effects from taking lessons in scientology. Paragraph 7 of the Select Committee's report states:

Your committee finds that scientology is being practised in South Australia with some very undesirable results. These include that scientology has been, and could continue to be, a serious threat to mental health. Scientology has been harmful to family life in this State . . .

I have received a letter from a woman living at Redwood Park, which states:

I would like to tell you of the benefits I have received from scientology. I have a far greater understanding of people and life. This applies particularly to my own family. My children are no longer just the kids to me. They are people in their own right, able to have their own ideas and opinions and make their own decisions. I can only provide for them and guide them so they will be worthwhile members of the community. I am much closer to my husband. We still have our differences of opinion, for we are two individuals, but I find that by applying what I have learned from

scientology we are more able to resolve our differences and do what is best for the family as a family and as a group of individuals.

This is contrary to what is contained in the Select Committee's report. I have received another letter from a constituent of mine, which states:

For myself I have derived enormous benefits from the use of scientology—a better job, a happier family, faster reaction time, more at ease with people. I have examined scientology from both a scientific viewpoint and also a humanitarian or rather religious philosophical viewpoint and have found nothing of the "corrupt", "potentially harmful", "brainwashing" characteristics that ill-informed people have attributed to it.

That letter is from another person who claims that, as a result of practising scientology, his family life has benefited and that it has not been harmful to his family life, as the Select Committee's report suggests. I have not received any telephone calls from people in my district claiming that scientology is harmful.

Mr. Virgo: Has any member received letters against it?

Mrs. BYRNE: I have not heard any honourable member say that he has received letters to that effect. Mr. Klaebe, who is a constituent of mine, was called before the Bar of the Legislative Council. He should not have been called, as there was insufficient reason for doing this. He could have been thrown into prison but, fortunately, this was not the case. This incident was given much publicity. Comment in the community was unfavourable (as it should have been), and I think that is why the matter was not proceeded with. However, I do not know whether any harm was done Mr. Klaebe as a result of the action taken by another place. It is possible that he and his family could have been affected as a result of this incident and that he could have lost his employment, but I hope that was not the case.

In common with other members I have examined all the documents, papers and booklets sent to me by the scientology movement in South Australia. I have no desire to practise scientology myself, but I respect the right of other individuals to do so if they feel so inclined and if they benefit from it. People who practise scientology feel they are benefiting from it. If a movement such as scientology does something unlawful, there is nothing to stop an individual from taking redress against such an organization in court. Paragraph 10 of the Select Committee's report states:

Your committee believes that consideration should be given to the registration of trained professional psychologists in South Australia. I agree with this. It is one of the few parts of the recommendations of the report with which I agree. This measure is what we should be debating before the House now. It has been said that such a Bill will probably be introduced, but perhaps not before two months' time. If such a movement is undesirable, this is the means by which it should be made to cease its teachings. I do not think the present Bill will have the effect the Government expects it to have, because history has proven that this is not the case.

We all know there is no freedom in South Australia: we do not even have the freedom to elect the Government of our choice. If we did have this freedom of choice, instead of the members of this side speaking from the Opposition benches we would be speaking from the Government benches—and such a Bill as the one we are debating would not be before the House at present. In the three years the Labor Party was in Government no such Bill as this was introduced. I oppose the Bill because it is against the freedom of the individual. I will also oppose any Bill of a like nature that comes before the House.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark (teller), Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Freebairn.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. CLARK: Although I do not like this Bill at all, I do not dislike it sufficiently to make a long speech at this stage. I am not at all enamoured of scientology, and I have been most unimpressed by the type of literature that has been sent to us on the subject. In fact, I do not know that I have ever read worse jargon in my life. On the other hand, I object to the way this Bill is treating

scientology as an organization. I urge the Government to investigate thoroughly the suggestions made today by the Leader of the Opposition before the Bill is proceeded with, for I believe those suggestions will solve the problem. It is absurd, despite what the Attorney-General has told us, that we should pass this Bill and that the Attorney-General should then examine the Leader's suggestions and, if he finds them acceptable, do something with this measure after it has been passed. Although I have said I am not particularly keen on what I have heard about this cult, I have received several letters from people in my district who are firm adherents of scientology and whose letters, contrary to the literature I have received from, I think, the scientology headquarters, have been sensible letters, giving me the impression that these people are good types. It seems to me that, if the people concerned are getting some good out of the cult, a blanket ban such as that for which the Bill provides should not be supported. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Although the measure has received much sincere consideration, many speakers have over-simplified the whole issue of scientology as a group (I do not intend to refer to it as a cult or religion). Members have said that their main interest is to preserve the freedom of thought that is everyone's liberty, and I agree to that, provided the freedom of thought does not reach the stage of suppressing the right of certain individuals and of damaging their lives and homes. I think we all believe that we have the right and privilege to possess our own philosophies and beliefs, provided we respect the rights and beliefs of other people. Indeed, I believe it is the responsibility of Parliament to protect the rights of individuals, but I am certain it cannot be said that scientology is doing just that. I regard the practice of this group to be terribly important as an indication of what its members honestly believe. I hope members on both sides of the House have examined intently the evidence given before the Select Committee.

The biggest problem I have in regard to that evidence is reconciling the habits and behaviour of the group with our role of protecting the rights and privileges of groups and individuals. Although I do not wish to dwell on the finances of scientology, I do not think any member is terribly pleased to know that large sums are going to the benefit of a certain individual. It is plain that from its inception scientology has in no way been

associated with a church: it seems to have originated when an opportunist saw that it could be made a profitable business. I think members would agree, after reading the early part of the evidence and the literature forwarded to us all, that this was an important aspect of the group's commencement.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That's no reason for banning it.

Mr. WARDLE: The group's name, "Church of Scientology", appears from the literature of the group and from the evidence to have been of recent inception. One is left wondering whether it was not expedient at a given time for the group to use the name so that it may in some way give it some protection, and I cannot help believing that there is something in that thought.

Mr. Riches: Have you seen their christening service or any of their order of service?

Mr. WARDLE: I have perused the documents from the organization.

Mr. Riches: I mean their order of service.

Mr. WARDLE: I took it to be that. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) asked why the leaders of the Christian church had not come forward and defended scientology. I do not want to go into theological detail about the reason why they have not, but I think that from a perusal of the evidence the reason is perfectly obvious. I do not think anyone acquainted with the larger religions (and, as well as the Christian religion, I have given some attention over the years to other religions such as Confucianism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Hinduism and most of the other large religions of the world) would in any way associate this group with a religion.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you think that is obvious to everyone?

Mr. WARDLE: No, I do not. I do not believe there is any connection at all between the confessional and the system of auditing practised by the group. In principle they are basically poles apart. As members present will know, a confessional is practised in many different ways by different Christian groups and by other groups. There are basic fundamental differences in that there are no records kept in the confessional to any degree, but it would appear from the evidence that detailed records are kept by this group for future intimidation. Where confession is carried out on premises designed for that purpose or within a Minister's study or home or under any other conditions, the principle of the confessional is that here is a spiritual father who is doing his utmost to assist a parishioner. The

material is confidential and his attitude is none other than goodwill, with a genuine and sincere desire to assist the person in the particular spiritual ailment or domestic problem that the person might have. I find some of the witnesses' accounts of an audit most disturbing. I am sure that members who have read the evidence of some of the audits would find it disturbing, too, and there seems to me to be no relationship between the auditing of the group and the confession as practised in religious orders. A member of the Select Committee asked the following question:

I should think that most people, who decided to go through a session of auditing, would do so not because of the general issue of gardening—

and those who have read the evidence will see the nature of the aspects discussed in the auditing—

but because of some moral or spiritual issue worrying them. They would have a guilt conscience regarding their sex behaviour or their business affairs or general moral conduct, and the auditing would be to get from this person a confession on such a problem, the relief being that, if this person confessed to somebody, he would thereby get some degree of freedom. Is that a correct interpretation of what would normally be the subject of an auditing process?

The answer was as follows:

No, definitely not. I go along to an auditing session to improve myself. I do not worry about guilt complexes or problems of business and so on.

The evidence of another person, who was one of a number who had an unfortunate experience in the audit, is as follows:

... audited me with a process called CCHs. When I pointed out that he did not do it according to instructions he did not take notice but continued in the wrong manner. I protested and protested with no results. When I refused to obey any more commands he pulled me from one end of the room to the other, pushed me against walls, locked doors and windows so that I could not escape, and even hid my cigarettes. I had black and blue marks on my hands, arms, legs, waist and my breasts were sore where he had gripped me. (He is approximately 6ft. 2in., and I am just 5ft.) At that time the then HCO (Hubbard Communication Officer) [name is given] was downstairs in his office, and although my screams must have been heard blocks away he did nothing to help me. When I was finally allowed to go, . . . to whom I complained about the treatment said, "You can make an appointment with me and book in for auditing."

I repeat that there is no confessional known amongst the prominent religions in the world that does business on that basis.

Mr. Freebairn: Did they ever show you a balance sheet?

Mr. WARDLE: No, I have not seen a balance sheet of the organization. One member said that the facts given in support of the Bill were largely gleaned from the Anderson report. That is not so, much of the evidence in the file being up to date. In fact, one of the witnesses referred to telephone calls, received by her only a few days before her evidence was taken, in which certain information was given her. I do not think it is a matter of banning an organization because of its beliefs. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) said that there were two aspects only in relation to a matter such as this: one was banning an organization because of its beliefs and the other the harm done to individuals. This is the basic reason for the introduction of the Bill. I disagree with the honourable member's statement that there was no evidence, because much evidence was given to the Select Committee, and I am sure the honourable member would be concerned at the nature of it. Although it has been said that there are organizations of a similar kind to the scientology organization, I have not, in my experience of groups in this State, known of any similar body in which such events take place.

The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) has said that people should be able to believe what they think, provided they do not harm other people, and I consider that that is the important issue. Convincing evidence was given to the committee about the harm being done. Through the history of the church in its many forms there has been ample proof that one group has had to rub off on to another in order to effect reform. That process will continue while people try to progress and bring their outlook up to date. This legislation will be justified until scientology arrives at a point where its practices are such that it can be allowed freedom in the community. Some of the obnoxious practices referred to in evidence given to the committee have been changed recently.

It is true, as the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) has said, that we are fighting for freedom, but we are fighting for a freedom that will not thrust practices of this type on the people. We are fighting for the freedom of the person to whom this organization is not bringing freedom. Unfortunately, many people involved in this group have not the mental and spiritual strength and stability to withstand the operation. They are nervous and have not a strong will or strong convictions. Thus, they are subject to the dominance of auditing and to

the influence of personalities stronger than their own. Sir, I believe that until such time as the group can prove that its practices are in the best interests of the community, this Bill should be operative. If the practices do improve sufficiently, the measure can be repealed.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I was disgusted at the fiasco in the Legislative Council a couple of weeks ago when Mr. Klaebe was called to the Bar. I say that it was a fiasco because Mr. Klaebe was judged even before he was called to the Bar. I was in the Chamber when this man appeared, and it was evident to all who were privileged to sit in the gallery that it was the most uncomfortable time any member of that Chamber had experienced during his membership of it. It is rather ironical that I should follow the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), who is a retired Methodist minister.

Mr. Jennings: Unfrocked?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I would not say that at all: I said that he was retired, and I meant that in the sense in which I said it. I, too, have been attached to the Methodist church, perhaps for longer than the member for Murray has been. It has been my privilege to preach not only in the Methodist church for about 40 years but also in Congregational churches, Churches of Christ, Assemblies of God, the Salvation Army, and other denominations. I wonder whether, if this Bill is passed, the church with which I have been proud to be associated for about 40 years may be next on the list to be banned in South Australia.

Mr. Ferguson: You know it won't be.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know that and the member for Yorke Peninsula does not know, either.

Mr. Ferguson: I've been preaching for 44 years.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member may have been and he has probably got a lot to learn yet. That is all I can say to him if he makes statements like that.

Mr. Ferguson: I don't think you know your own church.

Mr. HUGHES: I know my church very well. A few documents have been read this evening, first by the Attorney-General, and Government members have picked the most damning ones. Although many people telephoned me and others called at the House wanting to speak to me about scientology, I refused to see them all, because I wanted to keep an open mind.

Mr. Rodda: Did you want to keep cool?

Mr. HUGHES: This is not a laughing matter: it is serious, because it affects the civil rights of the people of South Australia. If this Government wanted to take similar measures to this in future, other churches could be affected. Before the honourable member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) made his interjection, I said I had been contacted by people who called themselves scientologists, but I refrained from speaking to them or allowing them to put any pressure on me while this measure was before the House because I wanted to have a free mind on the matter. Scientologists are fighting for something they believe in. This Parliament should uphold freedom of speech, freedom from want, and freedom to worship.

I have no sympathy for the Church of Scientology. Before this Bill was introduced I read a document that covered the various aspects of the Church of Scientology, but I could find nothing in it to influence me to say that these people should be banned from preaching their religion in this State. While I hold no brief for scientologists, I believe in civil liberties and in freedom to worship, which leaves me with no alternative but to oppose the Bill.

The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) said that no Christian church member (he used the word "ministers", and I take it that that was what he meant) had opposed the Bill and supported scientology but, apparently, he has not read the transcript of the evidence taken by the Select Committee otherwise he would not have made that statement. Rev. K. B. Leaver (Principal of Parkin Theological College) appeared before the committee. He supported scientology and opposed the ban. That indicates that members of the Government are prepared to condemn something before they examine all the evidence, either for or against, that is available to them. Before other members make such wild statements they should read all the evidence and material that has been supplied to them over the past weeks.

The Attorney-General went to great lengths to quote from a photostat pamphlet, which was also used by the member for Gumeracha, but they selected only the parts of the document that were most damning to support their arguments. They were not prepared to bring into the House documents with which I know they have been supplied and which place scientology on a par with other religious organizations in Australia.

Mr. Rodda: One could say that applied to Andrew Jones, and that would not be very nice.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That remark is unparliamentary.

Mr. HUGHES: I would have thought that the mere introduction of the name of Andrew Jones into the House would be most unparliamentary. I have in my possession (and I know other members have it, too) a certificate from the Secretary of State for the State of California. It is dated February 18, 1954, and it concerns the Church of Scientology, which was known then as the Church of Scientology of California. It contains a certification by Frank M. Jordan (Secretary of State for the State of California), which was witnessed by the Assistant Secretary of State. The certificate contains some interesting points which members opposite conveniently left unsaid during the debate. It states:

Articles of Incorporation of Church of Scientology. Know all men by these presents: That we, the undersigned citizens and residents of the State of California, have this day voluntarily associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation pursuant to Part I of Division Two of Title One of the Corporation's Code of the State of California. And we hereby certify, first, that the name of the corporation shall be Church of Scientology; second that the specific and primary purposes for which this corporation is formed are: (a) to accept and adopt the aims, purposes, principles and creed of the Mother Church, "The Church of American Science" of Camden, New Jersey, with the powers, objectives and duties as herein defined and enumerated; (b) to train and indoctrinate ministers and brothers and sisters in the principles and teachings of the Church of American Science.

There is nothing wrong with paragraph (b). Every church in South Australia adopts similar measures in respect of candidate probationers and ordained ministers, who indoctrinate people with the teachings of the church with which they are associated. In the certificate, scientologists are merely laying down the same things. Continuing:

(c) to prepare them and ordain them to carry forward the work of the Church of American Science, and to conduct churches and minister to and conduct congregations.

That is the same as is done by the Methodist church, with which I am associated, and by other churches that have representatives in this Parliament. I do not see that anything is wrong with that, either. The prime purpose in sending people to study in the colleges is to enable them to become ordained

eventually and to serve the church in the full capacity of an ordained minister. The constitution continues:

(d) To resolve the travail and difficulty of members of congregations as they may appertain to the spirit.

That, again, is exactly the function of the Methodist church and other churches in this State and throughout the Commonwealth, namely, to assist those members of the church who are in difficulties. Up to the present we cannot condemn scientology on this issue. Continuing with the constitution:

(e) To instruct in spiritual healing acts and other matters within the creed of the Church of American Science.

There again, scientology is merely conforming to the teachings of other churches. The member for Albert, who is saying something in his beard, knows only too well the teachings and doctrines of the various churches throughout the State. Having had a Christian upbringing, he knows that it is often the lot of a minister to give spiritual healing to members of his congregation. It seems to me that that is all the Church of Scientology is setting out to do.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Do you agree it is a church?

Mr. HUGHES: It is one in California, and the literature I have received indicates that scientologists in this State are attached to that church. While they have not been allowed to become registered as a church in South Australia, they still have affiliations with their mother church. If the Minister casts his mind back over Australian history, he will recall that that has applied with other denominations. The constitution continues:

(f) To conduct seminars and instruction groups.

I believe that is important, because today churches are realizing more than ever the value of instruction groups. The member for Murray will know as well as I know that churches today often have only one service (a morning service), having dispensed with their evening services and substituted instruction groups, sometimes comprising young people, at other times taking the form of what we know in the Methodist church as leaders' meetings and then there are also bible instruction groups. As the member for Murray said, it seems that Christian principles have rubbed off on those connected with scientology. Paragraph (g) of the constitution is as follows:

To create congregations and to have other powers similar to those of the Church of American Science.

Wherever new communities are established, such as at Elizabeth, the church moves in to create new congregations. The need for a Christian church at Elizabeth has been realized.

Mr. Nankivell: What has Scientology to do with the Christian church? There is no connection.

Mr. HUGHES: I am surprised that the member for Albert is missing my point.

Mr. Nankivell: You are getting away from the subject.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not. The constitution of the Church of Scientology refers to the creation of congregations, and I am simply illustrating the fact that various churches establish themselves in new communities. I know that Government members find this distasteful, but these people have a perfect right, as have the Methodist, Congregational and Roman Catholic churches, etc., to go into new communities to set up a church. Paragraph (h) of the document states:

The propagation of the religious faith known as Scientology: Believing man's best evidence of God is the God he finds within himself.

There is nothing wrong with that. I am pleased there is no interjection when I say that, because it indicates that members are convinced that what I have said is true.

Mr. Nankivell: You had better join them.

Mr. HUGHES: I have no intention of doing that. Over the last several weeks these people have tried to interview me to try to influence me towards their way of thinking, but I have refused this—

Mr. Rodda: I think you should have interviewed them.

Mr. HUGHES: That is up to each member to decide. However, I think the honourable member is being facetious and this shows that he takes the value of the church in the community lightly. That attitude is deplorable. In fact, the attitude taken by the members for Albert and Victoria is against the individual liberties of the people of the State.

Mr. Rodda: You're talking a lot of twaddle.

Mr. HUGHES: All I can say is that, if that is what the honourable member calls it, then the House will listen to much more twaddle this evening. The Government has seen fit, in the closing hours of this part of the session, to throw this Bill into the melting pot, when members should have had more time to consider it. To test honourable members out on this, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to continue his remarks?

The Hon R. S. Hall: No.

Mr. Lawn: Divide.

While the division bells were ringing:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave must be unanimous. An objection having been taken, the honourable member cannot have leave to continue his remarks. He can apply again for leave at the expiration of a quarter of an hour.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, did you refuse my demand for a division?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no division, because leave must be unanimous.

Mr. LAWN: I will ask for your ruling on Standing Order 218 and, pending that, I will move disagreement to your ruling. Standing Order 218 states that as soon as a division has been demanded the bells shall be rung. I demanded a division and the bells were rung.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but the leave must be unanimous in this case.

Mr. LAWN: Under which Standing Order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave can be granted if the House is unanimous. However, on this occasion an objection was taken by the Premier and, consequently, leave was not granted and the member for Wallaroo will have to continue his remarks. He could apply again for leave at the expiration of a quarter of an hour.

Mr. LAWN: I know that, but the point I take is that Standing Order 218 says that as soon as a division has been demanded the division bells must be rung and the sand glass turned for two minutes. In response to my demand for a division, you said that the glass should be turned and the bells were rung. I should like to know under what Standing Order you are refusing me a division.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the honourable member's benefit, I point out again that leave must be unanimous, and that has been the practice. Leave was not given in this case. An objection was taken by the Premier and, if leave is not unanimous, the member who is speaking (in this case the member for Wallaroo) has to continue unless he decides not to speak further in the debate.

Mr. LAWN: I move:

That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

Under "Leave of the House" in the Standing Orders, the following Standing Orders are referred to: 236, 177-8, 180, 137, 136, 125,

209 and 236-7. I have read through the lot this evening, and Standing Order 218 provides:

So soon as a division shall have been demanded, the Clerk shall ring the division bell, and turn a two-minute sand glass, kept on the table for that purpose, and the doors shall not be closed until after the lapse of two minutes, as indicated by such sand glass.

That happened in part. I demanded a division; you, Sir, ordered the glass to be turned; and the bells rang. Now you have said that the division will not take place because the Premier objected. That is a new one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has moved disagreement to my ruling, in which case he will have to bring up his objection in writing.

Mr. LAWN: With your indulgence, I will prepare it.

The Speaker having resumed the Chair:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Adelaide has moved "That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to" on the ground that Standing Order 218 provides for a division to be demanded, when the bells shall be rung, and that nothing in Standing Orders requires that the granting of leave be by unanimous vote.

Mr. LAWN: Standing Order 218 provides for a member to demand a division and provides that, when that demand shall have been made, the Clerk shall ring the division bells and turn a two-minute sand-glass. That was complied with, and during the ringing of the bells, the Premier apparently raised an objection.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: Members opposite are apparently objecting to what I am saying.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Yes.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know whether this is correct, but the Deputy Speaker told me, when I rose on a point of order, that he ordered that the bells be rung and that he turned the sand-glass, and the Premier raised an objection.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No.

Mr. LAWN: I am sorry and, if the Deputy Speaker was referring to the Premier's having objected to the member for Wallaroo, I withdraw. The Standing Order was complied with and subsequently cancelled. I have already quoted all the Standing Orders regarding the granting of leave of the House that are referred to in the index, and I have read them all. None of them states that the leave must be granted by unanimous vote of the whole

House, and Standing Order 218, under which a division may be demanded, is not contradicted. I take it that a division may be demanded on anything. Standing Order 180 refers to a motion for the adjournment or a request for leave to continue and provides that if one request is made no further request shall be entertained within a quarter of an hour thereafter. However, I cannot find any provision in Standing Orders that a request for leave to continue can be granted only by unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. Broomhill: It's not there, that's why.

Mr. LAWN: It is not there. The index refers to the unanimous vote of the House, but that is not a Standing Order.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That refers only to leave to withdraw a motion. No other Standing Order refers to a unanimous vote.

Mr. LAWN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition. That saves my looking up the Standing Orders again. I move:

That the Deputy Speaker's ruling be disagreed to,

on the ground that Standing Order 218 provides for a division to be demanded, when the bells shall be rung, and that nothing in Standing Orders requires that the granting of leave be by unanimous vote.

Mr. HUDSON: I second the motion. There are two points. First, the member for Adelaide has explained clearly that the only provision requiring that the granting of leave by the House be unanimous is set out in Standing Order 236, which provides:

After a motion has been read by the Speaker, it shall be deemed to be in possession of the House, and cannot be withdrawn without leave being granted without any negative voice, nor until any amendment which has been proposed is either withdrawn or put and determined.

That is the only reference that we have been able to find in Standing Orders to a requirement that the granting of leave be unanimous. Standing Orders 177, 178 and 180 apply to the granting of leave of the House to continue remarks. Standing Order 177 provides:

A debate may be adjourned on motion duly seconded, and without discussion, or by leave being granted to a member then speaking to continue his remarks at a future time, either to a later hour of the same day, or to any other day.

There is no requirement there that the granting of leave must be unanimous. Standing Order 178 provides:

The member upon whose motion any debate is adjourned by the House, shall be entitled to pre-audience on the resumption of the debate; but a member who is granted leave

to continue his remarks, if he fail to so continue immediately on resumption of the debate, shall not speak again at any subsequent stage of the debate.

Again, there is no reference to the granting of leave being required to be unanimous. Standing Order 180, the other relevant Standing Order, provides:

If a motion for the adjournment of the debate upon any question be negatived, or a member speaking to a question be refused leave to continue his remarks at a future time, a new motion for the adjournment of the debate or further request for leave to continue shall not be entertained within a quarter of an hour thereafter, except it be within a quarter of an hour before the time fixed for a suspension of the sitting of the House.

Nothing in Standing Orders requires that the granting of leave must be unanimous, and that must imply that a division can be called for on the question of granting leave. That is what happened in this case. So, Mr. Speaker, you are faced with the situation that the division was called, the bells were rung, and the glass was turned. There is no dispute over those facts: they are clear. That must mean the application of Standing Order 218, which provides:

So soon as a division shall have been demanded, the Clerk shall ring the division bell, and turn a two-minute sand glass, kept on the table for that purpose, and the doors shall not be closed until after the lapse of two minutes, as indicated by such sand glass.

There is no provision in that Standing Order for the calling off of the division halfway through by the Deputy Speaker instructing the Clerk to turn off the bells and then trying to require the member for Wallaroo to continue the debate. Once the division has been granted and the bells have been rung, it must be continued. That is all there is to it. These matters are set out clearly in Standing Orders.

The member has a right to move for a division on the question of whether or not a member shall be given leave to continue his remarks. He did so move for a division; the Deputy Speaker called for the ringing of the bells; the bells were duly rung; and, after they had been ringing for about 20 seconds, they were stopped. That should not have occurred. Mr. Speaker, you should not uphold the ruling of the Deputy Speaker to turn the glass and continue the division, and we go back to where we started. This is the only course open in the circumstances, because there is no provision in Standing Orders at any stage either to require that leave must be unanimous when a member seeks to continue his remarks or that the division can be called off in the manner in

which it was once the division has commenced by the ringing of the bells. Therefore, as Standing Orders on this matter are clear cut, I ask you not to uphold the ruling of the Deputy Speaker, and to instruct the Clerk to ring the bells.

The House divided on Mr. Lawn's motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn (teller), Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Freebairn.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HUGHES: About 28 minutes has been wasted by the Government this morning because of its challenge to me when I moved for leave to continue. The Premier can blame no-one else but his own middle-benchers for this, because of the remarks I made that the Government had thrown this Bill into the melting pot on the eve of the House rising for Christmas and because Government members denied there was any urgency attached to the Bill. As there was no urgency attached to the Bill, I moved for leave to continue. I was wrong in doing that, and I was corrected by the Deputy Speaker and told that I could seek leave to continue, which I did.

The Government is not going to bulldoze me, even though it tried to make fun out of what I was saying half an hour ago. If the Government wants to bring in these Bills in the closing hours before rising for the Christmas break, it is not going to bulldoze me: I am going to say what I want to say.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: Because I am such a fair man, I am placing the claims of the scientologists before the House this morning, even though I may not agree with those claims. The banning of scientology is taking away the rights of people in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: They have come over the border.

Mr. HUGHES: There is another half an hour the Premier can tack on to this debate!

Maybe the people concerned came over the border to South Australia where they thought they could receive justice but, judging from the attitude that has been adopted in another place and from that of members opposite, these people will not receive justice and their claims will not even be heard. I have called the Government's bluff. Government back-benchers have said by way of interjection that there is no urgency for this matter to proceed. Accepting a challenge, I moved that I have leave to continue my remarks, and the result has left me with no alternative but to place on record the statement that members opposite are insincere in introducing legislation on scientology under these conditions. Who are members opposite to say that people cannot practise a certain religion? Up to the present, the Government has not proved that anything is wrong with scientology. Members opposite have been making false statements, and that was proved by a remark made by the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles), who said he did not know of any ministers of religion who had objected.

Mr. Hudson: Rev. K. B. Leaver of the Parkin Theological College gave evidence—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: Yet the member for Gumeracha said this evening that no ministers had taken exception.

Mr. Rodda: Have you read all the evidence?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I have read more evidence than the member for Victoria has read, judging from his earlier interjections. If I were the Premier, I would certainly tell my back-benchers not to be so stupid, because they are leaving themselves wide open, only to be proved wrong, just as I have proved the member for Gumeracha to be wrong.

Mr. McAnaney: Proved wrong by whom?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member knows the answer to that. A section of the evidence which I have shows that Rev. K. B. Leaver (Principal of Parkin Theological College) appeared before the committee, yet this has not sunk through to the member for Stirling, who is still asking about it. This reverend gentleman appeared before the committee and opposed the ban.

Mr. McAnaney: What was that you were trying to tell me?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not mind if members opposite find it difficult to understand what I am saying. I do not mind if they want to stay here until tomorrow: I live at Wallaroo and I cannot go home, so I might

as well stay here. I should have thought the Premier would give sound advice to his members.

Mr. Clark: Particularly in the Council.

Mr. HUGHES: I am afraid it is beyond the Premier to give the Council advice, because it would not be accepted. The foolish attitude adopted by members opposite has now delayed the House for about 50 minutes.

Mr. Edwards: Who will read all this drivel?

Mr. HUGHES: It will not be the honourable member, because he would not understand what it is about.

Mr. Edwards: You don't understand it, either.

Mr. HUGHES: I have a much better understanding of it than the honourable member gives me credit for. I regret very much that the honourable member has referred to what I have placed before the House as drivel. The document I have was drawn up by one of the highest authorities in California, and it now appears that the member for Eyre is setting himself up above that highest authority. Therefore, he is wasting his time here and should be on the Supreme Court bench.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): There is nothing in the Bill about the member for Eyre.

Mr. HUGHES: True, but he has interjected, saying that what I have placed before the House is drivel, although it comes from one of the highest authorities in California. Therefore, I should be allowed to reply.

Mr. Clark: That is a reflection on another country.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I hope the South Australian *Hansard* does not reach California, because those people could be offended. Before I was interrupted, I was referring to paragraph (h) of the constitution of this body. What this paragraph states is true because, if a person can find peace within himself, he will find God. If the scientologists practise what is stated in this paragraph, I shall be able to find no fault with them. As one who has had some experience (and I say that without boasting), I believe that what is in that paragraph is true. The document also states:

... and trusting with enduring faith that the author of this universe intended life to thrive within it, the Church of Scientology is formed to espouse such evidence of the Supreme Being and Spirit as may be knowable

to man and by their use the Church of Scientology hopes to bring a greater tranquility to the State and better order and survival to man upon this planet.

How true that statement is! I am pleased that the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) is indicating that he agrees with me, because he and his wife are hard workers for the Methodist church in Gawler. They have had great experience, and the amount of work that Mrs. Clark does is commendable.

When the Church of Scientology states that it provides for a better order and survival for man on this planet, I think it gets close to the doctrines of other churches. Provided they carry this out, I have no quarrel with them. It would worry a dictatorship, and it has been worrying the Government. The document continues:

(i) The Church of American Science exists upon the following creed which is adopted as the creed of the Church of Scientology of California, with the additional tenets provided for in number 5 and 6 below:

1. That God works within Man his wonders to perform.

I attend not only the Methodist church but other special church services to which I am invited, and many times I have heard the quotation, "That God works within man his wonders to perform." The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) will find similar words to those in the Methodist hymn book.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Light doesn't know anything about hymn books. He's an atheist. He's anti-Christ and anti-Socialist.

Mr. HUGHES: Christ was the greatest Socialist that ever walked this earth. No-one was closer to this earth, and the policies of the Australian Labor Party follow closely the teachings of Christ. Paragraph (i) (2) of the document states:

That man is his own soul, basically free and immortal, but deluded by the flesh.

The very thing that scientology is fighting for is the preservation of its rights in South Australia. Every man should be allowed to speak freely and follow the religion that he believes in and I understand, not from discussions with scientologists but from conversations with some of our members who have scientologists living in their districts, that scientologists get a great deal out of their religion. I again emphasize that I am not advocating the practice of scientology. I am only putting the claims of scientologists before this House. If the Government rejects those claims, that is the Government's affair. If any denomination

wants survival and wants a hearing, I will see that it gets it. Paragraph (i) (4) of the document states:

That man has a God-given right to his own reason.

How true that is! No-one can deny that. Paragraph (i) (5) states:

That man has the God-given right to his own beliefs.

Again, if these people in the Church of Scientology really believe in scientology and get some good from it, who are we to tell the member that they cannot practise their religion? I should not like anyone to tell me that I should reject any of my beliefs in the Methodist church. Scientologists should be given the same liberties as are given to other people, yet this Bill will make them criminals if they practise their religion or have certain material in their keeping.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Are you trying to say that the Methodist church and scientology have the same sort of aim?

Mr. HUGHES: No, not at all.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Well, you are doing a fairly good job of putting a dirty slur on the Methodist church.

Mr. HUGHES: The Premier is trying to put words into my mouth, but I will not accept them. I am not putting a dirty slur on the Methodist church at all, and I take strong action and I ask for a withdrawal. I am not casting a dirty slur on the Methodist church, and I ask the Premier to withdraw that remark.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Is the Premier prepared to withdraw the remark?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In the interest of brevity and of getting this debate on the way, I will withdraw and will have something to say, when I wind up the debate, about the honourable member and about his championing of this cause.

Mr. HUGHES: That is fair enough. The Premier can say anything he likes but, if he says that I am championing this cause, he is making a grave mistake. When he makes that statement, he will not be telling the truth.

Mr. McKee: He will be further challenged.

Mr. HUGHES: He may be further challenged if he says that. I am not championing scientology at all. I am only bringing before the House the claim of the people of that faith to civil rights. It is stupid for anyone to say that I am championing the cause. If

I said certain things about the Roman Catholic church, the Premier would say that I was championing the cause of that church, Again, I could say something about the Churches of Christ and he could again make his statement, but he would be wrong, because I am not championing anyone's cause: all I am doing is being fair, which is more than the Premier has been. I hope that when he closes the debate he will be fair and give both sides of the question. (He has said he will take me to task.) The member for Chaffey laughed when I said "I hope the Premier will be fair." That indicates to me that he has not much faith in the fairness of the Premier.

Mr. Rodda: You're drawing false conclusions.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not. I think I am close to the mark. Paragraph (i) (6) states:

That man has a God-given right to his own mode of thought and for thinking.

Mr. Hudson: Not according to Big Brother.

Mr. HUGHES: That is the point I want to make. From the Premier's interjections a moment ago, he does not believe that man has a God-given right to his own mode of thought and thinking. Because I am bringing the claims of these people before the House (and justifiably so), he has said that I am championing the cause of scientologists, but that is far from the truth. I have been telephoned at least six times by different people asking to come to the House to talk to me about scientology. I refused to receive them because I did not want to be prejudiced on this matter when it came before the House. I wanted to use my own judgment: I did not want scientologists to do it for me.

Mr. Hudson: Or Big Brother.

Mr. HUGHES: No, nor the Premier. I will not call him Big Brother, because I may be called to order if I do.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: We are tolerant people. We don't mind.

Mr. HUGHES: The people of South Australia have to be tolerant about some of the things that have been put up to them over the last few weeks, but I am afraid they are becoming sick of it. This was evident at a meeting I attended last Friday night.

Mr. Hudson: What happened at that meeting?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. Hudson: They do not want you to tell them.

Mr. HUGHES: It is evident that the Acting Speaker does not want me to do so. I was addressing the Chair, not replying to interjections. I think I was wrongly called to order.

Mr. McKee: He is only trying to provoke you. He has a bad nature.

Mr. HUGHES: I think the Acting Speaker thought I was going to reply, and he wanted to stop me. Paragraph (i) (7) states:

That man has a God-given right to free and open communication.

That is true, and that is the point I am trying to make. The Bill bans this, and this Government has no right to do this.

Mr. Clark: It has no right to be a Government.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that. Besides that, it has no right to take away free and open communication.

Mr. McKee: Thousands of men have died for freedom.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and for the very thing I am bringing before the House, and I am thankful to the member for Port Pirie for bringing this matter to my attention. If we stop these people from communicating with one another on scientology we will drive them underground. It does not do an organization any good to be driven underground: it is better that it should operate openly and freely. Even the Premier would agree that it is better to know what is going on than not to know. We should not ban any organization, provided it does not interfere with other people's rights or does not cause damage or harm to anyone else. If, by communicating with one another, people can assist one another, I see nothing wrong with that. It takes place in this Chamber: we communicate with one another and, very often, a Bill may be improved because of communication between members. The member for Stirling, who is trying to interject, is not prepared to give certain rights to everyone; he wants them given only to certain people, and that is not right. We as Parliamentarians should stand foursquare for civil liberties of the individual. We should not be split on this matter, which is important. The Government is taking away the right of the individual, but it is prepared to take away the rights not of all but only of some individuals.

The Attorney-General this afternoon said, "I could tell you a lot of things that I am afraid I am not able to tell you today." If a person knows something and wants to talk

about it, he should, but he should not even mention it if he is not prepared to tell it all. The Attorney-General was not prepared to tell us what he had in mind. If honourable members look in the *Hansard* report later, they will see what he said. I do not want to be accused of misquoting him, but he meant that he knew many things about these people but was not prepared to tell them to the House. How can we be convinced on this matter unless specific cases are placed before us? If people are not prepared to give the bad with the good, they should say nothing at all. This afternoon the Attorney-General went to great lengths to produce some of the worst literature ever put out on scientology, but he conveniently missed what I am telling the House tonight.

Mr. Rodda: When are you going to tell us about California?

Mr. HUGHES: Honourable members had their chance to go home but were not prepared to do so. They obviously do not mind stopping here all night and tomorrow; otherwise, they would have agreed when I moved that progress be reported. I still have a lot more to tell the House about scientology and I want to compare the rights of people in this State as individuals with those of people elsewhere. If the member for Victoria and his colleagues do not want me to continue, I shall be happy to move that I have leave to continue my remarks, and I do so.

Mr. Lawn: I second that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That the honourable member have leave to continue?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leave not granted. The honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought, Mr. Acting Speaker, that you said, "Leave granted."

The ACTING SPEAKER: I said, "Leave not granted."

Mr. HUGHES: I am very disappointed. You must have lowered your voice on "not". I distinctly heard "Leave granted", and so did the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee).

The ACTING SPEAKER: I repeat it for the benefit of the honourable member: "Leave not granted."

Mr. HUGHES: It appears that you were told to do so by the Clerk. Paragraph (i) (9) of the document states:

That a civilization can endure—

Mr. Hudson: You have not yet dealt with paragraph (i) (8).

Mr. HUGHES: I gave you that; I am on paragraph (i) (9) now:

A civilization can endure only so long as both spiritual and material needs find a place within its structure.

Mr. Jennings: Who can deny that?

Mr. HUGHES: No-one can deny it because, as I said earlier, in all communities there is a need for spiritual guidance, and these people are being fair in the preparation of their document. That is what they say, and how very true it is. People must be fed, so they have material as well as spiritual needs. I do not think that any nation could exist for long without either.

That has been proved in the past, and I sincerely hope that we in this State never reach that position. I think you, Mr. Acting Speaker, would agree with me, being a man of the world as you are, that it is necessary to have both spiritual and material needs and they should be administered to people in the right proportions to enable them to lead a happy life in the community. A good point is made in paragraph (i) (10) as follows:

That a civilization is lost when God and the spirit are forgotten by its leaders and its people.

This Government is a very good example of—

Mr. McKee: —a heathen Government?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I would not say that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: Paragraph (i) (10) states:

That a civilization is lost when God and the Spirit are forgotten by its leaders and its people.

If this Bill is passed that will indeed apply to South Australia. The Government is disregarding the rights of certain individuals, and I believe that what I have just quoted should be a warning to the Government to think twice about forcing the Bill through the House, unless the Premier or the Attorney-General can come up with some good arguments and specific cases to prove their claim. The document continues:

That man and the nations of man carry with them their own salvation and that teachings exist sufficient to effect it—

how true that is—

The Church of Scientology exists to assist the strong and the weak, to suppress the wrongdoer and to champion the right and godly. Its mission is to carry to man revelations and teachings and practices of the present and the ages past and to assist him, his family and communities, to live in greater peace and harmony.

In fairness to the Church of Scientology, I point out that if its members are prepared to go out of their way to assist the weak (and there are always some weak people in the community who need spiritual guidance) and to make their life happy, those members are justified in carrying out that practice and should not be suppressed. Indeed, I think Parliament's aim in legislation is to suppress the wrongdoer: it is not to take action after the deed is done but to have legislation on the Statute Book that will deter a person in committing a wrong. Scientologists are merely attempting to do what Parliament is doing, and it is an injustice to suppress their efforts to assist people.

Mr. BURDON: Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. *A quorum having been formed:*

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I am sorry that it was necessary for you to have the bells rung to bring members into the Chamber, but nevertheless attention was drawn by the member for Mount Gambier to the state of the House, and justifiably so. I believe it would be wrong to prevent a member of any organization from assisting his weaker brother. I do not see anything wrong in the Church of Scientology's carrying out teachings and practices of the present age, assisting mankind wherever possible, and, above all, seeking to live in greater peace and harmony. That is more than the two Parties in this Parliament can do.

Mr. Virgo: It is more than the two Houses can do.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, even the two Houses cannot exist in harmony.

Mr. Virgo: The Upper House knows the permanent will of the people—

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

Mr. HUGHES: The Upper House knows the permanent will of the people, yet it was evident today that this House was not in harmony with the other place, otherwise the Minister of Education—

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

Mr. HUGHES: It is evident that yesterday this House was out of step with the other place, otherwise the Minister of Education would not have found it necessary to take the action she took in having a conference—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no reference to that in this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I was drawing the House's attention to the fact that scientologists advocate that people should live in greater peace and harmony but that certain people in this House and in another place cannot even live in peace and harmony and carry out their duties for the betterment of the people of South Australia. We argued in this House certain matters regarding the Public Examinations Board, but what happened? There was no peace—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member will confine his remarks to the Bill. There is no reference to the Public Examinations Board in this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: All right, if that is your ruling, Mr. Acting Speaker. I thought that those attitudes were related to the point I was trying to make. Apparently, honourable members want me to continue, because twice Government members have shown that they want to hear what I still have to say. It is not fair to any member if this Bill is stamped through. At this juncture, because of what has been said, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The ACTING SPEAKER: That the honourable member have leave to continue?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: No.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Leave is not granted. The honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. McKee: Divide!

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. McKee: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker. I have asked for a division.

The ACTING SPEAKER: This question has been resolved previously and the same ruling applies. The honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: I am flattered that Government members are so courteous in wanting me to continue. For the benefit of the Minister of Works, who was absent from the Chamber until the ringing of the bells brought him back again, we are still dealing with the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill, which constitutes a serious breach of civil liberties, and that is the crux of my objection. This is an infringement of human rights, and if Parliament continues to deny the people of South Australia their civil rights we are on the way down. We have been told that this State takes the lead in most things, but this is a retrograde step.

Mr. Broomhill: It could lead to anything.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it could. The Government would be well advised to re-examine this Bill in the light of what has been said in this debate. Apparently, the Legislative Council has insisted that the Government get on with the job, and it is certainly following orders. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier he would give directions to another place about what should be done and it conformed with decisions of this House, but that situation no longer exists. The day Sir Thomas left this House was a sorry day for the Liberal Party, for now there is nothing to hold the Party together. It is obvious who controls this State: it has always been understood that the Premier was the Leader of the Government, but that is not so today. From the way in which this Bill is being pushed through it is obvious that this part of the Liberal Party has received orders from another place.

Mr. Broomhill: Why are they so anxious to rush it through?

Mr. HUGHES: That is what worries me. What harm have these people been doing? We cannot seem to get a reply to that question. The Attorney-General said that he had plenty of evidence, but he has not yet submitted it. As individuals, these people have certain rights. Paragraph (j) of the document states:

To charter, support, organize, establish, cooperate with, affiliate with, other organizations of a like or similar nature.

Is that not being done by other organizations today?

Mr. McKee: The banks are doing it.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. However, I am talking about the churches, not the banks.

Mr. Virgo: They are all amalgamated.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. In my district the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian churches are taking steps to have a united parish. I have been active in bringing this about, and that is why I maintain that similar rights should be given to other organizations to do this. If this body became established in the community and wanted to affiliate with another body, who are we to say that it should not be allowed to do so? This paragraph is one of the most important paragraphs in the document. Members of the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian churches (and I have had experience of those churches) are functioning happily under a united parish in South Australia. The three church bodies have a head office in Adelaide, and the co-operation that has come from them is most heartening. Before long, we will have a united parish of the three churches at

Wallaroo. All that the scientologists are asking for is to be given the same opportunities that are given to other organizations.

Mr. Virgo: The way this Government is going, it might ban the Methodist church.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Even though I have been a layman of that church for 40 years, I was rudely interrupted by a member opposite, who said he had been a layman for 44 years, and I was told that I knew nothing about the workings of my own church.

Mr. Virgo: How can a man be a Christian and a Liberal? They don't go together.

Mr. HUGHES: I said earlier that I know the workings of the Methodist church well. I have not held the highest office the Methodist church of Australasia can confer on one of its laymen without knowing something about it. I said before (and it was hotly denied) that if this Bill is passed the Government, in a short period, could take away the rights of another organization in the same way as it is taking away the rights of scientologists. I do not say the Government would do this, but it could happen.

Mr. Lawn: You can't trust the Liberals.

Mr. HUGHES: No; in view of the way they have ratted on their promises in the last few weeks, we cannot accept their word. I have raised the point about what the Government could do to other organizations because I am afraid of what the Government might do.

Mr. Lawn: You can't trust a Liberal.

Mr. HUGHES: I know many members of that Party and I know some I can trust, but they are few and far between. However, in view of the capitulation that has taken place by members opposite in the last few days, it is evident that we cannot accept the word of this Government any longer.

Mr. Lawn: The only good Liberal is a dead one.

Mr. HUGHES: I leave the honourable member to say that.

Mr. Lawn: That is right.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member says that, then it must be right. The claims of these scientologists are not any greater than those made by other church organizations in South Australia. The Premier charged me this evening with championing the cause of scientologists, but I am not doing that: I am merely championing the rights of the individual and protecting his civil liberties. I am not championing the rights of the scientologists at all, and it will be no good any scientologists' telephoning

me later this morning to say he wants to see me, because I shall not be available to see him. Paragraph (k) of the document states:

This corporation is organized for the religious, charitable, social, fraternal, scientific, educational, research, welfare and protective purposes of the corporation, its membership, its churches, its affiliates, the public whom the Church of Scientology may serve, and its activities.

I challenge any member to point out anything in that paragraph that is wrong. Regarding the religious aspect, it means that these people believe they have something that can assist other people, and there are many weaker people who need assistance. These people are only offering to do the same kind of thing that other religious bodies are allowed to do. These people are prepared to work for charity: is there anything wrong with that? Every religious body that I know works very hard for charity.

Of course, ministers cannot be expected to live on hand-outs. They are grossly underpaid, because of the amount of training that they have had to undertake in comparison with the training undertaken by members of business organizations. Although they are receiving better remuneration today than they received some years ago, their salaries are still insufficient. We must remember, too, that they are on call seven days a week. Turning now to the social aspect, every church has its social activities, and there is nothing wrong with these people claiming—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

The ACTING SPEAKER: There being a quorum present, the honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: These people are justified in carrying out social work in the community, and I do not think this Parliament should ban them unless the Attorney-General or the Premier can instance specific cases that prove that they should not be allowed to do this work. Turning to the fraternal aspect, there is nothing wrong with that. I am associated with a certain organization, as are some other members of this House, whose members recognize other members as fraternal brethren. These people are prepared to enter the scientific field, too. This is the crux of the whole matter, and this is where the House has not been told what was in the mind of the Attorney-General when he spoke yesterday.

Apparently he knows something about the scientific approach of these people as a church body that we have not been told about.

It does not matter what was put before a Select Committee appointed in another place: the Bill is now before this House and, if there is anything this House should know in support of banning scientology, it should be told about it. When the Premier said he would tell me a few things later, I hope he had in mind bringing these things into the open so that this House could examine them in their true perspective. The Premier should not make snide remarks like, "We know certain things, but we are not prepared to tell you." If the Government can show that scientology is bad for South Australia, then the House will decide that these people should not be able to practise scientology. I think I have said enough not in support of scientology but in support of my claim that everyone in South Australia should have the right of freedom of speech and freedom of religion. The House should give serious consideration to this point before it makes a decision on the Bill.

Mr. BURDON (Mt. Gambier) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon (teller), Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. BURDON: I intended to be comparatively brief but, nevertheless, it may be necessary for me to speak at greater length to get through to members opposite the seriousness of the action the Government is taking against scientology, whether that organization be a religious faith or a body associated with mental health. The Government's action is completely wrong, and members opposite stand condemned. In 1951 a referendum seeking to outlaw Communism (and to my mind that is one of the most

insidious "isms" to inflict this planet) was rejected by the Australian people. At that referendum the voters upheld a principle that this Government has been trying to deny. The Government is denying a certain section of the people the fundamental freedoms of worship, assembly and association. I again ask the Attorney-General and the other members of Cabinet to seriously consider the proposals put by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: They were only in broad outline, you know.

Mr. BURDON: The Leader put two proposals to the Attorney-General and it behoves the Attorney, even at this late hour—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's early.

Mr. BURDON: Well, it may be early, but it will be late before we conclude this debate. The Attorney-General has it in his own hands to terminate the debate. Within the last couple of hours attempts have been made by the Opposition to terminate the debate, but the Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, has decided that the debate should continue. The proposals that have been put forward are two positive steps that could be placed effectively on the South Australian Statute Book. Both these measures, given to the House by the Leader of the Opposition, would eliminate the necessity for this Bill. Given time, Bills to serve this end could be prepared, but it appears that it is not the Government's intention to do this: it has set its course on banning scientology in South Australia.

I have no truck with scientology and I do not support it in any way. There are other such organizations in South Australia and in Australia with which I do not hold truck and they would not hold truck with some of my beliefs, but we have a duty to protect the interests of the individual, and it is in the interests of the State that we protect this interest. A move such as the banning of scientology could be the first move in a dictatorship.

Mr. Hurst: We've had a dictatorship here for years.

Mr. BURDON: We have probably had one for about 30 years, and now we have this move to impose an even worse dictatorship on the State.

Mr. Clark: The dictatorship has shifted to another place.

Mr. BURDON: That is correct. There has been a genuine attempt to get some semblance into the House of Assembly but, from the Government's actions in relation to this measure

and to another measure, it is the Government's intention to shift the emphasis of Government to another Chamber.

Mr. Hurst: If this is a taste of it, we must be careful.

Mr. BURDON: Yes. If we lose this right, as the member for Semaphore has said, we lose the right to govern the people of South Australia. We are the representatives of the people of the State. The abolition of this right by another Chamber is wrong, and the move to ban scientology is part of a plan.

Mr. Hurst: It's indicative of what Parliament will come to.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, I have no doubt there is no move the present Government would not come to to save its own hide. Nothing the Government does surprises me, the Opposition, or the majority of the people in the State. If the Government believes it has the right to continue in office, it should test its popularity by resigning and going to the people, as it has done enough in the last seven or eight months to let the people of South Australia pass judgment on its actions. I believe judgment would be passed, as it was in relation to the banning of the Communists in 1951. Many and varied versions of the practices of scientology have been mentioned in the debate and much literature has been forwarded to members during the last few months. Much has been made of the Anderson report, which has been quoted extensively in certain places.

Mr. Hurst: Has there been any evidence of anything happening in South Australia?

Mr. BURDON: I doubt whether there has been. I have not received any complaint from any person regarding the harm that scientology may be doing. If people wish, they should be allowed to practise scientology, but they should have the right to reject it if they so desire. Certain members on the back benches are opposed to this measure. I am pleased to see the member for Rocky River nodding his head in acceptance of what I have said, as I believe he agrees with the Opposition. The member for Yorke Peninsula may shake his head. That may be his means of keeping awake. I am pleased to see him swinging his head about because I know the discomfort he suffered in a motor accident some time ago. It is a pleasure to see him getting back to good health, as he is a fine gentleman, but he belongs to the wrong political Party. I am delighted to see the member for Rocky River smiling.

Mr. Clark: You're getting down a little low.

Mr. BURDON: He will rise at the right time. It is a pleasure to see him trying to digest the debate. We would welcome the contributions of members opposite, but I believe the word has gone around and instructions have been issued that there are to be no further speakers on the Government side.

Mr. Ryan: They are under instructions.

Mr. BURDON: They are under instructions and none of them wants to disobey those instructions, because we all know of the difficulties in the Liberal Party today. It is widely said, I think with some justification, that the Liberal Party is split right up the centre. We know that the coalition—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. BURDON: I was just getting back to the Bill. It is fundamental that members are free to please themselves how they act. I should now like to deal with some matters relating to scientology contained in publications put out by the scientology people. Whether they are relevant to this Bill is of no great consequence, for the simple reason that the Government has decided, come what may, that it intends to ban scientology. I believe (and all members on this side agree) that we have to guard against depriving the individual of his civil rights, taking away the right of man to please himself how he will conduct his own life. A pamphlet entitled *Why Scientology is Here* states:

Men have sought for thousands of years answers to questions of life and death. It is said that men have failed to find answers to those questions and that in the twentieth century they have found it dangerous not to have the answers. Man's very existence, through his ignorance, is being threatened.

The word "dianetics" is connected with scientology. It means "free thought". I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with suggested amendments.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

GIFT DUTY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with suggested amendments.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL
Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's message.

(Continued from December 10. Page 3164.)

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Mrs. Steele and Messrs. Brookman, Clark, Loveday, and Nankivell.

Motion carried.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to the conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 7.45 p.m.

At 7.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 10.9 p.m.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have to report that the managers have conferred together but that no agreement was reached.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 18 (clause 2)—After "produced" insert "or any other premises so situated that are, in the opinion of the court, by reason of their nature or character likely to attract tourists".

No. 2. Page 2, line 11 (clause 3)—After "age" insert "and that person was actually of or above the age of eighteen years".

No. 3. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—Leave out "subsection" and insert "subsections".

No. 4. Page 2, lines 16 and 17 (clause 4)—Leave out "may not be" and insert "is not being".

No. 5. Page 2, lines 18 and 19 (clause 4)—Leave out "a person or association not a member of or associated with the club", and insert "persons or an association of persons (whether or not those persons are members of, or that association is associated with, the club)".

No. 6. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 22 insert new subsections as follows:

"(8) An association, society or other body shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to be a club, and may be granted a permit under this section, notwithstanding that it does not have the exclusive use, occupation or control of the

premises in respect of which the permit is sought or that its use, occupation or control of the premises is intermittent, periodical or occasional.

(9) The fee prescribed for a permit under subsection (1) of this section shall vary in proportion to the number of members of the club.

(10) In determining whether the condition of premises in respect of which a permit is sought is adequate for the grant of a permit, the court shall have regard to the number of members of the club, the frequency of its use of the premises, and its capacity (financial or otherwise) to make improvements to the premises."

No. 7. Page 2, lines 27 and 28 (clause 5)—Leave out "persons or associations not members of or connected with the club", and insert "persons or an association of persons (whether or not those persons are members of, or that association is associated with, the club)".

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

This amendment enlarges the special licence provision relating to museums and art galleries. It seeks to allow licences to be given to any winegrowing districts that are "in the opinion of the court, by reason of their nature or character, likely to attract tourists". I believe this is far too wide. All sorts of places can be an attraction to tourists. I do not think it is necessary for us to be so extensive in our considerations as to allow this kind of amendment to be written into the Act. I am sure it goes further than intended by this Chamber and probably further than the mover in another place intended.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I agree with the Leader. We must remember that the original amendment to the Act we are considering is an innovation and that the amendment which has been inserted in

another place considerably widens the provision and is, in my view, undesirably vague. I understand that the mover had in mind **certain** premises, but from what I know of them I think that in any case those premises come within the definition of a museum. Therefore, I think there is no need for any **further** amendment to the clause as it left this Chamber, and I support the motion.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 2 to 7.

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

That amendments Nos. 2 to 7 be agreed to.

Amendment No. 2 is a drafting amendment, and is useful. Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 7 tidy up the proposals that we made to allow clubs to let out their premises to persons or associations other than the club concerned, and I think they are useful amendments. Amendment No. 6 alters the position in relation to permitted clubs, and makes it clear that permitted clubs do not have to be constantly in exclusive control of the premises in respect of which permits are given. Although it enlarges the Bill, I think that the new proposal is useful, and is sought by many permitted clubs.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I support the Leader. I think these amendments, which I have been through pretty carefully, are desirable and illustrate the value of the Legislative Council.

Amendments agreed to.

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

Because the amendment makes too wide a provision for new licences.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.58 a.m. on Thursday, December 12, the House adjourned until Thursday, December 12, at 2 p.m.