

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 5, 1969.

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

## QUESTIONS

## CHOWILLA DAM

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report of the technical committee on the Chowilla dam discloses that one of the assumptions made by the committee is the necessity for a flow of 900 cusecs at Mildura, but the report does not state the basis upon which this assumption is made. Will the Premier say whether the Government has any information on that matter and, if it has, will he give the House information about the quality of the water designed to be maintained at Mildura, with the proportions of salinity involved, and will he indicate the basis on which the committee has decided that a flow of 900 cusecs is necessary for that quality of water?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The committee has stated several conditions of a flow at Mildura of 600 cusecs as well as a flow of 900 cusecs and has related these to the need to maintain quality in that part of the river. I will get further details for the Leader from the South Australian representative on the River Murray Commission (Mr. Beaney).

Mr. HUDSON: As the Minister of Works knows from the debate yesterday, it was pointed out by Opposition members that the technical committee's report on the comparison of Dartmouth and Chowilla did not state any assumption that it made relating to the flow of the Mitta Mitta River at Dartmouth, nor did it state what information it had about the flow from the Mitta Mitta River either at Dartmouth or at some other point further, it did not indicate what limitation there was on this information. We know, I assume, that the information available about the flow of the Mitta Mitta River does not cover the full 65-year period of the studies, and the question arises as to what effect there would be on the conclusions reached in this report if the flow of the Mitta Mitta was less than had been assumed. We are not told what difference this would make to the relative comparison between Dartmouth and Chowilla. Although I appreciate that the Minister of Works may not have the information I require at his finger tips I should be pleased if he would ascertain, first, what information was available to the technical committee relating to the flow

of the Mitta Mitta at various points; secondly, what is the geographical relationship of the point at which flow figures were available to the site of the proposed Dartmouth reservoir; thirdly, what flows of the Mitta Mitta River were assumed for the purposes of the study; fourthly, how were flow figures reached for the years for which no information was available; and fifthly, whether the technical committee examined the effects of the flow of the Mitta Mitta River being less than the estimated flow.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yesterday, when the honourable member asked for information on a couple of these matters I assured him that if he or any other member asked questions of this nature I would undertake to obtain the information. I assure the honourable member I shall be pleased to get the information he requires, because I realize that this is a matter of great interest to all members. As far as I know, the information that he has requested is available and I shall expedite the inquiry. It may take one or two days to collate the details, but this and other information will be made available to the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. RICHES: At page 2427, *Hansard* records that this House carried, earlier this session, the following motion on the Chowilla dam:

That this House considers that the State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without delay and calls on all South Australian members in both Houses of the Parliament of the Commonwealth to support South Australia's case to the utmost.

On page 2429, *Hansard* records that you, Mr. Speaker, said:

I think it would not be a breach of Standing Orders if I made it perfectly clear that this resolution has my full support, and that makes it completely unanimous.

I take it, Sir, that, in the course of the duties of your office, you conveyed that resolution to the South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament. I understand that some Commonwealth members have come in for public criticism because they did not comply with the request of this Parliament. I fully appreciate the difficult position in which you, Sir, are placed in this matter but, as I have regard for the standing and image of this Parliament in the public eyes and in its relations with other Parliaments, I ask you what is the position of Commonwealth members now, following the debate yesterday and the decision of the House. Do you intend to communicate with them further, informing

them of what would appear to be a change of heart on the part of this House?

The SPEAKER: After the resolution was passed unanimously by the House last year (as the honourable member stated), I sent a copy of it to all South Australian members of the Commonwealth Parliament, in accordance with its terms. I think I am correct in saying that I received a reply from every one of those members, some of whom supported the Chowilla dam unequivocally and others of whom were a little bit half and half in their support. One member asked for further information but as it was technical information in the process of being produced it was not possible to give it until the report became available. If the honourable member desires, and if he wishes to test the House on this, I will bring the copies of the letters to the House tomorrow and have them incorporated in *Hansard* without reading them all. Does the honourable member wish that?

Mr. Riches: No. My concern is the position of the Commonwealth members now that we have, apparently, had a change of heart.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker of the House, I was instructed by the House to convey to them what was a straight-out resolution. I do not think I can do anything more about that without some other resolution being passed by the House.

Mr. ARNOLD: During the debate in this House yesterday, the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) and I referred to the Chowilla dam and the Dartmouth dam on the basis that they should be built simultaneously. If a dam of 1,300,000 acre feet were built at Dartmouth, this would meet the needs of both Victoria and New South Wales, and for a total overall cost of about \$90,000,000 both dams could be built, thus satisfying everyone. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet and our representative on the River Murray Commission have considered this line of approach?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not think any line of approach has not been thought of, investigated, and actively considered by the Government. The total cost of building both schemes, of course, at this time would be nearer \$130,000,000 than \$90,000,000, if both were built to full capacity. The finishing cost of Chowilla is about \$58,000,000 and the cost of Dartmouth, built to full capacity to yield additional water, is about the same. Other costs would have to be added, so the total cost would be at least \$120,000,000. I assure the honourable member—

*Mr. Virgo interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier, not the member for Edwardstown, is replying to the question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —that the State Government, in any negotiations that follow the meeting of the River Murray Commission tomorrow, will safeguard South Australia's position and take whatever action is necessary to acquire water for South Australia in the required quantities.

#### RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Methodist Church late last year, indicated that it intended to withdraw from the giving of religious instruction in State schools. Other religious denominations conducting independent schools, some of whose members also attend primary and secondary schools in South Australia, have indicated that they wish to continue giving religious instruction in State schools. I understand, too, that in November last the Education Department sent out a questionnaire to primary and secondary schools in South Australia to find out the effect of the withdrawal by the Methodist Church from giving religious instruction in State schools. Will the Minister of Education indicate the result of that survey?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This is a matter of some concern to the public and I am sure that my reply will be of interest to everyone concerned in religious instruction. The Director-General of Education has now received answers to a questionnaire sent to schools in an attempt to assess the effects of withdrawal by the Methodist Church from giving religious instruction. As could be expected, the anticipated effect varies considerably between schools, mainly because certain districts have a predominance of one denomination or other. For example, at Tanunda, in a predominantly Lutheran area, it seems that only 14 per cent will be without religious instruction, whereas at Port Broughton, which is strongly Methodist, only about 16 per cent will receive religious instruction at school. While the full effects cannot be gauged until schools resume, the position is complicated further by the Baptist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches and the Churches of Christ supporting the policy of the Methodist Church.

However, in these dominations, each church is free to decide its own attitude to religious instruction. As far as can be assessed at present, in about two-thirds of primary and

area schools fewer than 60 per cent of the students will receive religious instruction, and in about 50 primary schools it is likely that no religious instruction will be possible. In the 84 high and technical high schools, the position is more obscure, but it seems that in about seven-eighths of these schools less than 60 per cent will be receiving religious instruction. As in primary schools, the effect will vary considerably between districts.

For example, in the north-eastern suburbs and in Elizabeth, where the numbers of migrant children are high, the percentage of children who will receive religious instruction will be correspondingly high. In recent years one of the problems besetting religious instruction has been insufficient instructors, and it seems that at least for the Church of England this difficulty will persist. This effect is particularly evident in secondary schools, and there may be need to make special arrangements such as the division of the school into junior and senior sections for separate periods of religious instruction. As soon as the survey was completed, the Director-General of Education prepared a personal letter to heads of schools in which he sought their co-operation in providing as efficient a service of religious instruction as possible under the difficult circumstances that will prevail during 1969. This letter will be sent out to coincide with the opening of schools.

I have had conversations with some of the church leaders, at which problems associated with religious instruction in schools were discussed, but no further action can be taken until the schools re-open and the full effects of the position are evident.

#### SHOP PURCHASE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Messrs. K. D. and R. C. Hill, who are constituents of mine and who reside at 129 Alma Terrace, Woodville West, operate a business on the corner of Marion and Henley Beach Roads, and some time ago the Highways Department informed them that it wished to acquire the property. The department suggested to my constituents that they should provide a valuation in order that it could consider what would be reasonable compensation. More than 18 months ago the then Minister assured my constituents, after consultation with the Highways Department, that they would be paid compensation because stock was involved and they would lose the opportunity to operate the business. Recently, my constituents received a notice informing them that the premises had

to be vacated by April 24, and their solicitors were advised as follows:

Your clients' lease over the delicatessen at 1 Marion Road, Torrensville, expires on April 24, 1969, and, as the department does not require possession at this stage, occupation by your client may continue with payment of agreed rent until that date. Enclosed is a copy of letter of even date sent to Mr. and Mrs. Hill. In the circumstances, it is considered that a valid claim for compensation cannot be sustained.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this action is the result of a change of policy by the Government and, if it is not, will he ascertain whether compensation, which I believe is warranted, can be paid to the Hills?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague immediately and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible. I appreciate the necessity for speed in the circumstances which he has outlined. May I say, as this is the first opportunity to do so, how pleased I am to see the honourable member back in his place in the House. I am sure all members are delighted to have him back with us.

#### HILLS CORNER

Mr. GILES: A tragic accident occurred recently on the old Norton Summit road, Norton Summit, in which three people were killed. The accident occurred at a nasty corner at which numerous other accidents have occurred over the years. I believe that these accidents might have been prevented had an escape route been made available on the approach to the corner; indeed, a disused quarry in the vicinity could be made into such a route. An experiment was carried out recently in connection with aeroplanes, gravel having been placed at the end of a runway, so that if a plane's brakes failed it ran into the gravel and slowed down quickly. I am wondering whether this situation could not be investigated and whether something similar could be used in the quarry so that any vehicle that got out of control or whose brakes failed could use the gravel as an escape route, thus preventing another accident. Will the Attorney take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I remember only too well the tragic accident that occurred recently. I presume that what the honourable member has in mind is something in the nature of run-offs, such as the Railways Department used many years ago (I do not know whether the department still

uses them) and, indeed, I think there are such spurs on some roadways now. I will take up the matter with the Minister in the hope that something can be done about it in this case.

#### POWER BOATS

Mr. RYAN: A fatality occurred recently at Lake Alexandrina when a person who was not wearing a safety jacket was drowned from a small yacht. Shortly after this tragedy, the Minister of Marine made a public statement to the effect that consideration would be given to this matter and legislation possibly introduced for the licensing of power boats. When the matter is considered, will the Minister say whether it is intended that the drivers of the boats concerned will be licensed? Further, will consideration be given to the compulsory wearing of safety jackets in all of these licensed boats, so that tragedies may be averted and so that terrific expense and much time and anxiety on the part of all those concerned may be saved?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I announced previously that the Government intended to introduce legislation this year on what is known as power boat control and to have it brought into the House in time for it to be operating for the next summer (that is, this year). The basis of this legislation would be in conformity with the recommendation made by the power boat committee and would certainly include the registration of the boat. Therefore, if any misdemeanour or bad boatmanship occurred in contravention of laws, the vessel concerned could easily be identified and action taken against its driver. The licensing of drivers is still being considered. Also included in the legislation would be a most important clause providing that certain basic life-saving equipment should be carried at all times and that if anyone did not carry such equipment an offence would be committed. That is the basis of the legislation. I have stressed often publicly, when I have been at marine shows and with organizations interested in this matter, the point that basic life-saving equipment should be worn by drivers of boats at all times, and I am happy to say that the organized clubs have co-operated splendidly in this regard. People who do not wear this equipment are usually those who do not belong to an organized club and who lack a sense of responsibility. Some of the fatalities involving power boats have been as a result of the actions of an inexperienced driver who has acquired a very expensive and fast craft and

who, when he gets the boat into the water, does not know the most elementary rules that apply in waterways and who does not even know that one goes to the right of a waterway instead of to the left, as is the case on a roadway. Such cases are similar to those of unlicensed people driving unregistered motor vehicles. The Government intends to introduce legislation next session so that its provisions will operate by the coming summer.

Mr. EDWARDS: As most people know, a tragedy occurred at Wallaroo recently, when a young girl lost her leg just below the knee when a speed boat came too close to where people were swimming. This is a serious matter and is a problem in almost every swimming area in the State since the use of speed boats with skiers being towed behind has become so prevalent. Sometimes the driver of the speed boat looks behind to see how the skier is going and his attention is distracted. Apparently, this was the case at Wallaroo. If the Minister has not already done so, will he investigate the introduction of legislation to keep speed boats out of swimming areas along the beaches? This matter certainly needs examining.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I greatly regret the occurrence of the accident to which the honourable member refers. The honourable member rightly points out that speed-boating is becoming a risk at many suburban and country beaches, as well as on the Murray River. At present local government authorities have vested in them certain powers for the control of speed boats. There is a model by-law on this matter. I think the Brighton council was one of the first authorities to introduce the provision. In a proclaimed area a speed boat may not proceed at more than a specified speed, say, five miles an hour. This provision also applies on the Murray River. Further, areas under the control of the Marine and Harbors Department are also policed. I point out to the honourable member that accidents sometimes occur when the operator of a speed boat does not have an observer in the boat. In areas under the control of the Minister, the requirement that the operator have an observer in the boat when a skier is being towed is strictly policed and both the driver and the observer must be at least 16 years of age. Only a few days ago I authorized prosecutions for offences that had been detected. As I said earlier, this whole matter, will be further investigated and provisions laid down. This sport is gaining in popularity and I consider that we all want to foster it. However,

in certain areas, in the interests of bathers and of operators and drivers of speed boats, more strict control should be exercised, and the Government intends to enable such control to be exercised.

Mr. HUGHES: I refer to the boating accident that occurred at Wallaroo on January 21 when a girl of 17 years of age was run down by a speedboat and had one of her legs cut off. I have visited the girl regularly in the Wallaroo hospital and say that it is only a miracle that she was not killed. A few days after the accident the Minister of Marine stated in the *Advertiser* that the Government would introduce legislation this year to control the operation of power boats and water skiers. He also stated that the legislation would be an important step in preventing boating accidents, such as the tragic one at Wallaroo. Will the Minister say whether a record has been kept of other accidents, if any, caused by power boats and will he treat the proposed legislation as an urgent matter with a view to introducing it this session?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I do not know whether the honourable member heard my reply to the member for Port Adelaide earlier when I reiterated the announcement I made last year in the House that the Government intended to introduce legislation to control power boats. I point out to the honourable member, as I did on that occasion, that this involves a terrific amount of draftsmanship and consultation, not only between Government departments but with the organizations concerned. I said earlier that I intended to hasten this work as much as possible so that the legislation could be introduced next session and operate in the summer of 1969-70. That is the earliest we can introduce it and that is the earliest it can operate. I desire to expedite the introduction of this legislation, but it is physically impossible to introduce it and have it considered in the next few weeks.

#### LANGHORNE CREEK BASIN

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the level of the Langhorne Creek Basin has dropped during this summer and that the salinity content has increased greatly. Will the Premier obtain from the Minister of Mines a report on the present activities of the Mines Department in this area and on the possibility of this area's being proclaimed under the Underground Waters Preservation Act?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report from my colleague for the honourable member.

#### SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. VIRGO: On December 5, I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry a question about the racket taking place in service stations, and a few days later I received from the Minister a reply to the effect that nothing could be done. I now refer the Premier's attention to an article in the *Advertiser* of January 7 stating that the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce had called on the State Government to begin urgently an inquiry into petrol marketing. I have been given startling information, not the least startling of which is that Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited can sell petrol to its employees for 33c a gallon, which is 5½c less than the oil companies charge the wholesalers at Whyalla and about 11c less than the general public is charged. Can the Premier say whether the Government is prepared to have a full inquiry made into all aspects of petrol marketing, including the indiscriminate building of service stations and the unscrupulous action of some oil companies that are leasing service stations to unsuspecting people and thereby forcing those people to work for sums that represent usually far less than the wage prescribed by arbitration?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government has a submission before it that it is now considering. I point out that I merely accept the honourable member's question without agreeing or disagreeing to any suggestion he makes. After considering the submission, the Government will make announcements in due course.

#### NARACORTE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to the low water pressure in some parts of the Naracorte Housing Trust area. During the recent heat wave some residents did not receive any water, and many received only a trickle. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with his department? I understand it is not a question of lack of bores but of boosting the water supply in the mains.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will look into this matter.

#### MINISTERIAL VISITS

Mr. McKEE: I address my question to the Premier because it may be a matter of Government policy. Since the Government took office, two Cabinet Ministers have inspected Government facilities at Port Pirie and, on each occasion, I was not advised of their visit. In future, when Cabinet Ministers are to visit my district I hope that I will be shown

the courtesy of being notified of their visits so that I may join them if I am in the area. Will the Premier say whether the failure to advise the local member of a Minister's visit is the result of a Cabinet decision and whether, in the future, it will be the Government's policy to disregard the local member?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not sure whether the honourable member refers to my colleagues from the Legislative Council or from this place. In any case, I am pleased to know that he would like to be present when Ministers visit his area. The inference I draw from his question is that he would like to see more Ministers visit his area. I will bring his complaint to my colleagues' notice and will ask them, if possible, to notify him and other local members when a Minister is to attend a public function in the district or is to pay a visit that will impinge on the local member's Parliamentary service. I think the honourable member realizes that some Ministerial visits relate to an inspection of a Government service and are what might be called internal inspections of a Government arrangement. It is the Government's objective to be of service to all at all times, particularly to the honourable member.

#### MILLICENT HOUSING

Mr. EVANS: Recently, it was reported that at a district meeting of the Liberal and Country League at Millicent a resolution was passed asking for a report and inquiry into the condition of certain Housing Trust houses in that area. The main cause of concern was the prevalence of dampness. Will the Minister of Housing inquire into the prevalence of dampness and also into the maintenance of the houses, as their general deterioration is such that their outward appearance requires attention? Although this question relates specifically to Naracoorte, my concern is that the Housing Trust's specifications are standard throughout the State and this situation could arise in other trust areas.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Having been concerned about this matter for some time, I have discussed it with the General Manager of the trust. Only last week, I think, he saw me about it again and said that he wanted to make clear (and I take this opportunity of doing so) that the trust's officer for that area, located at Mount Gambier, is always available to inspect any house at the request of any occupant. In addition, if considered necessary, a

regional officer from head office will go down to consider a specific case. I know that many arguments have been advanced about the cause of this problem (and it is accepted as being a problem). Indeed, there is dispute about what is the cause and what is the best remedy. In addition to the availability of trust officers to make an inspection (and I repeat that they are available to inspect at the request of any occupant of a house at any time), I intend to go to Millicent as soon after the end of this session as I can arrange to do so in order to look at some of the problem areas. I invite the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) to accompany me and to introduce to me people who may have made representations in the matter or may think that they have a problem to be considered.

Mr. Corcoran: Thank you very much.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will let the honourable member know when I can make a visit. I am concerned about the matter and, indeed, said before last Christmas that I would go there.

#### ROAD SAFETY

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: All members will know that when a police car arrives at the scene of an accident the absence of adequate warning that an accident has occurred sometimes results in further accidents through oncoming vehicles crashing into vehicles involved in the first accident and a fatal injury may be sustained by a person or persons assisting the removal from the roadway of persons injured in the first accident. A friend of mine, who is extremely interested in road safety, has made a suggestion that I should like the Attorney-General to submit to his colleague for consideration. The suggestion is that a triangular sign, about 12in. from the base to the apex, be placed on top of the patrol car when the patrol car arrives at an accident. The sign could be illuminated by connecting leads to a battery. Such a sign would be clearly visible for a considerable distance from the scene of the accident. Will the Attorney-General request his colleague to consider this suggestion?

The Hon. R. R. MILLHOUSE: This matter concerns, I think, two of my colleagues, both the Chief Secretary (so that it may be transmitted to the Police Commissioner) and the Minister of Roads and Transport. I will bring the matter to the attention of both Ministers and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

### EDUCATION INQUIRY

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the Minister announced the names of members of a committee appointed to inquire into education in this State, and all people interested have been pleased with the setting up of the committee. However, some people in my district who are interested in education have asked me whether a practising teacher could be added to the committee. Although some of the members already appointed are former teachers, the people who have approached me consider that a practising teacher would be an acquisition to the committee. Will the Minister of Education consider this suggestion?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am pleased to have the honourable member's assurance that people in the community who have spoken to him on the matter approve of the setting up of this committee. The composition of the committee has been well received, with one exception. If there are other people who feel this way, I shall no doubt receive letters from them to this effect. The composition of the committee was carefully considered and we think that we have a good committee comprising people who, as I told the press, will take a very broad view of education. All the members have an academic background. As the honourable member has said, two of them have been actively engaged in education. Professor Dunn, a South Australian, was employed by the Education Department and taught in our departmental schools, and Dr. Radford (Director of the Australian Council of Educational Research) was a secondary schoolteacher in Victoria before being appointed as Assistant Research and Curriculum Officer in the Victorian Education Department. Professor Karmel, the Chairman of the committee, is an educationist, an economist, a demographer and a statistician of world renown. Justice Mitchell needs no words of mine to describe her educational background, and Mr. Ian Hayward, the other member of the committee, is a graduate of Cambridge University and a family man, so he would naturally be interested in education. The reported statement by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers in the newspaper the day after the appointment of the committee, that he welcomed its setting up and its composition and that he thought that nothing but good would come of it, reflects the attitude of teachers in this State to its composition and to the responsibilities with which the committee has been charged.

### PORT CLINTON WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FERGUSON: My question concerns the low water pressures on Yorke Peninsula. Some time ago the Engineering and Water Supply Department decided to build a concrete storage tank near Port Clinton to boost water pressures, which at times are poor in this beach-house area. As I understand that recently the department purchased land on which to erect the tank, will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the progress of work on this project and ascertain whether the tank is likely to be completed by next summer?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

### PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to an article, appearing in the *Retail World* of January 8, which referred to the New South Wales Government's decision to establish organizations to protect consumers. I draw attention particularly to a reference under the sub-heading "South Australia moves too" in which the Attorney-General is quoted as saying that he has considered recommending to Cabinet a protection that would be a satisfactory alternative to the price control now being progressively relaxed. Can the Attorney-General say what recommendations he has made to Cabinet, and whether his comments about relaxing price control mean that we can look forward to further relaxations of it this year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: At the moment I have nothing to add to what has been read out by the honourable member.

Mr. LAWN: Under the heading "Lower Prices in November", the following article appears in the *Advertiser* of January 16 this year:

Canberra, January 15. The overall level of wholesale prices for basic materials and foodstuffs declined again in November. It was the fifth successive monthly fall. Figures issued today by the Commonwealth Statistics Bureau show a 4 per cent fall since the opening of the 1968-69 financial year.

Under the heading "Adelaide C.O.L. up 35c Week", the following article appears in the *Advertiser* of January 22, 1969:

Canberra, January 21. The cost of living in Adelaide in the December quarter rose by about 35c a week. The consumer price index for the six State capitals issued today by the Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. K. M. Archer) recorded a weighted average increase of about 38c. The price of meat in Adelaide fell by about 28c but this was more than offset by increases in the prices of potatoes, other foods, clothing and drapery, housing and household supplies and equipment. There

were also rises in the miscellaneous section, including fares and beer.

In view of the fact that for a period of five months at least last year wholesale prices dropped, can the Treasurer, as Minister in charge of prices, give later a considered explanation why retail prices have increased over that period to the extent of 35c a week, as reported by the Commonwealth Statistician?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the information the honourable member has already given answers his question but, as soon as I can get information for him of the movement in the various sectors, I shall be more specific. I believe the honourable member knows that movements in prices are determined by various factors. For example, he referred to an increase in miscellaneous items that included fares. I presume the movement to which he referred is the increase in bus fares that occurred during the period under review. However, I will discuss the matter with the Prices Commissioner, bring down the information he gives me, and give it to the honourable member as soon as I can.

#### SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. VENNING: I understand that a petition has been sent from my district to the Minister of Education from parents of children attending Port Pirie High School. Because rail services have been curtailed in that area, school buses are to replace the rail passenger service previously available to the schoolchildren. I understand that one problem concerns a school bus that will leave from the western side of Crystal Brook where it is expected that more than 40 children will board the bus, which will then proceed in a westerly direction picking up children on the road to Port Pirie. The distance traversed will be about 29 miles, but about 14 miles will be travelled on unsealed metal roads before any children are picked up, although the distance from Crystal Brook to Port Pirie is only 18 miles.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member ask his question?

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education received this petition and, if she has, has a report on it been obtained and is it available?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Particularly at this time of the year many letters are received from school committees on the subject of transport for children to various schools throughout this State. When the honourable member was explaining his question I recalled

having seen a letter dealing with this matter. A report having been called for, I will inform the honourable member of its details as soon as I receive it.

#### STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the charges made in debate last year that the introduction of a composite allowance would affect teacher-trainee enrolment and applications for teaching scholarships, can the Minister of Education say what, if any, has been the effect of the introduction of the composite allowance on applications for teaching scholarships and on the number of people applying for enrolment at teacher-training colleges?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Several weeks ago, when applications for these two categories were being processed, I asked officers of the department who were dealing with the matter whether they would let me have a report on the state of the applications concerned. Having had that report in my bag for some days to bring to the House, I am pleased to be in a position to answer the honourable member's question. Offers of admission to applicants for teachers college positions in 1969 are nearly complete. The quality of applicants is appreciably higher than in 1968 in nearly all courses. The number of applications for teachers college admission in 1969 is 2,750 (2,416 in 1968: an increase of 334). Of these applicants, 1,550 have been offered a place and 850 acceptances have been received; 1,330 places are available for all courses at the teachers colleges.

In addition, there were 1,334 separate applications for teaching scholarships to undertake a fifth year of study at an approved secondary school. These applications will be considered shortly and it is too early at this stage to give any indication of the standards for these awards. A total of 550 teaching scholarships will be awarded for 1969. As there were 1,148 applicants in 1968, the increase in this particular category is 186. The general standard of entry to teachers colleges has continued to rise. Many students who have matriculated have not been successful in gaining a place at Adelaide Teachers College. Only a few students with exceptional qualifications have gained admission to a teachers college on the results of their Leaving examination.

A number of students from fifth-year non-Matriculation classes in high schools and technical high schools, together with a few students who have completed five years secondary



schooling at area schools, have been successful in gaining admission. For the first time a number of married women have been admitted to courses of training at the teachers colleges as private fee-paying students. As in the past, students sponsored by religious bodies have been admitted as private students to the courses for which they qualify without any payment of fees. In addition, about another 20 students have been offered places as private students not sponsored by any organization.

#### DEVALUATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked late in the first part of the session about the effect of the devaluation of the pound sterling on the trade in canned fruits?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I received a deputation on January 20 from representatives of the canning industry, the Chairman, Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited, and the State President of South Australian Canning Fruitgrowers' Association at which the matters referred to by the honourable member were discussed. Cabinet decided to set up a committee of inquiry of three persons (and the Minister of Agriculture is at present seeking suitable personnel) to inquire into all aspects of the effect devaluation is having on the South Australian canning industry. On completion of the report, Cabinet will consider the recommendations and make an approach to the Commonwealth Government if necessary.

#### BEACH TOILETS

Mr. HURST: An article appears in the *News* of Thursday, January 30, condemning suburban beach toilets. The heading of that article was "Filthy—Haven for Hepatitis", and there were such references as "absolutely disgusting" and "haven for hepatitis and other diseases". Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether any investigations are being made as a result of that article?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out.

#### SALISBURY HIGHWAY

Mr. CLARK: I have been contacted by some constituents living on Salisbury Highway, Salisbury, who are most concerned about the intended widening of the highway. It is apparently intended that the highway is to be greatly widened, possibly by 17ft. on each side and, although householders in the area previously understood that this widening might take place in about 10 years' time, the work is apparently imminent; in fact, some of it has already been started. As the loss of frontage

of the properties concerned will make a serious difference to their value and possibly make them unsaleable, will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a clear statement of his department's intentions concerning the widening of this road? Will he also ascertain when the work is likely to be completed and obtain any further information that may assist the disturbed householders in the area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to obtain that information for the honourable member.

#### HORMONE SPRAY

Mr. WARDLE: Late in the first part of the session I asked a question about hormone spraying in and near horticultural areas. Can the Treasurer say whether, after considering this matter, the Minister of Agriculture has made a decision?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report on this matter. I know that there was one specific case in which it was believed that some damage had occurred to neighbouring crops when a spray had been used. Although I know that that matter has been considered separately by the Minister, I will refer the honourable member's question to him for a more detailed reply.

#### CREMATIONS

Mr. BURDON: I refer to a letter, dated September 23, 1968, which was forwarded by the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier to the Minister of Health, seeking financial assistance for the establishment of a crematorium at the Carinya Gardens cemetery in Mount Gambier. Indeed, Mount Gambier has one of the most modern cemeteries that one will find in Australia. Part of the letter states:

In Mount Gambier, a cemetery has been planned and financed by council and assistance is now requested to build a crematorium which is truly a natural extension of the cemetery. The demand for cremation today is growing rapidly. The following table will illustrate this point:

State	Percentage of Cremations to Total Deaths		
	1950	1966	Increase
New South Wales . . . . .	29.6	43.7	14.1
Victoria . . . . .	19.8	36.1	16.3
South Australia . . . . .	3.3	20.9	17.6
Queensland . . . . .	20.7	34.2	13.5
Western Australia . . . . .	14.3	34.0	19.7
Tasmania . . . . .	17.7	29.9	12.2
Northern Territory (a) . . . . .	—	—	—
A.C.T. (b) . . . . .	—	36.0	36.0

(a) No crematorium in Northern Territory.  
(b) Crematorium commenced operations in 1966.

When it is appreciated that these figures cover the whole of each State, it will be realized

that the percentages are much greater in the areas where cremation is available. Country people should not be denied this form of burial, nor should the relatives of the deceased be expected to travel up to 290 miles to Adelaide to honour the last wish of their departed loved ones. Rather it is fitting and proper that regional crematoria should be established. Mount Gambier, with its new lawn cemetery, planned to incorporate these services, is ideally situated as a regional centre for this purpose. With its population of 17,500, plus the surrounding districts of some 40,000, there is sufficient need to warrant such an installation. The Corporation of Mount Gambier requested from the Chief Secretary a grant of \$20,000, but this request was refused. Another request made was for an interest-free loan of \$70,000, which it is estimated would cover the total cost of the installation of the crematorium. On behalf of the corporation, I ask the Premier whether he will take up again with the Chief Secretary and also with the Treasurer the request for an interest-free loan to be granted to the corporation over an amortization period of 50 years, the sum to be repaid at any given time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I realize that this is a burning question in the honourable member's district, I will bring it to my colleague's notice again and have it reconsidered.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: On June 26, 1968, in reply to my question, the Minister of Works said that priorities for the erection of the Government hospital at Modbury had not been altered by the Government. The hospital had been unanimously recommended by the Public Works Committee in its report dated February 8, 1968, and much preliminary work had been done by June 26. An assurance was also given at that time that the hospital would be completed at the time forecast by the former Government. Again, the Minister stated that some alterations had been suggested, that plans for these had not been finalized, but that when they had been finalized I would be notified. This hospital is very important to the people in the Barossa District, and I raised this matter again on July 25, 1968, when I received similar assurances. As six months has now elapsed, can the Minister give me definite information on this project?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The statement I made last in the House still stands. I told the honourable member that there were certain design alterations and modifications and, certainly, the order of priorities had been affected. I assured her on that occasion that the completion date now fixed was the same

as that originally planned. I checked on this matter last week and it is the intention that this will be adhered to. It is the method of construction and programming that have been slightly adjusted. Although the completion date is no doubt the main point in which the honourable member is interested, if she would like further details (such as tender dates, etc.) I shall be happy to get them for her.

#### RAILWAY PASSES

Mr. CLARK: As the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, realizes, many people in my district, particularly from Gawler, Elizabeth and Salisbury, travel to and from work by train each day. Last week, for a day or two when the rail strike was on, they were denied the privilege of using the weekly, monthly or other season ticket they had paid for. Will the Attorney-General inquire whether some arrangement has been made by which travellers who lost a day's or two days' travelling they have already paid for can be recompensed for this loss?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister spoke about this the other day. I believe it is possible to get some recompense or refund, although I am not sure. Unfortunately, I was not paying sufficient attention to have the detail in my head.

Mr. Broomhill: Haven't you got a train pass?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: A gold one, old boy. I will seek the detail and let the honourable member have it.

#### BURRA COPPER

Mr. ALLEN: During the Parliamentary recess I visited Burra, where there is a possibility of the copper mines reopening. The business people of Burra are extremely anxious that this project proceed. As I have been asked several times what progress has been made regarding the overcoming of the present metallurgical problem, will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines whether any such progress has been made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a copy of a report from the title holder, Mines Exploration Pty. Ltd., for the period ended December 31, 1968, together with some up-to-date comments by the exploration manager that show that three independent avenues of research are being actively followed in trying to solve the serious metallurgical problem of obtaining a satisfactory copper recovery from the Burra ore. The company informed the department in mid-December, 1968, that it would probably take six months to finalize these investigations.

The whole future of mining at Burra hinges on solving this difficult metallurgical problem of copper recovery, and the Minister is satisfied that Mines Exploration Pty. Ltd. is fully aware of this and is doing its best to obtain a satisfactory solution.

#### ABALONE FISHING

Mr. CORCORAN: Recently people engaged in the abalone fishing industry in this State have made representations and have expressed general dissatisfaction with what is happening in the industry. My attention has also been drawn to recent press reports on this matter. The dissatisfaction concerns mainly the issuing of licences, the fee that it has been stated will be charged for a licence or permit, and the fact that the fishermen are now required to shell the abalone above high-water mark (which creates difficulty so far as the load factor in the vessel is concerned). Because of these matters, as well as the future and increasing importance to the State of the industry, will the Minister of Marine ask the Minister in charge of fisheries whether he will appoint a committee to inquire into this industry, such committee to comprise representatives of people engaged in the industry, the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department, and people interested in the marketing of this product?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to submit the honourable member's views to my colleague.

#### FIRE BAN NOTICES

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Recently when I was at a holiday resort many people in caravans and holiday houses asked me whether I could define the districts referred to in the fire ban notices given each morning, and I had to say that I could not. Since I have returned, I have searched unsuccessfully to find the provision regarding these districts, but it must be in the Act. I told the people that they should get this information from a police station. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is possible to publish and display at police stations the definitions of these districts?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I thank the honourable member for raising this most important matter, and I was extremely interested in his reference to approaches made to him. This matter is of much interest to many people, particularly those beyond the metropolitan area, and I shall be pleased to ask my colleague whether he can not only

make this information available readily to the honourable member but also have it broadcast as widely as possible.

#### GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. GILES: A series of sharp curves at the bottom end of Greenhill Road is giving many of my constituents headaches. This area is in the Burnside District, and the Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele), who represents that district, is also extremely concerned about the position. As the road is used mainly by my constituents, and used regularly, I am bringing the matter before the House. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether, in order to make the road safer, these curves can be straightened before the safety fence is erected in this area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will refer this complex question to my colleague.

#### ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether a final decision has been made by the Education Department regarding the purchase of land for a school site at St. Agnes? As the Minister knows, alternative sites were being considered.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I cannot give the honourable member a reply today but I will certainly call for a report and let her have it at the earliest opportunity.

#### TELEPHONE COSTS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last year about problems regarding telephone connections in country areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Following the honourable member's question I wrote to the Postmaster-General, and I have received a detailed reply. I shall read extracts from it, but the honourable member may have it so that he can study it in full. The reply, in part, states:

It is the Government's aim to assist residents in country areas, by making the conditions applicable to the provision of telephone facilities as attractive as possible to subscribers. As a result of the liberal conditions which have operated over many years, more than 97 per cent of subscribers' services throughout the Commonwealth are now wholly provided and maintained by the department. It is not practicable, for economic reasons, to open new exchanges in rural districts in such numbers that all subscribers' lines are short and, for this reason, it is unavoidable that some applicants are required to erect and maintain portion of their lines because of the distance of their properties from the exchange . . . However,

for subscribers seeking financial assistance in meeting the cost of constructing lines beyond the distance the post office can go at its own expense, the Government also decided to provide additional funds for the purpose. The lines must meet departmental specifications and may be constructed by the post office, the subscriber, or a contractor engaged by the subscriber. Subscribers will be required to repay the funds advanced, with interest chargeable at the long-term bond rate current at the time funds are approved for the work. Repayments of the principal may be made in instalments when the amount is over \$100. Minimum instalments will be \$100 a year plus interest on the balance outstanding and the maximum period over which repayments may be spread will be 10 years . . . In an endeavour to provide a measure of service for the local residents during those times when exchanges are closed, office-keepers are encouraged to provide an after-hours service for which the prescribed opening fee may be charged. If the office-keeper's co-operation is not forthcoming, every effort is made to arrange for the after-hours connection to the nearest continuous service exchange of either a multi-coin public telephone, if one can be justified, or the service of a centrally located subscriber, depending on the circumstances.

#### PETERBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. CASEY: I understand that early last year tenders were called for constructing toilets at the Peterborough Primary School and that a tender was eventually accepted by the department. Will the Minister of Education say when these toilets will be made serviceable for the children and when construction will begin?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report.

#### TEXTBOOKS

Mr. VIRGO: A constituent has drawn my attention to a problem she has encountered concerning school textbooks for this year. Her son, who is a second-year high school student, was provided with the normal book list and told the types and titles of books that he had to obtain. The detailed information given to him showed the date on which the students had to attend the school (according to the alphabetical order of their surnames) in order to purchase the books. Unfortunately, when my constituent and her son went to the school they found that about half the books he required were not available, and they were told that the publishers could not provide them. Although I concede that possibly the best interests of education are being served by schools and teachers being allowed much latitude in nominating the textbooks they desire to use, will the Minister of Education ensure that textbooks required by students are available from the schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: If the honourable member will give me the name of the school and of the people concerned, I will obtain a detailed report.

#### TOURISM

Mr. McKEE: I direct my question to the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Minister of Immigration and Tourism. I read with interest a statement made by the Minister of Immigration and Tourism on his recent return from South-East Asia that it was important to spend more money to promote tourism. As I believe there is an imbalance between the number of tourists coming to South Australia compared with the number going to other States, will the Minister ascertain what facilities this State has available in other States and how many people are employed there to attract more tourists to South Australia from other parts of the Commonwealth?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will ask for this information to be provided for the honourable member.

#### LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Premier will recall that several times in the last 12 months I have drawn his attention to the public discontent at the price of wine served with meals in hotels and restaurants compared with the price charged for the same type of wine when purchased from the bottle department of the hotel. I understand that the liquor industry appointed an advisory council to investigate this problem, and the Premier told me last year that this council would give him a report last November. Can he say whether this report is available now and, if it is not, will he seek it urgently?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It has not been made available to me yet, but I will find out where it is.

#### VICTOR HARBOUR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that an all-purpose room has had to be used at the Victor Harbour High School as a classroom and that there is an urgent need for new buildings, will the Minister of Works ascertain when the construction of two new classrooms there will be completed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes.

#### NORTHERN MAGISTRATE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General been able to make any progress regarding the appointment of a resident

magistrate at Whyalla? I asked this question last year and the Attorney said he was concerned about the position and would do everything possible. Can he say whether we are any nearer to getting at Whyalla a resident magistrate who would perform duties at Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Pirie?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I regret to have to tell the honourable member that I have nothing fresh to put before him at present. As I have announced several times, I am actively examining proposals for re-organizing the subordinate judiciary in this State in order to give an increased service in country areas. I am afraid that I am unable yet to make any announcement on this matter.

#### WINNING BETS TAX

Mr. HUDSON: In the Budget presented by the Treasurer early in September last year and later in reply to a question I asked the Premier, it was promised that legislation would be introduced to remove the winning bets tax by the end of June of this year. As yet no legislation has appeared on the Notice Paper or been introduced. Will the Premier say whether the Government will go ahead with its intention to introduce such legislation, or is this another promise, similar to the promise about Chowilla, on which the Government will be reneging?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: My obvious reaction is to reply in terms similar to those in which the honourable member tailed off his question and to say, "It will be in the future." However, despite the honourable member's obvious intention to insult the Government and to continue with the uninformed position that he took yesterday, I point out that the Government is in the process of drawing up legislation and, depending on the co-operation available from members opposite, and on the time available for debate, the relevant Bill will be introduced, debated and, I hope, passed.

#### RED CROSS HOME

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had submissions from a prominent allergist in South Australia relating to the closing of the Junior Red Cross Home at Glenelg and to the consequent effect on accommodation available for asthmatic children in South Australia. I also have copies of voluminous correspondence between Dr. Ford and the executive of the Red Cross, similar copies, I understand, having been sent to the Chief Secretary. So far, there seems to be no satisfactory reply concerning why action has been taken by the executive of the Red Cross in South Australia to close

the Junior Red Cross Home, particularly since the Red Cross is an organization licensed under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act and specifically raised money extensively for this home. The only reason I see given in the correspondence is to conserve money for the purpose of extending the new Red Cross headquarters at Adelaide, but that does not seem to me to be in accordance with the provision of the licence to which the Red Cross is entitled for collections for charitable purposes.

The case which Doctor Ford has made and fully set forth in the letters is the necessity to maintain accommodation particularly for convalescent and asthmatic children who previously only had this accommodation to rely on for professional assistance. I therefore ask the Premier whether he will get promptly from the Chief Secretary a report on what has happened in this matter and on what action the Chief Secretary has taken to ensure that this home is available to the children who need it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This matter having been fairly widely canvassed in the press recently, I am rather surprised that the Leader has not been able to obtain a sufficiently detailed answer from the Red Cross organization itself. The Government, of course, does not control that body. However, I will direct the question to my colleague and try to obtain the information for the Leader.

#### IRRIGATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Within the Lands Department general irrigations are provided to growers on a rate basis which involves a given quantity of water an acre. With special irrigations, water is provided on an hourly basis at a flow rate of 2 cub. ft. a second, and the grower purchases the number of hours he requires to irrigate his land. If a grower purchases more hours than he subsequently finds he needs, the amount is credited to his account but, in the case of general irrigations, which are on a rate basis, if a grower finishes considerably under the allowable time, there is no means by which he can get a credit for the water he has not used. This situation is brought about by improved irrigating techniques and also by recommendations made to growers on water management, and so forth. It also stems from the fact that the grower operates on a roster system and there is a variation from grower to grower throughout the season. If a certain grower has found it necessary to take a special irrigation, say,

one week before the general irrigation, his water requirements in that general irrigation will be much smaller than if he had not irrigated for three weeks. Will the Treasurer, in the absence of the Minister of Irrigation, look into this matter with a view to allowing growers to have the unused hours or the quantity of water credited to their accounts? Although the quantity concerned may be used later in the season, at present it is a complete loss to the grower concerned. Further, if he proceeds to use this water, it is detrimental not only to his own property but also to the district inasmuch as it is building up the water table of the area and tending to overload the comprehensive drainage system.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am aware generally of this matter and also of the fact that it is being studied at present. I will refer the question to the Minister of Irrigation for him to inform the honourable member of the stage reached in the considerations or for him to say whether any conclusions have yet been reached in the matter.

#### GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I previously asked about the amalgamation of Colonel Light Gardens (the Garden Suburb) with the Mitcham council and about the grounds on which such amalgamation would take place?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. The reply relates to a question asked by the member for Unley, helped on by the member for Edwardstown.

Mr. Virgo: We always work together.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I know that the member for Unley lives in that part of Colonel Light Gardens—

Mr. Virgo: And it is very well represented in this Parliament!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, part of it—that part east of Goodwood Road.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Attorney-General to address the Chair.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I was giving the background to the matter. The Colonel Light Gardens Inquiry Committee held its first meeting on January 24, 1969 and decided on the action considered necessary to obtain full information on which to base a report. It was decided to invite the following to give evidence or express views in writing:

(1) Members of Parliament for the electorate.

(2) Progress associations, sporting and other organizations, and churches.

(3) Local residents by circular letter. Meetings to hear evidence will be held in the district.

(4) Councillors of the city of Mitcham.

(5) The Town Clerk, city of Mitcham, and the Garden Suburb Commissioner.

The next meetings of the committee will be held on February 14, 21 and 28, 1969.

Mr. VIRGO: My question is directed to the Attorney-General more in his capacity as the member for the district than as a Minister. He and I have the privilege of representing the Garden Suburb of Colonel Light Gardens. I was interested to note a few days ago a letter that the honourable gentleman was good enough to send me. Subsequently, the chairman of the committee invited me to submit views to the committee. I am interested in the points in this reply, point (3) being:

Local residents by circular letter. Meetings to hear evidence will be held in the district.

Will the member for Mitcham join with me in requesting the Minister to require a poll of citizens of Colonel Light Gardens to be held, the result of that poll to be a determining factor in the ceding of this area to the Mitcham council?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Not at this stage.

#### WORLDWIDE CAMPS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to the question that I asked just before Parliament adjourned last year concerning a large number of dismissals by the Worldwide Camps organization?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The business of Wowic Industries Limited is, to a large degree, dependent on extensive development contracts and it does suffer temporarily variations in volume. In December some of the larger contracts had concluded, and the company was expecting further business from some of the developmental projects. I am informed that Wowic Industries Limited is presently tendering for considerable work and will be awarded tenders for some major industrial camps within the next three weeks. I should like to think that the industry would be successful in its tenders. When I inspected its premises last year I became more aware than I had previously been of the variation that occurs in the flow of work through the factory.

At that time the organization was tendering for a multi-million dollar camp or a hospital building in the Middle East. I am afraid it is the type of industry that inevitably will present difficulty in continuity of employment. Various large-scale developments of natural resources around Australia, for instance, are likely to increase or reduce the demand in the particular period of progress.

Mr. Clark: Can't they try to minimize this?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe they do. This is especially in the interests of the industry itself because, whilst in some respects some of the workmen are not skilled (in the sense of being in all respects tradesmen who have served years of apprenticeship), in this type of work men who are trained in the techniques of assembly line construction, which are used with these buildings, are needed, and I know it is in the interests of the company to retain experienced people if possible. However, there is the basic difficulty of large-scale contracts affecting employment requirements.

#### ROAD-MAKING

Mr. CASEY: The Highways Department is currently carrying out roadworks in the Peterborough district. It is fulfilling a contract that the Labor Government left when it went out of office. A road-sealing programme covering Terowie to Peterborough, Peterborough to Black Rock and Ucolta to Peterborough will be undertaken, and work has already commenced. The Highways Department will require suitable crushed stone for this major work of construction. I understand that a local business man, Mr. Peter Weydling, who operates a stone-crusher in the town, has written to the Highways Department asking that officers of the department be made available to inspect his stone-crusher to ascertain whether the plant is suitable to supply the necessary stone. It would be an asset if this crusher could be used, because the employment it would provide would benefit the district greatly. Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport information about the department's attitude towards the submissions that Mr. Weydling has made to the department, and ascertain whether or not the department will send officers into the district to inspect Mr. Weydling's plant to see whether it will be suitable for the requirements of the Highways Department in this work?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### WHEAT

Mr. HUGHES: I quote briefly from this morning's *Advertiser* an article headed "12,000 tons of wheat for Japan":

The Iberian-registered freighter which has been waiting for a berth at Port Pirie since Sunday morning is expected to begin loading bulk wheat for Japan late tomorrow. The vessel, the *Demetra*, of 16,000 tons, will take on about 12,000 tons of wheat at Port Pirie and then go to Port Lincoln at the weekend to top up her cargo by about 3,300 tons of bulk wheat.

Further on the article states:

She has been berthed at No. 5 berth waiting for the Dutch freighter *Amstemer* to finish loading 10,000 tons of bulk wheat for Ceylon. This ship could have called at Wallaroo and in less than the period during which it was waiting for a berth at Port Pirie it could have been fully loaded, taken its cargo of 12,000 tons, and been on its way. Will the Minister of Marine ask the Minister of Agriculture why this ship was not sent to Wallaroo—

Mr. McKee: Because it is better quality wheat at Port Pirie.

Mr. HUGHES: No, it is not, according to what I was told at a recent meeting held at Kadina. Why did not the ship call at Wallaroo instead of wasting four days at Port Pirie waiting for another ship to move out that was taking aboard 10,000 tons of wheat for Ceylon?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with my colleague but I imagine the short answer is that the chartering of these vessels is in the hands of the Australian Wheat Board.

#### GOVERNMENT PSYCHIATRISTS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In 1968 there were two cases in the Criminal Court in which there was some disagreement between the members of the bar and the Crown concerning the calling of evidence by psychiatrists employed in the Mental Health Service. One was the case of Searles, in which a doctor who was at the Child Guidance Clinic had at the request of the solicitor for Searles interviewed the child. She was then asked to give the Government a report; she gave the same report, I understand, to both sides and objection was taken to this. Messrs. Lempriere Abbott, McGovern & McLeod, solicitors, were later involved in the case of a man named Carver and called a doctor who had dealt with this man as an outpatient, I think at Enfield. I understand that since that time a direction has been given by the Crown Solicitor that no psychiatrist in Government service can give

information to a solicitor appearing for a defendant in a criminal case, and that the only way in which evidence can be called from somebody who has seen a man or woman through Government services is by subpoena without having given an opinion to the solicitor for the defendant. With great respect, I cannot see why such a ruling should be given. If there is information in the hands of a psychiatrist in Government service that is relevant to the treatment of a person who is appearing before the Criminal Court, it seems to me perfectly proper for that psychiatrist to give information to the solicitor for the defendant before the court. It places a defendant in a most difficult position if his solicitor does not know the opinion of the psychiatrist but must bring him in on subpoena and go on a fishing expedition, not knowing what information he will put before the court. I cannot see why evidence of this kind, which is in the hands of a servant of the Government but which is relevant to a defendant's case, should not properly be given to a defendant's solicitor. Will the Attorney-General examine the matter and see whether a different ruling should not be given in the circumstances?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: With great respect to him, I cannot agree with the views put forward by the Leader in the preamble to his question. My own view is that the present ruling, to which he referred, is proper, but I am prepared to have another look at it. In any particular case, if the solicitor or counsel for the defendant cares to approach me about it, I will certainly consider whether or not in any special circumstances the report should be released. In fact, I did this in a murder trial last year; I had made available to the defence every skerrick of evidence that we had, and I am prepared to take similar action in any particular case. As a general rule, however, my view is that the present practice is the proper one, but I will reconsider it.

#### HANSARD ACCOMMODATION

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked him before the Christmas break about the working conditions in the *Hansard* offices in this building?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have approved expenditure for the installation of air-conditioning equipment in the *Hansard* offices upstairs, and this work will be put in hand as rapidly as possible.

#### PORT PIRIE OVERPASS

Mr. McKEE: As I understand a contract has been let for the construction of a railway overpass at Port Pirie, will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, inform the House to whom the contract has been let and when work is expected to commence on the construction? If the Attorney-General does not have that information, will he obtain it as soon as possible?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member has anticipated, I do not have the information, but I will speak to my colleague and see whether it is possible to make the information available to the honourable member.

#### CHILD-MINDING CENTRES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had a submission from the Association of Child-Minding Centres of South Australia concerning representations to the effect that there are no adequate uniform rules governing child-minding centres in South Australia. Although a model by-law has been published, it is not incumbent upon various councils to adopt the by-law, and different standards apply in different child-minding centres in different areas. The aim of the association is to achieve uniformity in standards of care in child-minding centres, and it advocates that child-minding centres should be under the surveillance of a central authority. As there would be reasonable provision for the Social Welfare Department to undertake this particular duty, will the Minister of Social Welfare examine the question of taking steps to see that there are uniform provisions for child-minding centres?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I do not think I have seen the submission to which the Leader refers, I will have inquiries made to see whether there is a copy in the office, and I will consider the suggestion.

#### SCHOOLGROUNDS

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the latest position regarding the sowing of the ovals at Glangowrie High School, which work has been delayed for a couple of months? Will he also inform me about the letting of a contract for developing the oval at the Brighton Boys Technical High School, this having also been delayed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes.



## FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Marine say what progress has been made by the committee appointed to investigate regulations dealing with the survey of fishing vessels?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The committee having gone into this matter fully, a report came to the Minister of Agriculture and me. Following this, a scrutiny was made by the Marine and Harbors Department and some modifications were found to be necessary. This work is currently being done in conjunction with the Crown Solicitor's Department and, when it is completed, the committee will meet again. The committee then has to visit the various fishermen's organizations in country centres, and after that it will return so that regulations can be tabled in the House in time for them to operate before June 30 this year (or before the appropriate day, whatever that might be).

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

## ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION)

## BILL

Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from December 10. Page 3164.)

*Amendment No. 1.*

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): When this amendment was before the Committee previously, I had moved that it be agreed to. I have been refreshing my memory by reading the speeches made when this matter was last discussed. I have read again how the Opposition was extremely displeased that the Government had seen fit to support the amendments of the Legislative Council. One of the points of criticism made by the Opposition was that the Government had used some trick in the way it introduced the original Bill in this place and then sent it on to the Legislative Council. However, no tricks were used in the presentation of the Bill or in the subsequent treatment of it by a private member in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Virgo: He is a member of the Liberal and Country League, and you know it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Again, to demonstrate the Government's good faith in relation to this Bill, I undertake that, if the Bill passes this place in this form, two Bills will subsequently be presented to amend the Constitu-

tion to achieve electoral reform, in one case for the House of Assembly and in the other case for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Broomhill: What difference does that make?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It makes a great deal of difference. Opposition members have implied that we have tried to bring in redistribution for the Legislative Council at the tail end of a Bill to alter boundaries for the House of Assembly. I give a clear undertaking that these two matters will be separated.

Mr. Virgo: How can we rely on that?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member cannot rely on it, he need not act on it. However, I undertake that we will bring in two separate Bills, and each Bill will deal separately with each matter, although I do not believe this to be really necessary. It has already been pointed out to members opposite that, because of the numbers they have in this place, they have the whole situation of electoral reform within their control: they can reject this Bill as it stands or either of the Bills dealing separately with each House. It is within the Opposition's power to reject all these Bills if it wishes, but, to clarify the matter to ensure that each item is dealt with clearly on its own merits, members were given an undertaking that the section dealing with the House of Assembly would be introduced first. That was a clear statement that both items would be legislatively separate, and it is clear that no trick is involved. That is the situation at the moment, and I ask members to pass the Bill having that undertaking in mind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not know what sort of fools the Premier thinks we are, but I assure him that we are not as foolish as he evidently thinks we are.

Mr. Clark: It is meant to fool the people. He knows it will not fool us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What sort of undertaking can the Premier give this Committee as to the actions of the Legislative Council? If the Premier were to introduce a separate Bill for constitutional amendments dealing with the House of Assembly alone, and that passed this Chamber, then members on this side would have absolutely no protection to give to the public to prevent the Legislative Council from insisting upon implementing the section of the commission's report dealing with the Legislative Council in an amendment, and that would be passed in this place on a simple majority.

Mr. Corcoran: The Premier knows that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course he does, yet he has the gall to offer undertakings. What were his undertakings and those of his Ministers on this matter? When this matter was being debated we said we feared that the Legislative Council boundaries would be tampered with. We said we required that this Bill should deal with the House of Assembly only. In reply, the Attorney-General said:

There will be some readjustments in the boundaries of the Midland and Northern Districts because of the new Assembly districts, but they will only be consequential adjustments to conform with what has always been the constitutional position in South Australia—that Assembly districts are wholly contained in Council districts. If we accept the Opposition's amendments, this principle will be breached and we will immediately run into some difficulty in connection with the Constitution. Opposition members were concerned last night—for the first time—about the relationship between this House and the Legislative Council. I can assure them that what they were worried about will not happen. We have made certain of this today by discussion with some honourable members of another place.

The member for West Torrens interjected, asking whether the other Bill was discussed, to which the Attorney replied as follows:

No; we discussed only this Bill. The tender concern of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) need not worry us at all. There will be no difficulty over this.

Earlier the Premier said no trickery was involved, yet when this Bill went to another place a Liberal member introduced an amendment that completely re-drew the Council boundaries and provided in the Legislative Council a permanent in-built majority for the Liberal and Country League, no matter how the people of this State voted, and a 20 per cent increase in the number of members. Then, the Government having given us these assurances, another measure was introduced in this place on the basis that it would be an acceptable compromise between the Parties. The Government returned it here knowing we could never accept it.

What Government would ever submit to the position that, if 70 per cent of the people voted for its policies, there would still be a power of veto in another place? That is what the Government is proposing we now accept. The Premier has assured us that he will introduce separate Bills, but that assurance is worth nothing because he knows perfectly well he cannot give an undertaking about what the other place will do and that, on the basis of what he assured us earlier,

we cannot rely on his assurances about how he will stand up to the people in the other place with whom he says he disagrees. Obviously, he has no control over the members or Ministers of the other place. Indeed, the Ministers in another place and not the Ministers in this Chamber dictate the policy in this State. They are the people who are now seeking to write into the Constitution that they have a God-given right to stay in the Council irrespective of the way the people of this State vote. We will not submit to that for one moment. The Premier has proved how worthless his assurances are, and we will not accept them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I think I heard the Leader mention me in the course of his speech. Of course, all he said would be quite forceful if it were not for the fact, which he deliberately ignored, that whatever the commission recommends to Parliament as a result of its deliberations cannot be passed into law and cannot find its way into the Constitution—

Mr. Corcoran: That has nothing to do with this.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, it has.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —without the assent of members on both sides of this House. If it were in some way possible for this Government to pass recommendations based upon the proposals in the amendment, there would be some force in what the Leader has said. However, he knows as well as I know and every member knows that it is not possible for those proposals to be included in the Constitution without his assent or that of every member opposite. I do not blame members opposite for trying to make political capital out of these amendments, but they know what they are doing is quite dishonest, because it can never pass into the Constitution of this State without their consent. They have the right of veto on this, just as we have.

Mr. Hudson: Is a constitutional majority required for the amendments to be accepted here?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is something that is worrying honourable members opposite.

Mr. Casey: You talk about being dinkum on that side, but your credit is absolutely destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid members opposite are trying to have some amusement at my expense, but I challenge any of them to get up and deal with the point I have made. Indeed, I challenge the Leader to deal with it.

Mr. Corcoran: He has made a point. Why don't you answer that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I said before Christmas that we wanted to get through at least the redistribution for the House of Assembly, and the only way in which we can do that is to go on with this Bill. Members on both sides know that if there is not an absolute majority when these proposals come back from the commission for the redistribution of either the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council they cannot pass. Therefore, there must be concurrence on both sides. This is the complete answer to what has been said by members opposite, and I challenge any of them, from the Leader of the Opposition down to the member for Edwardstown, to answer that point.

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader pointed out that any Bill that passes here with a constitutional majority to amend the Constitution can be amended by the Legislative Council and its amendments can come back here and be accepted by a simple majority. There is nothing in the Constitution Act to say that this is not the case.

Mr. EDWARDS: I cannot understand why members opposite are making so much fuss about the Legislative Council's amendments. The Leader of the Opposition was bitter and sarcastic and said, amongst other things, that the Bill was a gerrymander. Not only is the Bill not a gerrymander but it brings to the people of South Australia a plan that will work satisfactorily to both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Casey: Don't talk such rubbish.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Leader said that his Party would never be able to get control of the Upper House, therefore it could never be abolished. But why should the Legislative Council be abolished?

Mr. Corcoran: When did the Leader say that?

Mr. EDWARDS: It is in *Hansard*. Recently, a member of the New Zealand Parliament addressed us at a Parliamentary luncheon, and he was asked whether he thought the Legislative Council was necessary. He replied that when there was a Bill of great importance in New Zealand it had to be referred to a Select Committee. That is exactly the work

the Legislative Council is doing, so why should we abolish it?

Mr. Casey: Why don't you quote Queensland, which is in the same position as New Zealand?

Mr. EDWARDS: The Legislative Council is doing this all the time, and it is only a House of Review. We must have a House of Review to have good legislation. Every democratic country has a House of Review. The Government has been accused of turning a somersault, but it has never said anything about abolishing the Legislative Council. We all know that to have good legislation we must have a House of Review. I was surprised that the member for Glenelg got so worked up when he spoke to the Bill. If he keeps getting so upset over trifles such as this, I am sure he will blow a fuse and so do more harm than would occur through our getting on with the work the Bill requires us to do. The Bill is harmless and definitely does not introduce a gerrymander. It is an attempt to bring about a fair redistribution acceptable to all of the people of the State, so why all the talk about abolishing the Legislative Council? What is the alternative? The figures I will quote show that the Legislative Council is not detrimental to good legislation. In the period from 1930 to 1967, 64 Bills were defeated; in 11 years, no Bills were defeated; in 14 years, only one Bill was defeated each year; in four years, two Bills were defeated each year; and in five years, three Bills were defeated each year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is straying somewhat.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is all relevant to the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must deal with the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am giving the Legislative Council's record and saying why it should not be abolished. In the three years of the Labor Government's term of office only six Bills were defeated—four the first year and one in each of the other two years. Altogether, 58 Bills were amended for consideration, 90 Bills were passed—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order. These amendments deal with certain terms of reference to the commissioners regarding the Legislative Council.

Mr. EDWARDS: With such a record, why should anyone want to abolish the Legislative Council, which is working well and doing

much in the interests of the State? It is hard to understand why this Parliament cannot function as successfully in future as it has done in the past, with both Houses of Parliament working harmoniously together. The member for Glenelg is always talking about banning things, and by the way he spoke he would ban more than half of the legislation of this Chamber. That is why we must have a House of Review, so these matters can be looked at again. The Government is not as weak as members opposite take it to be: it is strong in its beliefs and does not believe that the Bill is in any way a gerrymander. We feel that we have really compromised in this Bill. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey), in speaking on this Bill, said that financial measures would always be ruthlessly rejected by the Upper House when a Labor Government was in power. I do not agree with this.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is getting too far away from the question before the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: The member for Frome was not at all consistent.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are discussing the Legislative Council's amendments, not the Bill as such.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am dealing with it—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is the arbiter in that respect, and I ask the honourable member to respect the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: If I cannot continue along those lines, I may as well not go on. Members opposite have had their say. When I was in Tasmania recently—

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: When I was in Tasmania recently I asked people there what they thought about their Upper House and they said, "Sir, we could not do without it. It is definitely a House of Review and we consider it a useful House because it makes possible better legislation for this State." Later, I spoke to some Queensland people, who said that they would have a better Parliament if they had a two-House system. Later still I asked some Western Australians what they thought about the two-House system, and they said, "We definitely could not work with a one-House system in Western Australia." Therefore, I am quite sure that the people of South Australia would not want to abolish the Legislative Council. Members on this side of the House are definitely not trying to "sell"

the people of South Australia; they are simply trying to protect this State's interests. This is what the Legislative Council has always done in the past and what it will continue to do in the future.

Mr. HUGHES: This Parliament certainly provides entertainment, particularly through the remarks of the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. It is quite evident that he has not read the Legislative Council's amendments.

*Mr. Edwards interjecting:*

Mr. HUGHES: I was courteous enough to give the honourable member a hearing, so I was hoping that he would pay me a similar courtesy. I sat quietly during his speech because I was highly amused. There is nothing in the Legislative Council's amendments about abolishing the Council, yet that is all the honourable member spoke about. He also disobeyed the Chairman's call on three occasions and ignored him, and in doing so he was being most discourteous. The honourable member said that the Legislative Council is not a gerrymander but that it is a House of Review. Well, that is the joke of the year. If this Chamber was to accept the Legislative Council's amendments, the greatest gerrymander of our time would be instituted; indeed, it would be the greatest gerrymander that anyone would see until about the year 3000. We used to refer to Sir Thomas Playford's gerrymander, but the gerrymander proposed at present would put Sir Thomas Playford's gerrymander to shame. Time did catch up with his gerrymander but, if we accepted these amendments, time would never catch up with the gerrymander that would thereby be created, and the Liberal and Country League would rule this State through the Legislative Council for all time.

Mr. Corcoran: As it is doing now.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The member for Eyre spoke about turning a somersault. Members opposite have turned so many fancy somersaults recently that they are missing their calling: they should join up with Bullen's circus or Wirth's circus, because they would certainly get a job on the trapeze. The Opposition views with alarm the developments that took place in the ranks of the L.C.L. prior to the Christmas recess. The Legislative Council's amendments to increase the number of members of the Legislative Council represent a complete reversal of what was said when the Labor Government was in

office; then, members of the Legislative Council condemned the Labor Government when it attempted to increase the number of Parliamentarians.

One member of the Legislative Council said that the Labor Party's aim was to abolish the Council. The L.C.L. members of the Legislative Council are afraid that the people's wishes will eventually catch up with them and, to prevent this from happening, they are prepared to sacrifice the redistribution Bill introduced by the Premier. Because of its growth and development, South Australia needs a redistribution of electoral boundaries. There was no sign of differing schools of thought when the redistribution proposals were initially brought before this House. When the Bill left this House it dealt specifically with redistribution of electoral boundaries for this House, and this House alone. The Premier said:

I am adopting the same principle as was adopted by the A.L.P. in its last published Bill of dealing only with the House of Assembly. The Bill is, therefore, concerned with the constitution of the House of Assembly, the election of whose members decides the type of Government that will govern South Australia.

The amendments before the Chair represent the greatest piece of trickery ever put up by any Premier in Australia, and the Premier knows this only too well. The Premier has taken the people of South Australia for a ride. If he was genuine when the Bill was before the House, he should have been the first to oppose these amendments when they were returned here. However, we all know that the Premier was the first to support the skulduggery of the Legislative Council, and by so doing he left no doubt in the minds of the majority of members that he had taken the members of this place for a ride. Further, he has broken a pledge to the people of South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: It's one of many.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. It is wrong for any member of a political Party to do that. One member of the Legislative Council was reported in the press as saying:

The Legislative Council is truly a House of Review. The Liberal and Country League members, who are in the majority in this House, are free to vote according to the dictates of their judgment. They are neither bound nor restricted.

How true that statement is! They are worried not about the people of South Australia but about themselves and about remaining in force and in power in the other place. The Premier of this State is held up to ridicule by the majority of the people, who are sick and tired

of the rotten electoral system in South Australia. The Premier will be held up to ridicule by the people because of his dirty deal with members of the other place. Never again will the people of South Australia be prepared to accept his word, because he has broken an undertaking, given here, that he was dealing only with redistribution of the electoral districts for this place. When the people of South Australia realize how they have been taken for a ride on this occasion, and how this dirty deal was cooked up before the Bill was introduced, they will say that the sooner South Australia has another election the happier they will be.

The Committee divided on the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Stott, and Virgo.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Langley.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus disagreed to.

*Amendments Nos. 2 to 15.*

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I understand that, as a matter of form, I must now move on the remaining amendments of the Legislative Council. Therefore, I move:

That Legislative Council amendments Nos. 2 to 15 be agreed to.

Amendments disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments are extraneous to the purposes of the Bill.

## SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 11. Page 3268.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): As this debate was delayed during the dying hours of the session before Christmas I do not intend to say much today, but I emphasize that neither I nor other Opposition members support scientology. We have taken the stand we have in order to protect the freedom of the individual in this State. The only reason why Opposition members have taken this stand is that we believe in the freedom of the individual. We believe that the banning

of one organization by the passing of legislation will lead to banning any organizations that are considered to be opposed to our way of thinking. We believe it is harmful to ban any organization; we believe in the freedom of the individual and, together with my colleagues who have spoken in this debate, I ask Government members to support our move, not because we support scientology (we do not support it) but because we like to think that we are supporting the principle of the freedom of the individual, and I trust that this freedom will continue in South Australia.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I will not give a silent vote on this matter and, like the previous speaker, I declare my attitude to this Bill. I neither support nor condemn scientology, because I know little about it. I am convinced that this type of legislation has all the earmarks of a dictatorship, is somewhat Fascist in nature, and does away with the freedom of the individual. All my life I have cherished the right to practise a type of religion to which I could subscribe, and I cherish the right of every other person to do this. I believe that if anyone in the name of scientology has done anything contrary to the best interests of other people he should be prosecuted under the existing law. If these people have done something unlawful (and I have read nothing from those who are advocating the banning of scientology to show that these people have done something contrary to the law) I suggest that the powers that be have failed in their duty for not prosecuting these people. Evidence of unlawful acts has not been forthcoming, and I believe that someone has misled the Minister, who has been persuaded, because of prejudice on the part of some people, to take this action. This is a dangerous situation and, accordingly, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I sincerely hope that this Bill will be passed. It restricts the activities of some people, but it would not be the first time that such a Bill had been introduced in this House. I have been responsible for introducing a Bill, which was supported by members opposite, to curtail severely, and in some cases to prohibit, the activities of some book salesmen in South Australia. That legislation was introduced in order to protect people who could not protect themselves and who could not resist the blandishments of well-trained salesmen selling articles that were either worthless or extremely over-priced. Concerning scientology,

we can consider evidence on the files of the Chief Secretary, a comprehensive report prepared by a most responsible person in Victoria, and the writings of the adherents and of the founder of the cult of scientology. What chance would a member of that cult have if he disagreed with those who control it, when we read the pamphlet I have that attacks the Chief Secretary in the terms that it does?

Mr. Clark: No-one likes that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not suggesting that Opposition members like it. But do Opposition members realize the significance of this in relation to those who are members of the cult? It is a cult aimed at the personal aggrandizement and the financial enrichment of L. Ron Hubbard, and I do not think anyone here would deny that. Should we restrict the operation of certain book salesmen in this State, but permit this cult to operate for the financial aggrandizement of one person? Is it any worse to prevent the amateurish attempt to seek financial gain through brainwashing tactics? Are we to let this continue in our society? In the name of freedom—

Mr. Riches: You are not asking us to ban it because of the circular that you have?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course I am not. I am using the circular as an example. The Chief Secretary does not give a dash about it; he is a person who is able to protect himself, and the best way he can do so is to ignore the pamphlet concerned and throw it in the rubbish basket. Cannot the person in the community, who does not have the resources and experience of members in this House, be the counterpart of the person protected under the Book Purchasers Protection Act? What does such a person do when he or she runs head on into the scientology cult? The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), arguing the matter at great length at the end of last year, equated the people connected with this organization with the Methodist Church. When I said it was a slur on the Methodist Church I was called to order and made to retract. This pamphlet in question is the sort of thing that comes out. Who cares a fig for this rubbish?

But what about the person who is without resources and who may be weak and in some form of mental instability or, say, under pressure of bereavement or other stress? What does that person do in the face of this ruthless, lying organization? Are we in this House to let the matter continue? Are we to be responsible by our vote here for saying that we will control book sellers who take down widows

but that we will let the scientology cult continue to get at bereaved widows through brain-washing, etc.? What is the difference, except that the situation we are now discussing is far worse?

Mr. Riches: Have you any evidence that it is a lying organization?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The document I have is sufficient evidence. Have not all members been sent a copy of it?

Mr. Riches: If it is lying, it is libellous.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course it is.

Mr. Riches: Then why don't you take the organization to court?

Mr. Corcoran: They challenged Mr. DeGaris to do so.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Do members think that a man who can protect himself, and who is sufficiently strong in character to shrug off approaches by this organization should give prominence to the cult by suing it—by suing some twisted and mindless individuals who have put out this pernicious rubbish?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think I can allow the Premier to pursue this line of debate, particularly concerning the pamphlet to which he has referred, because that was not brought up in the general second reading debate. The Premier is replying now to the general tenor of the debate; I have given him a fair amount of liberty, and I do not think he can pursue this line.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I accept your ruling. True, this pamphlet was not used in the debate, but it is an exhibit that came to us, and I have used it as an example of the type of cult with which we are concerned. I think there are many dupes, indeed, in this cult. From conversations I have had with members of my own Party, I believe that some members of the cult in South Australia genuinely believe that such a pamphlet could not have come from their organization. Also from what has been said, I think that a certain section of the scientology cult, up until as late as yesterday or the day before, has denied that this sort of thing goes on, and I do not think the people concerned realize that it does go on.

Mr. Corcoran: Are we arguing whether the organization printed the document?

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this line of debate.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I accept the fact that we are arguing not whether it was printed but whether the organization is sufficiently bad to ban.

Mr. Clark: We are arguing how it should be treated.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is correct. The Government's answer is one that it believes will be taken around the world: this is a cult based on intimidation, to say the least. Our Statutes contain many instances of protection, and we believe that we owe it to the public, not only to those who may be involved now but also to the many people who will undoubtedly be involved in the future if this cult is allowed to proliferate in South Australia, to protect them now and to take the appropriate action in time. I therefore hope that I make the Government's attitude quite clear: this Bill is a protective measure for those who may not see the evils of this very evil organization. I commend the Bill to the House for the sake of the citizens of the State.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Langley.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, it is necessary for me to give a casting vote for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Prohibition on the practice, etc., of scientology."

Mr. HUDSON: I am puzzled by the wording of this clause. Under subclause (4) the Governor may by proclamation declare that subclause (3) does not apply to a person or class of persons named therein—for example, all legally qualified medical practitioners—but subclause (3) (c) provides for addition to the class of persons to which the subclause does not apply, by means of a proclamation made under subclause (4). There appears to be a drafting error here, in that subclause (3) (c) permits the addition of a person or class of persons free from the provisions of this clause, but that must be done by proclamation. However, subclause (4) provides that only by proclamation can it be stated that subclause (3) does not apply.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So the exceptions are cut out.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I suggest there is a drafting error here. As the clause stands, we should not support it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I agree there is an error. I move:

In subclause (3) (c) to strike out "subsection" second occurring and insert "section"; and in subclause (4) to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Search warrant."

Mr. HUDSON: This is an objectionable clause under which the Attorney-General has only to say he has reasonable cause to believe that someone has scientological records in his possession, custody or control, or such records in or at any premises or place, and a warrant can be issued under the authority of the Attorney-General to permit anyone named in that warrant to enter by day or night any place where records are suspected to be found. I do not think this involves nearly sufficient protection for individuals in the community. We all know that our current Attorney-General is a man of great honour and would use the provisions of clauses 5 and 6 only in the most extreme circumstances. However, one cannot be sure that all future Attorneys-General will be as upright and have so much respect for the law as he has.

Clause 6 gives power to the Attorney-General to have scientological records destroyed, and I can imagine that a future Attorney-General might have bonfires started in Flinders Street or Victoria Square to get rid of these records. I think it is unwise that the political master of a particular department should have the power to issue a warrant on a matter as touchy as this, particularly as this clause authorizes the removal of books, tape recordings and other things from the control of the people to whom they belong, as it authorizes a search at any time of the day or night, and as it authorizes the Attorney-General to appoint anyone and to name any assistant to do this job. He could even authorize his office boy or the Premier to do it. I think this Parliament has the responsibility to ensure that no mistake is made. I believe the whole clause is objectionable. Although I have no intention of supporting the Bill, we should at least see to it that some proper limitation is placed on the powers given under this clause. I believe the least the Government should agree to is an

amendment that would require the Attorney-General to apply to a judge or stipendiary magistrate for the issuing of a warrant. As this is a subject in which individual prejudice enters to a marked extent (as this debate has shown) and as the Attorney-General, as a politician, is more likely than a judge or stipendiary magistrate to be subject to political prejudice, I think the clause as it stands gives unwarranted power to the Government and the Attorney-General of the day, and I oppose it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Attorney-General must be responsible for issuing the warrant and, as he is responsible in this place for the actions he takes, he cannot act without public scrutiny. This is not the only provision on the Statute Book that gives sweeping powers of search. In recent years far-reaching powers were given to game wardens or inspectors to police the duck limit.

Mr. Corcoran: That was in 1963-64.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I understand that provision, it gave a council power for its inspector to enter a house or caravan, without reference to the owner, at any time of the day or night.

Mr. Broomhill: Those things are right, are they?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: They have been agreed to by this place without demur. When the provision to which I have referred was before the Chamber, I thought about it and consulted various people associated with introducing it. After due consideration, I did not oppose it. We know the basis for the contention of the member for Glenelg: this is a provision everyone regrets including in a Bill. However, similar provisions in other legislation have been passed many times by this Parliament. The Attorney-General tells me that this power is necessary to enforce the provisions in the Bill. The Attorney-General of the day will be responsible for his actions through questioning in this place and through public scrutiny.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not think that answer is satisfactory; after all, we are searching not for ducks but for scientological records.

Mr. Corcoran: They could use this as an excuse to find something else.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and we do not want to start a Ku Klux Klan in this State. Clause 2 defines "scientological records", and clause 5 gives the Attorney-General authority to issue a warrant for the seizure of scientological records, the person named in the warrant having the right to search any such premises or places mentioned and to seize and deliver to



the Attorney-General at his office any scientological records found. He does not have any right to go beyond scientological records so, presumably, if he comes across a gramophone record he must play it or, if he comes across a document that he is suspicious about, he must read it; otherwise, he may deliver to the Attorney-General something that he should not deliver.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That will make him fearful.

Mr. HUDSON: That is a silly answer, because it is the duty of the Legislature to make its legislation clear. It is our responsibility to do this. Whenever we are dealing with seizure of books, records or documents, we are entering a field that is very close to the individual and to the individual's beliefs. Of course, this Bill involves an interference with the rights of individuals, and that is why we on this side are opposed to it. In effect, it says that individuals in our community cannot express their views in certain ways on a particular matter. It is an interference with the freedom of speech and with the right to possess certain things. In order to find legislation that permits this sort of search and seizure of documents and records of any kind, one must go to wartime regulations, where most of the institutions of the democracy are suspended, or one must go to the kind of practice that applies in a totalitarian society.

This Government says it is a Liberal Government (everyone knows it is not) and it is always spouting about the freedom of the individual. In this Bill we are concerned with the freedom of the individual, so it is up to the Government to ensure that there is no possibility of a slip-up, even in terms of the purpose that it wants to pursue in relation to this Bill. We have already explained that that purpose is objectionable but, even in relation to that purpose, the Government should not write powers in such a way that the rights of individuals can be abused excessively. What guarantee is there that records other than scientological records will not be seized as a result of the operation of this clause? All the Attorney-General has to say is that he has "reasonable cause to believe". Attorneys-General are politicians, and they reckon they have reasonable cause to believe all sorts of things. This simply will not do, and it should not in any circumstances be right for the Attorney-General, under his own hand and without any check by anyone else, to issue a warrant to search any premises belonging to any citizen of this State and to seize documents, records

and other things and have those things destroyed. This gives the Attorney-General excessive power, and power he should not have.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): In pure theory, I entirely agree with what has been said by the honourable member. There is no doubt that, if we were living in a society that was a good deal better ordered than our own society is, it might be possible to convert the pure theory into practice. Unfortunately, we are not living in such a society. Because the purpose of this clause is to deal with what the Government regards as a grave situation, an extreme case, the provision has been inserted in this form. As the Premier pointed out in his reply to the honourable member on his first raising this matter, the authority that this clause gives is an authority to the Attorney-General personally, and the Attorney-General, as the honourable member has been at pains to point out, is a politician. He is a member of Parliament sitting in one of the two Houses and he is answerable there for every action he takes. This would safeguard the liberty of the subject in this case. As we are not able to put the pure theory into practice, if I, or any of my successors, do something that is unreasonable or turns out to be unjustified, I have no doubt that the Opposition of the day (whether it be the present Opposition or any other Opposition) will immediately call the Attorney-General to account in the House. This is the nature of our democratic society.

Mr. Casey: What if the House is not sitting?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I acknowledge that this is a practical flaw, but sooner or later the Attorney-General must meet the House of which he is a member and he can be called to account. I am not the first to use this kind of argument. The Leader has used the argument of the accountability of Ministers to Parliament to justify giving them powers. This is common practice, and the Leader knows it. The oratory (if one can call it that) of the member for Glenelg took some rather fanciful turns; he said that we would have to go to wartime conditions, and so on, before we could find any comparable legislation. That is not so. In the last few minutes I have been handed a copy of the Underground Waters Preservation Act, in which powers of entry are set out in section 40, which provides:

(1) The Minister or the director or any authorized person may, at any reasonable

time, enter and remain upon any land or premises . . .

If the honourable member is not prepared to accept that as a comparable provision, perhaps I could remind him that under the Police Offences Act (and as far as I am aware neither of the two previous Labor Governments did anything to alter this) there is a power to issue a general search warrant under section 67, which provides:

(1) Notwithstanding any law or custom to the contrary, the Commissioner may issue general search warrants to such members of the police force as he thinks fit.

This refers to the Commissioner, not even the Minister. The section continues:

(2) Every such warrant shall be in the form in the schedule, or in a form to the like effect, and shall be signed by the Commissioner. Let us see what the form in the schedule is. It is as follows:

*General Search Warrant*

To

You are hereby authorized at any time in the day or night, with such assistants as you think necessary, to enter into and search any house, building, premises, or place where you have reasonable cause to suspect that—

- (a) any felony or misdemeanour has been recently committed, or is about to be committed; or
- (b) there are any goods obtained by any felony or misdemeanour; or
- (c) there is anything which may afford evidence as to the commission of any felony or misdemeanour; or
- (d) there is anything which may be intended to be used for the purpose of committing any felony or misdemeanour,

and to break open such house, building, premises, or place, and to break open and search any cupboards, drawers, chests, trunks, boxes, packages, or other things, whether fixtures or not, in which you have reasonable cause to suspect that . . .

That is the power that we give to our police officers, and it has been part of the Statute law of South Australia since at least 1936, according to the marginal note.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not so. It has been there since 1963.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The marginal note reference is "cf. 2280, 1936, s. 119." Maybe it was not quite as extensive a power then. It is significant that, although neither the Walsh Government nor the Dunstan Government did anything, as far as I know, to alter that provision, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) now complains about a provision that authorizes a Minister (who is answerable to Parliament) in special circumstances to do like things. I cannot believe, in the light of our experience in this State,

that the honourable member's criticism is justified or that the power is likely to be abused.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Attorney has said that, in pure theory, he does not think that the Executive should have power to issue a search warrant, that such a warrant should be issued by judicial procedure, but that practice compels us to do otherwise. Why does it? I see not the slightest reason why, if the Executive has reasonable cause to believe that there are scientological records somewhere, a judicial officer cannot be persuaded to issue a warrant. That is the normal common law procedure. The only example the Attorney could cite to justify any opposition to that principle was that of the general search warrant issued under the Police Offences Act. When that measure was introduced I bitterly opposed it and, if our Government had remained in office, at a general revision of that Act I would have tried to do something about the provision.

If the Attorney looks at the long row of books of legislation introduced by Labor Governments and contrasts it with the legislation introduced in previous years he will see that the time of our Governments was taken up in dealing with much reform and we could not do everything we wanted to do in the time allowed to us by the gerrymander in this State. That does not get away from the fact that, to maintain the rule of law, there should not be a breach of privacy without proper judicial authority. The exceptions to that principle are quite minor and are not comparable with the intrusion of privacy and the examination of records such as are intended here. In order to establish that they are scientological records, the records have to be examined. It would be possible for a Minister to issue a warrant in those circumstances, saying that he had cause to believe that they were scientological records, simply to enable him to examine every book, record, tape, or anything else that was on private premises.

Mr. Hudson: He could sit and read the books.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. In those circumstances, the citizen has no protection of his privacy. The Attorney cannot say that Acts passed in this State for one purpose have not been used for another purpose. An example is the Lottery and Gaming Act, and the Attorney-General has spoken in criticism on that matter in this Parliament. This provision is not proper and the reasons given by the member for Glenelg are perfectly correct.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General, if he were a member of the Opposition, would persist in this matter and say, "Surely we are going to hear some reply from the Minister. Surely he is not going to just sit there." Is this how the Attorney expects to get his legislation through? Even accepting for the moment the provisions of the Police Offences Act about general search warrants, the power with which we are dealing here is different. Some members of the Government consider that, if a person is a scientologist, he is involved in something akin to criminal activities. We are dealing here with an individual's beliefs and material that he holds in relation to those beliefs.

If the Attorney-General insists on this interference with the rights of the individual to read and to listen to what he wants, we should try to circumscribe the provision in an appropriate way. As the Attorney-General holds certain views about scientology and its practice that mean that he regards this sort of thing as almost criminal, he may be prejudiced and his views may not have been arrived at entirely by a process of sweet reason. We should circumscribe the provision by requiring that the Attorney-General obtain a warrant from a magistrate or judge, and I ask the Attorney to agree to that proposition.

The Committee divided on the clause:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Langley.

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

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6—"Destruction of scientological records."

Mr. HUDSON: This is an objectionable clause, because it gives considerable power to the Attorney-General but does not require even a respectable delay before the records are destroyed. If a member of the community challenged the Attorney's determination that these were scientological records it would be

too late, because the records would have been destroyed. Once the records have been destroyed, what right does any member of the public have? Even if the Attorney-General incorrectly destroyed the records, what chance would the public have of proving a case against the Attorney-General? None whatsoever! This is a completely objectionable provision in any circumstances. Further, it is at the whim of the Attorney-General whether or not records are destroyed, for the wording is, "The Attorney-General may cause to be destroyed . . .". In some cases, the Attorney-General can keep these records for as long as he wishes, and they become part of the files of the State Government.

What criteria are to be used by the Attorney-General in determining whether or not the records are to be destroyed? What are the conditions under which the Attorney-General will become a book-burner, or the conditions under which he decides that he will keep the records and not destroy them? Why is it necessary to have these provisions in the Bill? Surely the Bill is sufficiently objectionable without this clause. It can operate without it. I should be interested to hear from any member of the Government side an explanation concerning what right of redress the individual in the community had against an Attorney-General who used his power excessively under clause 5 and then destroyed what he has seized under clause 6. I oppose this clause.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: One can imagine what the Attorney-General would have said about this clause had we been in Government and put it in a Bill of this nature. One can just imagine his ranting in indignation at the thought of one of our Ministers having these powers. Some people have derived benefit out of scientology despite what has been said by the Premier this afternoon about the organization and despite the claptrap that is in some of its documents. The fact remains that good people in good positions in the community have benefited from scientology, and we know that on evidence. But, of course, we have a Bill in which someone can pimp on, say, a particular student of scientology. This may be a neighbour who dislikes a student and who informs the Attorney-General of the presence of certain records. The Attorney-General can then cause these records to be seized and, if he finds on looking at the documents that some of them do not conform to the description within the Bill, no doubt he

will burn them with the greatest expedition, so that no-one can argue about it afterwards. It is amazing that we have this power being put into the hands of a person who would have been the first to be most critical and condemnatory of such powers being placed in the hands of a Minister of a Labor Government.

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Whyalla has referred to a provision in this clause about which I am also concerned. I do not know whether the Attorney-General will be the arbitrator concerning what may or may not be destroyed or whether he will have officers appointed to do this for him. However, I think it is most important to the people of South Australia that the Attorney-General take immediate action to remove this clause from the Bill, because of the danger that exists in its provisions. If, when material dealing with scientology is taken away, the officers concerned also take with them certain other material, does the Attorney-General think that this additional material will be returned? I hope the Attorney-General goes so far as to have this clause struck out, because the danger exists that valuable records may be destroyed as a result of these raids (and that is what they will be) that are made on certain people in order to collect scientology material. I do not think for one moment that the power contained in this clause should be in the hands of the Attorney-General.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I agree with all the views that have been expressed by members of this side. I am appalled to think that the Attorney-General can sit in his place and listen to the completely valid criticisms that have been made from this side on such an important issue and not even attempt to justify the insertion of this clause in the Bill. Obviously, he is unable to justify the inclusion of this clause. It disturbs me to think that, although the Attorney-General makes some play of the fact that as he is a member of this Chamber members may criticize him if he acts incorrectly and that he is responsible for the actions he may take under the Bill, the clause provides that he may cause records to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of.

Clause 5 provides that the Attorney-General may authorize other people to seize records, and it seems clear to me that such people may inform the Attorney-General that, having taken such a step, in their opinion the records they have seized ought to be destroyed. Therefore, simply by issuing the instruction, the Attorney-General is causing records to be destroyed. I appeal to him to heed our

arguments before we on this side come to the conclusion that he is completely unable to answer our criticisms.

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

Mr. McANANEY: A Parliament or a Government has to make decisions on certain matters, and if it decides that a certain thing should be suppressed then, as is the case with nearly all legislation brought before this Parliament, it must give someone the authority to see that that Act is enforced. Otherwise, any law we pass is a complete waste of time.

Under this clause the Attorney-General can take possession of any scientological records or documents and, before anyone has the opportunity to take action to restrain him, they can be destroyed. I do not suggest that the present Attorney would do this, but that possibility always exists. I think that in the normal course of events any harmless documents that were seized would be returned. I believe we should provide some period during which these documents must be retained so that the people from whom they have been taken can take the necessary action to have them returned or, on the other hand, so that the Attorney can take action against the people concerned if he believes they have committed an offence: therefore, I move:

After "Act" to insert "but any such scientological records shall not be so destroyed or otherwise disposed of before the expiration of one month from the day on which they were so delivered".

Mr. RODDA: I support the amendment, which demonstrates the honourable member's mercy.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This amendment gives only a month's breathing space between the time the documents are seized and the time they can be disposed of. That is not enough. It is merely gilding the lily a little to make the clause acceptable. Arguments about documents that may be seized could go on for months. They could be seized when Parliament was not sitting. The period should be at least 12 months. If documents are to be held, there is nothing difficult in holding them for 12 months instead of one month. There is no reason to destroy them within a short period.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In Mr. McAnaney's amendment to strike out "one month" and insert "12 months".

Mr. HURST: I support the amendment of the member for Glenelg and, if members opposite were consistent in their attitude, they, too, would support it. The clause as drafted is ridiculous. Some white-washing is being done

by the member for Stirling to make it appear better. Not long ago the Attorney-General, in a debate on another Bill, argued that there should be 12 months' grace for certain legal matters instead of nine months, which he maintained was not sufficient time for professional men to examine certain things.

During the second reading debate, the Attorney-General admitted that these provisions were bad, but said he could not find another way to overcome the problem. I deplore the Attorney's attitude on this occasion. He sits in his seat, power drunk, refusing to answer the logical arguments put forward by the member for Glenelg. I suspect that there could be political implications in this provision; the Attorney-General could use the power given him in this clause for political purposes and cause to be searched the premises of innocent people.

As it is contrary to the principles of British justice, I do not believe this provision would be supported by the Law Society. Under principles established before the Privy Council, some clauses in this Bill would not hold water. The Attorney-General knows that, on occasions, the Commonwealth Government has caused the trade union movement to be fined thousands of dollars when that Government did not have the legal right to do this. If the Attorney-General wants to save face, he should accept Mr. Hudson's amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: On the one hand, we sometimes see the Attorney-General as the gallant major of the Citizen Military Forces; he is so accustomed to exercises where the aim is to search and destroy that every so often search-and-destroy operations become mixed up with his legislation. Hence we have clauses 5 and 6. On the other hand, we sometimes see the Attorney-General posing as the upholder of civil rights and religious liberty, as he has received an application for the registration of the Church of the New Faith, and it has been registered. The application states:

I, Thomas Blundell Minchin of 45 Albany Crescent, Oaklands Park in the State of South Australia, organising secretary, hereby make application for the incorporation, under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956, of the Church of the New Faith.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with clause 6.

Mr. HUDSON: I am coming round to the question of destroying documents. Here we have a situation where the objects of the Church of the New Faith, which has just been registered, are as follows:

To present and uphold the religion of scientology as founded by the church and as further developed by the church as prescribed herein to the end that any person wishing to participate in its communion and fellowship may derive the greatest possible good of the spiritual awareness of his beingness, doingness and knowingness.

This organization was registered by this Government, and now we are told that after this legislation has been passed any scientological records associated with the Church of the New Faith, as recently registered, can, by warrants under the hand of the Attorney-General, be searched for and seized and, under clause 6, destroyed.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you mean to say that the Government registered this infamous organization!

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; this is something that the previous Government refused to do.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: They are not the same things.

Mr. HUDSON: Clause 3, which leads to clause 6, provides:

- (1) A person shall not—
  - (a) demand or receive directly or indirectly any fee, reward of any kind by whomsoever paid or payable for or on account of or in relation to the teaching, practice or application of scientology or of any stage, aspect or phase of scientology;

So, if the Church of the New Faith holds a service and takes up an offering that is used to support the minister of the church, it is "gone" under clause 3. If it sets itself up as receiving any fee directly or indirectly in relation to the teaching, practice or application of scientology, it is in trouble. The teaching is sufficient. There does not have to be practice or application. If any minister of the Church of the New Faith practises scientology at a meeting at which a collection is taken up, an offence attracting a fine of \$200 is committed, and for subsequent offences the penalty is a fine of \$500, or imprisonment for two years. At the same time, clause 6 provides for the searching for, seizing, and destruction of documents at any time, although the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) says that they may be destroyed after one month, and the Premier is now prepared to accept a provision that they may be destroyed after six months.

Mr. Corcoran: I take it that the Attorney will have to destroy his file.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know. Scientologists will be allowed to preach and talk, but

not to take up a collection. Before we consider amending the clause, we want an explanation of the Government's action in registering a church whose records it intends to destroy.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently, members opposite have just been told of the incorporation of the association called the Church of the New Faith and have seized at that completely irrelevantly, if I may say so with respect, Mr. Chairman, on this clause to try to make capital. An application was made to the Registrar of Companies, who had no power that he or I could find under the Associations Incorporation Act to refuse the application. The member for Glenelg may gibe and poke fun at me and the Registrar but if he looks at the Act he will see that the grounds for refusing to accept the incorporation of a body are fairly restricted. There are no grounds which, in the opinion of the Registrar, could be used in this case.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What are the grounds?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Section 7 (1) of the Act provides the following grounds on which the Registrar may refuse to register a body:

- i. That the person giving notice of the intention to incorporate the association is not duly authorized to make application for such incorporation:
- ii. That the association is not an association within the meaning of this Act:
- iii. That the association is formed or is about to be formed for an illegal purpose or a purpose contrary to public policy.

Mr. Hudson: Surely, with your imagination, you could have stretched that one a little.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I could have, but the point was not taken. The Opposition, if it cared, could have objected pursuant to section 7(1) the whole of which I have not read out. At the moment scientology is not, in fact, proscribed in any way in this State, nor was it proscribed on January 31. While it may well be proscribed within the next few weeks or days, within the terms of this Bill, it certainly was not proscribed at the time the application was made. In those circumstances the Registrar believed that he was not in a position to refuse the incorporation of the association. We have blocked the incorporation (when I say "we" I refer to my predecessor and to me) of any association using the name "scientology" or "scientific", but there is nothing in the name "Church of the New Faith" that would justify

the refusal to accept the application to incorporate. What, in fact, incorporation means to this body, I do not know; it does not seem to me that it helps the body at all.

The amendment meets the objection the member for Whyalla raised, namely, that records might be delivered to me and I might forthwith, or secretly and in speed, before anyone could do anything about it, destroy them so as to get rid of the traces of the evidence. Whatever period we eventually decide on, the amendment will prevent that happening, if any future unscrupulous Attorney may be so minded, because I point out that even with a period of one month it would be perfectly possible for proceedings to be taken for the return of the documents or anything else seized. The definition in clause 2 is a restricted one regarding the type of documents, and so on, to be seized. Further, there would be plenty of time for proceedings to be taken for the return of the documents and for proceedings to be taken to restrain the Attorney-General from having anything done to them. But whether it is one month or three months does not matter much. This clause is simply a corollary of clause 5. The records, and so on, are delivered to the Attorney-General at his office and something has to be done with them. In the very nature of what we believe to be those records, many of them contain matter which it is undesirable to continue to be recorded.

Members in this place know that one of the gravest objections to scientology and its practice has been the danger (I put it no higher than that) of blackmail. These records are the very things that can be used for the purpose of blackmail, and victims and prospective victims would be the first to want these things destroyed. That is a reason, apart from the practical reason, why something has to be done with these things eventually, and this clause will make sure that there is some proper way of disposing of the records once they have been seized. This is not, of course, my Bill: it is the Premier's Bill. However, in view of the fact that the Attorney is mentioned in this clause, and in view of the various points that have been raised by members opposite, I thought I should give some explanation of these matters.

Mr. HUDSON: I point out that we now have quite an extraordinary situation. It seems that the Bill will pass in its current form, because the Government with its numbers is using steamrolling tactics and enforcing rigid

discipline on its members, probably on a direction from North Terrace. We have the extraordinary situation that there will really be no ban after all. The Church of the New Faith will be able to teach scientology, and it will be able to hold meetings and services. The only thing it will not be able to do is print any document, for if it does the Attorney-General will be after it with a search warrant at any hour of the day or night. It will not be able to put the plate around for a collection, and it will not be able to hold itself out as being willing to teach scientology under clause 3. It will not be able to use a galvanometer, but it will be able to use everything else. It will be able to teach scientology, which the member for Stirling now says is a religion.

Mr. McAnaney: I said, "If they have got one."

Mr. HUDSON: I suspect that the Government has really got itself into an awful muddle over this sort of thing. There is a clause that would permit the Attorney to refuse registration as being against public policy, but he did not seek to do this. The situation is absolutely extraordinary. I think the Government should reconsider its whole position in this matter and try to reach some sort of consistent position, which it has not got at this stage. I am afraid the Government is just holding itself up to ridicule through banning with one hand and registering with the other. I think we should take advantage of the Premier's offer to provide for the delaying of the destruction of documents for six months, and with the permission of the Committee I should like to withdraw my amendment to the member for Stirling's amendment with a view to moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. HUDSON moved:

In Mr. McAnaney's amendment to strike out "one month" and insert "six months".

Mr. HUGHES: This clause is totally out of context and should be struck out of the Bill altogether. In view of the further information made available this evening by the member for Glenelg and the Attorney-General about the registration of the Church of the New Faith, the Government would be well advised at this juncture to report progress so that it could have another look at the Bill because, if anybody is to be held up to ridicule in this matter, it is the Government. This afternoon the Premier said that the member for Wallaroo had equated scientology with the Methodist Church. That is lie: it is the Premier, not the member for Wallaroo, who does that.

Until this evening we had been kept in the dark by the Premier, who had not once said that the Government had given these people the right to form themselves into a church and to preach scientology and hold meetings provided that they did not print documents or take up collections. That has only just been revealed. The Premier and the Attorney-General should, in the interests of the people of South Australia, ask that progress be reported to enable them to look again at this Bill. I am not happy about one month or even six months in the amendment. If the Bill is passed, not only the Government but Parliament also will be ridiculed, because the Government will say that Parliament passed the Bill. During this debate some hypocritical statements have been made by Government members. When the Premier criticized me this afternoon, I could have raised an objection then. However, from what I have heard this evening, what he said about me (and it was all lies) would have been more applicable to him.

Mr. McANANEY: I point out that I was not in the Chamber at the time when the member for Wallaroo claims he influenced me to move my amendment. After listening to his speeches for three hours at a time this session, when he gets on his feet now I try to get as far away as possible. He maintains he is a Christian, therefore he should behave like a Christian, love his neighbour, and not abuse everyone who disagrees with him. He is the biggest little hypocrite that ever came into this Chamber. My amendment is my own idea, but I am prepared to agree to a term of six months rather than one month. As a primary producer, I am used to doing things straight away and not after one month, let alone after six months. However, perhaps for practical purposes six months is preferable. I am sure that that is a reasonable period to allow for people to take any action they may wish to take.

Mr. LAWN: I register a protest against the way this Government is carrying on. The time of this Parliamentary session can be better spent than it is being spent at present. We are being told all the naughty things that this organization is doing. Much time was wasted through the appointment of a Select Committee and through issuing a summons in respect of one of our ordinary citizens without any charge being laid against him, and he was found guilty.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is not the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: No. I am not concerned with the second reading.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must be concerned with clause 6.

Mr. LAWN: I am not digressing any further than the Attorney-General and other members were allowed to digress.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks with clause 6.

Mr. LAWN: I am doing so. If you give me two minutes you will see that I am, but I have been speaking for only one minute up to now. The member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) rambled all over the place this afternoon. You told him he was out of order, but that was all you did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is doing exactly the same, and I ask him to link his remarks with the clause.

Mr. LAWN: You told the member for Eyre three times he was out of order and to confine his remarks to the Legislative Council's amendments, and that was all, but you are saying a mouthful to me.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must link his remarks with clause 6.

Mr. LAWN: I resent being made a fool of and I am not going to take it from you or anyone else. Look at him over there: he is no Don Athaldo. Tom Playford ran his Cabinet and knew what every Minister was doing, but this man, who has no portfolio, does not supervise his Cabinet, does not speak to his Ministers in another place, and does not know what his Attorney-General is doing, nor does he care.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. LAWN: This Bill was introduced in another place last year and brought into this place last year, yet on January 31, 1969, an application for registration was granted in the following terms:

To the Registrar of Companies—  
under the control of the Attorney-General—  
I, Thomas Blundell Minchin of 45 Albany Crescent, Oaklands Park in the State of South Australia, organizing secretary, hereby make application for the incorporation, under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956 . . . . The Church of the New Faith and in support of the application, submit the following information:

1. The name of the association is 'The Church of the New Faith'.
2. The objects and purposes of the association are: To present and uphold the religion of Scientology as founded by the church and as further developed . . . .

It was registered on January 31, 1969, yet last year this House and another place were asked

to ban the organization. Now the Government is asking us to let it destroy any papers and documents that the organization has—immediately! Of course, its premises must first be raided and the documents confiscated. Search and destroy! It has only recently come into being as a registered organization and now it is to be searched and destroyed! This is an irresponsible and incompetent Government: I have said this before, but now I can say that it is an idiotic Government. Since it took office it has imposed numerous taxes, although it promised the people it would not do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I have been speaking about searching and destroying. The Bill does not mention destruction of documents after a period of one month: the allowing of a period before documents are destroyed is mentioned in amendments from the floor of the Committee. This Government is destroying itself every day. It has repudiated the promise it made last year to build Chowilla. This place was unanimous last year about the need to have Chowilla: the Speaker went out of his way to say that he agreed with the resolution. Now the Government asks us to ban an organization and to search for and destroy its records when, unbeknown to us, the people who do not speak to each other—the Cabinet—registered the organization on January 31 last. The Government will not make a fool of me. This Parliament should be used for better purposes than it is being used for at present.

I register a strong protest at the incompetence of this Government, which is making a farce of Parliament. Members of Cabinet here do not speak to the Cabinet members in another place. The Government has repudiated a resolution of Parliament and it is about time it resigned. It was never elected: it is only hanging on. The Speaker said today, as reported in the *News*, that the Government was only hanging on with his support. He is giving support only because he wants the honour, prestige and pay of the position of Speaker. Clause 6 should be withdrawn from the Bill and, as the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has said, the Government should adjourn the debate and find out what it has been doing. I do not think Cabinet knows. I do not think the boneless wonder, who never will be a Don Athaldo, knows. The previous Premier could sit in his office and meet a deputation when Cabinet was meeting. When he was asked afterwards about



the meeting, he said, " We have had the meeting." He had told each Minister what to do and what resolutions to pass. He conducted the Cabinet meeting from his own office.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I am suggesting that Cabinet, which is responsible for the insertion of clause 6, is making this Parliament look ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is a responsible member and I ask him to deal with clause 6.

Mr. LAWN: I will sit down now. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the latitude you have allowed me, although it is not as much as you allowed the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) this afternoon. I ask the Government to adjourn the debate until we can consider this matter further.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Mr. Chairman, you asked my colleague, the member for Adelaide, to be a responsible member, yet it is incredible that we should have to sit here and consider clause 6 regarding the destruction of scientological records that may be seized by the Attorney-General and to be castigated by the Premier for daring to oppose the Bill. The Premier told us this afternoon that this was an evil organization and that we were doing something very wrong in opposing the Bill. This organization was so evil that it had to be banned; it had to be stamped out! However, a few days ago it was registered as a church. The member for Adelaide is not exaggerating one bit. It must have been known for months what was being done in this regard. Everyone knows that when an organization wants to protect itself it calls itself a religion and gets itself registered as a church, yet in the face of all the investigations that have been going on and despite the promotion of this Bill before Christmas—

Mr. Ryan: And a Select Committee!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: —this Government registered the organization as a church. I cannot find words to describe the position. If Gilbert and Sullivan were alive they would make the funniest play in the world out of this particular situation. Members opposite are telling us to be responsible, but we cannot trust anything they say. They break their promises and, in addition, ask us to agree to ban an organization that they registered as a church a few days ago. What could be more ridiculous than that? The

Government of this State has become a complete farce and its members have no right to be in their seats. It is beyond belief that the Government should ask us to support a provision for the destruction of records and to support a Bill that enables the Attorney-General to order someone to break into premises, to use force if necessary and, if necessary, to arrest people who are connected with an organization whose church the Government registered a few days ago.

Mr. LAWN moved:

That progress be reported and the Committee ask leave to sit again.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr. Brookman.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. Hudson's amendment carried; Mr. McAnaney's amendment, as amended, carried.

Mr. HUDSON: Although the amendment that has been agreed to represents some improvement, the clause as it stands is still unsatisfactory, particularly in view of all the other ridiculous circumstances surrounding the Government's action on this matter. I intend to vote against the clause.

Mr. HUGHES: I, too, am not satisfied with this clause. I have already intimated that I am not prepared to accept a provision for one month's delay or for six months' delay, in view of the information which has been made available tonight and which the Government purposely withheld this afternoon. I consider that this clause should be struck out.

The member for Stirling, who made certain charges against me tonight, said that he was not in the Chamber this afternoon while I was speaking and that he was not influenced by what I had said. Well, there is nothing new about his not being in the Chamber, so that is excusable.

We on this side have been in this Chamber long enough to know the tactics employed by members opposite. When I was asking this

afternoon that this clause be struck out of the Bill, the Attorney-General was listening carefully; then he crept along to the Premier and they put their heads together. In view of what the Premier said this afternoon, he could not very well suggest a period of one month or six months, so he asked somebody else to do the dirty work for him. That is why the Premier was able to say, affably, "We will give you six months." I do not accept that, neither do other members. It is not acceptable to the people of South Australia. I strongly object and am sorry that the Government refused to ask that progress be reported so that it could look again at the Bill. In the past it has been the generally accepted thing that, when strong opposition to a clause appears and good arguments are adduced, progress is reported to enable the Government to look again at the Bill in question. We must have submitted a good argument today; otherwise, the Government would not have offered six months. The Government will live to rue the day it refused to allow progress to be reported in this case.

The Committee divided on the clause, as amended:

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

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Langley.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes.

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 9) passed.

Title.

Mr. LAWN: As the member for Adelaide, it is possible that if the first church of this group is opened in the city of Adelaide I might be invited to the opening ceremony. As I would prefer to give way to the Premier, will he indicate whether he will attend the official opening service of this church?

Title passed.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved: *That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I continue to oppose this Bill. I have listened carefully to the debate during

the Committee stage. Although at times this has ranged far and wide, what is clear from any discussion on the Bill is that this is a signal departure from the rule of law and that no justification whatever has been given to this Parliament or to the public of South Australia for passing legislation of this kind. I am astonished that the Attorney-General, who was with me when we met Mr. Hewitt, the writer who writes under the name of C. H. Rolph, has not had a look at what that gentleman had to say about the banning of scientology and at the way other legal authorities generally react to this kind of interference with the general rule of law. No-one on this side of the House supports the kind of actions undertaken by some of the people involved in this organization, but there are other means at law than legislation of this type to deal with any transgressions or interferences with the liberties of others. To say that this kind of legislation that so severely limits the actions of private persons who in no way interfere with others—private persons who are known to many members to be perfectly proper and estimable citizens giving a proper account of themselves and living properly in this community—to say that this kind of law should be promulgated in this Parliament is repugnant to those members of this House who are concerned with the maintenance of civil liberties.

The legislation was hurried through another place and it has been introduced into this place, but at no stage of the proceedings has any sufficient indication been given to this House of practices or events in South Australia that would justify what has been done. The Premier has got up and said, "We have heard a report from the State of Victoria." I read that report when I was in office and I have examined the file of the Chief Secretary in South Australia, but I have seen no evidence in South Australia that could justify some of the findings of that report. It may be that those things happened in Victoria but there is no indication that they have happened here.

What is the purpose of passing this kind of legislation at present? How can it be shown that things that have happened in relation to this organization are more serious in affecting the public than things that happened in relation to numbers of organizations about which every Government has had complaints, organizations that also claim a religious aspect of some kind—the Jehovah's Witnesses or the Exclusive Order of Plymouth Brethren? Are we going to take action against them? Are

we going to say that, because there is some kind of cult with which most of us disagree, that cult should be banned from engaging in its activities, when it cannot be shown that there is any particular harm in its doing so? I know numbers of people in South Australia—and I am sure other members do—who are perfectly estimable citizens and who can and do claim that they have received some benefit from this organization.

I do not pretend for one moment that I can see anything in the way of benefit in the organization, but some estimable private citizens, who are not in any way misleading or harming others, claim that they have received quite considerable benefit from this, and who are we to say what their private actions or undertakings shall be? The arrogance of this legislation in laying down what may be the actions of other individuals and proscribing their private actions is something that we ought not to tolerate. I think it will be a disgrace to the State of South Australia if this legislation passes, and I hope that members will vote against the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Combe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teüsner, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Brookman. No—Mr. Langley.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, it is necessary for me to give a casting vote. My casting vote is for the Ayes, and so the question passes in the affirmative.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

#### MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 4. Page 3380.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the Bill. In the time of the Labor Government, one of our proudest achievements was the extension of the preventive services of the mental health services in South Australia so that South Australia, far more than had any other State, achieved a

reduction in the proportion of people who were in mental institutions. We were able so to spread the mental health services in this State in the preventive area and to obtain treatment for people involved in mental difficulties at an early stage of those difficulties as to make real progress in dealing with one of the greatest scourges of modern times, namely, mental illness. No move could be more calculated to reverse the achievements of the previous Government than the imposition of charges for mental health services. I do not know of anyone directly involved in mental health services in South Australia who for one moment would support this measure, and I know most of them. I know that many of them are absolutely appalled at the effects that this will have on the development of mental health services in the State.

Let me give the House some of the basic reasons why this is so. Mental illness often runs a long and chronic course; under even the most supportive conditions from the community, it is often financially crippling to the individual. The proposed charges discriminate in favour of the private practitioner and against the State service. A patient who is a member of a medical insurance fund can receive a refund in respect of the cost of a private psychiatric consultation but not in respect of a consultation fee or hospital treatment fee charged by the mental health services.

I know the Government wants to extract some money from the Commonwealth Government to help mental health in South Australia but, if it thinks that the way it is going to force the Commonwealth Government into supporting mental health services is to beggar the mental health service patients first, I can only say that this is an extraordinary and inhumane way of going about it, and I do not believe it will be effective. How in the world are we going to extract the money from the Commonwealth by begging the patient, and yet that is the course which is advocated by the Government? It is the State mental health services which have deliberately expanded to introduce preventive psychiatry (the day hospitals such as St. Corantyn, and services such as these) and to encourage people to seek help without charge in the early course of their illness. We have had several Mental Health Weeks in South Australia and again and again, in the course of these, it has been stressed by Government that early treatment can shorten the course of mental illness and favour treatment with a successful outcome.

Yet now we are to put a hindrance in the way of treatment by the mental health services.

One of the most important arguments against the proposed charges is the fact, which is continually observed in psychiatric practice in this country and supported in the United States of America by research, that whereas neuroses (the milder forms of mental illness) are found more often in the people who come from the middle and upper-income groups, psychoses (the more severe forms of mental illness) are found more often in people in the lower income groups. As a result, private psychiatrists have tended to develop expertise in treating neurosis and have left the development of therapies for psychosis largely to the State mental health services. On balance, then, the people who most often suffer from the more severe mental illnesses (the people who are least able to pay) will in most cases need to receive treatment for which they will not only have to pay but in respect of which they will not receive any refund, even if they belong to a medical insurance scheme.

It is not certain yet from this measure the Government is to have *carte blanche* to introduce regulations for mental health services) whether the Government intends to charge certified patients, but there has been no undertaking that it will not. What an extraordinary situation this will be—a charge to certified patients! Here, the community takes people suffering from grave mental illness and we say to them, "We are going to put you into protective custody. You do not want it, but we tell you that you have to have it, because as a community we demand that you be put into protective custody not only to protect you but to protect us." Then, we are going to charge those people. There is no undertaking that we are not going to charge certified mental patients.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That appears to be the intention.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as we can make out, there is no sort of indication that the Government is not going to charge certified mental patients. As is often the case, it is stated that there will be a means test, but we do not know what kind of means test there will be. In any case, a means test always protects the spendthrift and penalizes the thrifty.

As has been pointed out previously, mental illness runs a long course. Treatment and

psycho-analysis can take as much as two years, sometimes more. Mental illness is in an entirely different class from the average stay of patients in a general hospital. The operation of a means test can mean that a patient undergoing mental treatment will dispose of the whole of his or her assets in the course of obtaining this treatment from mental health services, and what sort of assistance is that going to give to the recovery from the mental illness? Obviously, it will be a great hindrance. Yet this is what the Government proposes.

If a patient in a State psychiatric hospital is a breadwinner, no Commonwealth social service benefit is payable to his family unless his wife consents to being technically regarded as a widow. Even then, if the family does receive a pension it certainly is not calculated to cover the cost (albeit at Government rates) of a long mental illness. What is more, under this proposal it is apparent that the charge will not only be upon the patient himself but, as in the case of certain payments in public relief, charges can be made to other members of the family and recovered from other members of the family. In other words, assets of relatives can be "got at" by the Government in order to support the patients in mental hospitals.

Again, what sort of influence is that going to have on the recovery from mental illness? What is going to be the effect of that on a psychotic patient? Mr. Speaker, this proposal is not only foolish but inhuman; it runs entirely contrary to everything that social welfare workers and psychiatrists in South Australia would suggest was the proper basis upon which mental treatment should proceed, and it will completely wreck the course which has previously been followed in South Australia for the expansion of preventive mental health treatment. Sir, this legislation is unparalleled in Australia, and I cannot see why this Government should proceed in this way for one reason alone, namely, that it believes that by wrecking the condition of mental health patients in South Australia it is going to twist the arm of the Commonwealth Treasurer.

Mr. Casey: Perhaps it wants more revenue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The excuse given by the Government for this legislation is that it has to extract some money from the Commonwealth Government, that the Commonwealth Government is not meeting its obligations in mental health services at the moment, and that this is the way to make it do so. I believe in the necessity of bringing home to the Commonwealth Government its

obligations in the social services sphere, and I do not believe that the Commonwealth Government is meeting its obligations in relation to mental health services in Australia; in fact, it is clearly not doing so. But, Sir, I believe that this is a shocking way of trying to extract the money from the Commonwealth Government, because the misery that it will impose is untold.

Anyone who has seen the ravages of mental illness and had to see the long course it takes and the separate situation of those involved and of their families cannot but feel for what the effect upon them of legislation of this kind will be. My imagination boggles at how the Government could introduce a measure of this kind in South Australia. I hope it will have second thoughts and look again at it. Nobody connected with mental health in South Australia that I know of would, for one moment, support this. The people who have gone out voluntarily to try to help mental health patients in South Australia are appalled at this legislation. I hope members opposite will go and talk to them and see the effect of what they are doing, because charges will

be imposed only in some cases, remissions will be made in other cases, and in some cases there will be no charge at all. This discretion in the imposition of fees will not work effectively.

We cannot simply by a discretionary administrative measure avoid the consequences of imposing charges for mental health services. There is no effective way of doing it. If we look at the administration and the way in which the discretionary remission of fees occurs, we can see what the result will be. I beg the Government to have second thoughts about this.

Mr. Lawn: Do you really think it will?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Hope springs eternal. I hope the Government will have a spark of humanity when considering the people affected by this kind of disease, and that it will not proceed with this shocking legislation.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 9.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 6, at 2 p.m.