

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m., if necessary.
Motion carried.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to enable the Classification of Publications Board to revoke a classification where the publication concerned is no longer available. The board maintains annual volumes of all classified material, and, as time goes by, these volumes are becoming increasingly cluttered with defunct publications. Furthermore, a power of revocation will clearly enable the board to render a previously restricted publication open to prosecution under the Police Offences Act, if the board considers that it is appropriate to do so. As the Act now stands, the board has power only to refuse a classification initially, or vary an existing classification.

The Bill also seeks to remove the obligation upon the board to publish lists of classified publications, and of publications it refrains from classifying, in a newspaper circulating throughout the State. In actual practice, vendors find it much easier to consult the consolidated lists made available by the board through the State Information Centre, and individual newspaper notices are therefore of not much value. Also, in view of the lurid titles many of the publications bear, it is appropriate that the requirement of publication should be limited to publication in the *Government Gazette*.

As the remainder of the explanation is formal, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.
Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 seeks to clarify one of the conditions that the board may impose in relation to the sale of a restricted publication. It is made clear that the word "personally" in paragraph (d), as it now stands, means in effect "while physically present in the shop". It has been alleged that this condition may not prevent a person from requesting a publication by post and thus may mean that a vendor can negotiate a sale by post. It is not intended that this practice should be permitted where the condition specified in paragraph (d) has been imposed by the board.

Clause 3 empowers the board to revoke any classification or condition assigned or imposed by the board. Clause 4 provides that the revocation or variation of a classification or condition must also be published by the board. Publication is restricted to publication in the *Gazette*.

Mrs. ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two objectives. First, it seeks to increase the maximum penalty for exhibiting an unclassified film from the present rather low \$200 to \$1 000. It also seeks to widen the Minister's power to prohibit the exhibition of certain R films in drive-in theatres. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

Unfortunately, some time ago certain sex shops in Adelaide were abusing the freedom they had been allowed in the exhibition of films that had not been classified under the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. It was the practice to allow sex shop proprietors to exhibit such films to prospective customers who were genuinely interested in purchasing the film. But some shops virtually operated as theatres, and the various subterfuges employed made it extremely difficult for the police to establish whether or not the audience were prospective customers. Proprietors have been advised that the concession by virtue of which they exhibited films not classified under the Film Classification Act has been withdrawn. It is essential that higher penalties be imposed so that it will be unprofitable for offenders to exhibit pornographic films.

There are some R films that are, in my Government's opinion, far too explicit in matters of sex and sadism for exhibition in drive-ins. At the moment the Minister has power to issue notices to individual drive-in theatres prohibiting the exhibition of a particular R film where he considers that the film may be seen from outside the theatre. This necessitates issuing approximately 40 notices. The Act has been widened so that the Minister can issue general or particular notices of prohibition in relation to drive-in theatres, whether or not the drive-in theatre is constructed in such a way that people outside can see the screen.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the penalty for an offence against the section from an amount not exceeding \$200 to an amount not exceeding \$1 000. Clause 3 enables the Minister to prohibit the exhibition of all R films in all drive-in theatres or any specified drive-in theatres, or of any particular R film. The prohibition may be imposed by a general notice in the *Gazette*, or by individual notices served on drive-in theatre proprietors. Clause 4 enables the Governor to prescribe fees in respect of an application for classification of a film and other related matters. There is, of course, a good deal of work involved in assessing a film for classification, and the imposition of a fee seems entirely justified.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1973; to repeal the Oats Marketing Act, 1972, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to—

- (a) arm the Australian Barley Board, established under the principal Act the Barley Marketing Act, 1947, as amended, with the necessary powers to engage in the "statutory marketing" of oats;

- (b) grant the board power to market other crops but without any powers of compulsory purchase; and
- (c) grant the board certain additional powers to borrow money under a Treasury guarantee.

As the remainder of the explanation relates to the clauses, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 formally amends the long title to the principal Act. Clause 4 repeals the Oats Marketing Act, 1972. This measure was never brought into operation and will no longer be required if the amendments proposed by this measure are agreed to. Clause 5 amends the definition section of the principal Act by inserting such additional definitions as are necessary. It is felt that these definitions are self-explanatory, but I would draw members' attention to proposed subclause (2), which is consequent on the definition of "proclaimed produce" and would emphasise that the new function of the board in relation to proclaimed produce does not carry with it any right to acquire that produce.

Clause 6 inserts a new section 8a in the principal Act and this section provides for the licensing of receivers of oats. This section corresponds almost exactly to the present provision relating to licensed receivers of barley. If other amending legislation is agreed to the principal licensed receiver will be the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company. Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act which sets out the general function of the board by arming the board with the statutory marketing powers adverted to above. In addition, the capacity to receive a guarantee by the Treasurer against liabilities arising from borrowings is provided under these amendments.

Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act by extending the inspectorial powers of the board to matters relating to oats. Clause 9 amends section 12 of the principal Act to provide for the keeping of accounts in relation to oats. Clause 10 is formal. Clause 11 inserts a new clause 14aa in the principal Act. This clause confers the statutory marketing powers in relation to oats and is the prime function of the measure especially at subclause (2), which is commended to members' particular attention. Further it is pointed out that this provision is, as it were, dormant until the "appointed day", as to which see subclause (3), is fixed. Present indications are that that day will be fixed so as to encompass oats of the season 1978-79.

Clause 12 amends section 14a of the principal Act to extend the regulating powers of the board to cover oats. Clause 13 amends section 15 of the principal Act to cover the receiving of oats by licensed receivers, and clause 14 is consequential on this provision. Clause 15 inserts a new section 17a, which relates to oats and almost exactly corresponds to section 17 as at present applies to barley.

Clause 16 inserts a new section 18a in the principal Act and this clause, together with new section 19a, inserted by clause 17, sets out the scheme for the marketing of oats and exactly follows the existing scheme for the marketing of barley. Clause 18 makes some drafting amendments to section 20 of the principal Act and, in addition, extends by six months the time within which prosecutions may be brought for offences against the Act. Clauses 19 and 20 are, it is suggested, self-explanatory. Clause 21 extends the life of the principal Act—

- (a) in relation to barley until the season 1982-83; and
- (b) in relation to oats for five seasons from and including the season 1978-79.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1959-66. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for amendments of the principal Act, the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1959-1966, that are consequential on the amendments of the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1973, provided for by the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977. The Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977, provides for the extension of the statutory marketing powers of the Australian Barley Board to the marketing of oats. This Bill extends all the powers, rights and duties of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in respect of the handling of barley to the handling of oats. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation of Bill

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by applying the definition of "warrant" to "grain" instead of wheat only. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act to extend the exclusive right of the co-operative to the bulk handling of wheat and barley to the bulk handling of oats. Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment provided for by clause 4. Clause 6 extends the right of the co-operative to be a licensed receiver of bulk wheat and barley to bulk oats. Clause 7 amends section 30 of the principal Act and is consequential to the amendment provided for by clause 6. Clauses 8, 9 and 10 are also of a consequential nature only.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from November 16. Page 864.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. This is the second Address in Reply debate that we have had in a short time. I object that this Address in Reply is not to be completed, as we were warned by the Deputy Premier, until the end of this session, because he claims that the Liberal Party has taken most of the time in the debate, yet four Labor members have spoken. Since my entry into Parliament it has been the custom for the Address in Reply debate to be completed and presented to the Governor before we proceed with other business, but already several Bills passed through this Chamber before the Address in Reply was commenced, and I think that is most unfair to the Opposition.

I congratulate the new members on both sides of the House. Their speeches have been interesting, to say the least. I pay a tribute to past members who have retired voluntarily from this place; the former member for