

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 7, 1974

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1974)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1975.

SUPERANNUATION (TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(GOVERNOR)

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

BOATING BILL

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

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

WALLAROO JETTY

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (February 21).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The depth of water at low tide at a point 9 metres seaward of the boatshed is only 3.6 metres, gradually decreasing to zero about 75 metres shoreward of the boatshed. It is doubted very much whether this short length of shallow water would be of much use to anglers, and I have been informed that the rocky and stony foreshore is not a popular area for picnics. The repair of that section of the jetty from the shore to a point 9 metres seaward of the boathouse for half-width only would cost at least \$40 000 using secondhand materials. In the circumstances, I do not consider that this portion of Price's jetty should be preserved.

PORNOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

Dr. EASTICK: Before asking my question, I take this opportunity, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Premier and the member for Ross Smith on attaining their majorities as members of this House. Of course, one knows that in the political numbers game they have spent the majority of those majorities in the minority, and I am sure that both members will excuse me if I express to them the hope that they are permitted to serve out the balance of their time on the benches they have occupied for the majority period, that is, on this side.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Wishful thinking.

Dr. EASTICK: Nevertheless, I congratulate them on this achievement. Will the Premier say whether the Government will take more positive and determined action than its previous futile endeavours to stem the flow of pornographic literature which has, as a result of the apparent immunity available to booksellers and publishers, from a trickle of this material several years ago turned into a full-

scale flood? Concern at the open display of what can only be described as gross pornography has been raised by the community at large and by members of this House on numerous occasions, yet still the number of these publications increases, and the extent of sexual depravity written about and depicted worsens. The shame of it all is that anyone who attacks these publications is invariably labelled a wowsler.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting in his explanation of the question.

Dr. EASTICK: As a result, people who object to these publications are invariably told they do not have to buy them. The open display of magazines and publications such as those which I hold in my hand and which depict not just full frontal nudity but also photographs of explicit sexual activities and grossly indecent poses must be offensive to any reasonable person. The publications that I have here were procured this morning and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader cannot display any literature.

Dr. EASTICK: These publications were procured by the one person from a bookseller in Adelaide, and they were on open display. They bear the following names and descriptions: *Cocksure*—Australia's Sexiest Paper; *Him*, with a warning of adult-type sex material; *Stallion*, Australia's Stud Paper; *Fury*—Why Some Women Prefer Animals; *Flame*—Women's Lib. at Maroubra; and *Screw*—A Sex Review—First and Best in the Field it Created. As these publications are freely available on the shelves of many book outlets in this State, I ask whether the Government will correct this situation by adopting a more positive attitude and show the responsible leadership that the people of this State demand.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier to reply to the Leader's question, I should like to endorse the Leader's remarks.

Dr. Eastick: In every detail?

The SPEAKER: No; I am dealing only with the first part, because I am dealing with history. I think all people have regarded reaching the age of 21 years as achieving the greatest degree of responsibility during their lifetime. To achieve 21 years as a representative of this Parliament must rank highly in the ambition of anyone. I think I speak for all members when I wish the honourable Premier and the honourable member for Ross Smith a happy birthday on achieving 21 years political life in this Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I hope we see them here for another 21 years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am most grateful to you, Sir, and to the Leader for the very kind remarks that have been made about the member for Ross Smith and me. We came here to a Parliament that was very much different from the Parliament of today. I assure the Leader that the member for Ross Smith and I will endeavour to represent the majority of the South Australian community, as we always have done.

Regarding the question raised by the Leader about what he calls explicit pornographic material, the policy of the Government has been clear and expressed for some years. It is that adults in this community may read and see what they choose, and that it is not for others in the community to say to them what they may or may not read or see. At the same time, the Government's view is that material which is offensive to people and which they have not solicited in any way should not be forced on them. No-one unwillingly or unwittingly should have forced on him material that is offensive to him,

because that would be an invasion of his rights as an individual. In addition, there should not be made available to minors material of which the parents of those minors do not approve.

Dr. Eastick: You wouldn't approve of this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader (and I have said this in the House previously) can show that material of this kind is made available or sold to minors, prosecutions will ensue, and they have ensued.

Mr. Coumbe: They're on open display.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Their titles may be on open display, but unless the material in them that is on open display is in itself patently offensive—

Dr. Eastick: It is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Eastick: I table it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where it is patently offensive, on complaint prosecutions will ensue. We have taken prosecutions in consequence of complaints in relation to these matters. It has been made clear to the publishers, distributors and retailers that, where there is sexually explicit material that may be offensive to any reasonable adult, it may not be placed on public view, available to minors and without warning to adults. If there is warning to adults, they cannot very well complain if they go in and have a look at it, any more than a lady could be held properly to complain if she climbed on a box in the kitchen to look out through a window to see her neighbour's activities, which she did not like. If people are duly warned about what they may see and if they take the opportunity to see it, they cannot very well complain about it.

Mr. Mathwin: What about these things being left around?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has a complaint where that has happened, we will deal with that, but we will deal with it on the basis of a specific complaint made.

Mr. Mathwin: I mean when they are discarded.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has been told that, where there are specific occasions on which this can be shown to have happened, and someone has committed an offence, the matter will be investigated immediately. However, I, as the Minister in charge of this area of the law, have not received a single complaint from any member; no specific instance has been referred to me. It is all very well for members to say, "Oh, we are full to capacity of this dreadful stuff." However, the Leader has not in the course of explaining his question given me an instance of where this material is on sale, available to minors and without a warning being given to adults. If the Leader did that, the matter would be investigated immediately. I reject the stand taken over a period of years by many politicians and others in this State, whose attitude has been to play "porno-politics". All they do is get up and create a great stir about the dreadful deprivations on the community in relation to things they think are terrible. The Government does not intend to institute in this community a group of people who consider themselves able to read material of an explicit sexual nature and make a judgment about it, but who say to the rest of the community, "You are in so poor a state of weakness and lack of discretion that you as adults cannot make a judgment about it yourselves." The Government rejects that attitude: it is a particularly liberal one!

WINE GRAPES

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question follows a report in the *Advertiser* of February 28 of statements made by the Premier when opening the 1974 wine festival, part of which is as follows:

There had to be some restructuring of the wine-grape growing industry in South Australia, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday. This had to be reflected in prices and would also require Commonwealth financial support. Mr. Dunstan said that the most pressing problem facing the industry was the need for some redirection of wine-grape growing in South Australia. "Against our present problems can be offset, happily, the rising domestic and export demand for wine", he said. "If we are to take maximum advantage of this—and we must—the industry has to be geared to meet it. This means that we have to produce the right kinds of grapes for the wines in demand. There has to be some restructuring and prices have to reflect this."

Concern has been expressed, especially in a letter which came to my notice this morning, that what the Premier was doing was representing the desires of certain wine manufacturers and indicating that he favoured a form of differential pricing that bore no relationship to the cost of production. Does this mean that the Premier favours the introduction of differential prices to encourage the planting or the replanting, as the case may be, of selected wine-grape varieties? Further, in his reference to the Commonwealth Government for assistance—

The SPEAKER: Order! The procedure adopted in this House is that an honourable member may ask a question and then explain it briefly. As I understand it, the honourable member for Mallee asked his question and then explained it, and he is now going on with another series of questions.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As was required of me, Mr. Speaker, I asked my question before I explained it. I could not ask the questions that I was about to ask without referring to the Premier's statement, which, of course, I was forbidden to do before asking my original question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can ask a question and then explain it, but he cannot thereafter ask a further series of questions.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Premier is well aware of what I want from him by way of reply. Will he therefore give me that reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member would be aware that, in the wine-grape growing industry, individual wine-grape growers have faced much difficulty. The small wine-grape grower in an irrigated or non-irrigated area has faced real difficulty in making ends meet. The position in the irrigated areas has been bad enough, but in the dry-land areas the average wine-grape grower, unless immediately associated with a winemaking company, has been faced with a return, for the most part, well below the basic wage. These people have been subsistence farmers. This has been the situation which, in an industry that is reasonably buoyant, ought not to occur. The State made submissions to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in this specific area of rural production.

Mr. Nankivell: Did you have vine pulling and replanting in mind?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not immediately. However, the Commonwealth Government made an investigation together with our economists, who have been working for more than a year on legislation to help the wine industry. The Commonwealth Government pointed out that our minimum wine-grape price structure was, in fact,

supporting something of a distortion in the industry; that is, it was putting a premium on the continuation of growing the bread-and-butter lines and some lines that, in effect, were in considerable supply when the premium wine-grapes were not being planted in a way to get the best return in the industry. The Commonwealth Government pointed out that, because of our minimum grape price activity, we were merely adding the cost of production to the existing structure, rather than considering what might be the best returns to the industry to make the wine-grape grower much more viable than he had been previously. Therefore, we had an investigation carried out about what should be done on this matter, and we took advice from the Wine Grape-growers Council. We also had advice from Dr. Rankine, whom the honourable member would know well, and from Mr. Chatterton, a member of this Parliament who is a winemaker and a wine-grape grower and is well regarded throughout the industry.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the member for Chaffey? He produces wine. Did you ask him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, we did not, but we would always be pleased to hear from him. We have had much advice in this area and we have consulted the Commonwealth Government. The economic intelligence unit of my department made a recommendation about an alteration in the structure of minimum prices, the objective of this being to ensure that we complied with the Commonwealth Government's view about restructuring the industry, because it was apparent that, if we did not do that, we might have difficulty getting the kind of Commonwealth assistance we wanted for eventually restructuring the industry and for the support of wine-grape growers. We are satisfied that the new structure of wine-grape prices in South Australia will help us get Commonwealth Government support for the industry. I appreciate that in irrigated areas, in respect of what are termed the bread-and-butter lines, there was an increase that was designed to cover the increased cost of production but not to give an additional incentive for the planting of more of those grapes. I have had a deputation from wine-grape growers in the District of Chaffey suggesting we have another look at the costings in this area simply because, as a result of the various cost increases to them, practically all the increases specified by the Prices Commissioner have, in their view and in their submission to me, been taken up and they are perhaps in real terms slightly worse off. That is the basis of their submission. I told them that if they submit further costings on this basis through their association, we will look at the figures immediately to see whether something further should not be done in relation to the bread-and-butter lines in the irrigated areas. Overall, we believe that the course taken in restructuring minimum grape prices is to the benefit of the industry. Over a period of years it will make it very much more possible for the average wine-grape grower to make ends meet and to encourage him to grow those grapes for which he will get the best return. That having been done, we are much more likely to get direct Commonwealth assistance for the industry.

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Premier say what he considers should be the form of Commonwealth assistance to the grapegrowing industry in connection with the growing of premium varieties? If it is not to be in the form of a vine pull and replacement scheme, how does the Premier expect growers to continue in the industry when they have established vineyards and, because of the loss of production, cannot afford to replant? In these circumstances, the grower cannot take advantage of the premium variety prices fixed by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer

Affairs. Can the Premier say what assistance should be provided, and how it should be provided, by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of Commonwealth assistance is still being discussed, and I do not want to forecast at this stage what may come from those discussions. I point out to the honourable member that the provision of extra minimum prices for the premium grape varieties did not in any way disadvantage the growers of the bread-and-butter lines (the bulk varieties). The Commissioner's recommendation of an increase in other minimum prices in accordance with previous policy was accepted, so that the growers of the bulk varieties have not been disadvantaged in any way as compared to previous policy. However, what happened was that extra was given in the minimum grape prices, particularly in non-irrigated areas, to growers of premium grape varieties. The honourable member will know that these are mainly the shiraz variety and the costs in this case are rather higher in proportion. In no way is that any detraction from what was granted to the growers of the bulk varieties. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, as requested, recommended a price that would cover the cost of production, plus a small margin extra. We are now discussing in some depth with the Commonwealth Government the restructuring of the industry. At this stage I cannot say that a vine pull policy is better than some other policy. In fact, some submissions from wine-grape growers suggest that the vine pull policy is not better, that there is a reasonable demand for the bulk varieties remaining, and that consequently there should not be a vine pull scheme. This matter has to be looked at. I will not decide on one policy rather than another in relation to restructuring until the matter has been considered. However, we had to give an earnest to the Commonwealth Government, plus assistance to our own wine-grape growers in this area.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Education discuss with the Minister of Health the possibility of supplying vitamin C and/or multi-vitamin capsules to Aboriginal schoolchildren in this State? Some time ago, when I asked whether the Government would consider supplying citrus juices to Aboriginal schoolchildren in place of milk, I was told that it was a Commonwealth matter and that the Commonwealth Government had consistently refused such a request. Since the discontinuation of the supply of milk to schools a short trial period with the supplying of vitamin tablets to Aboriginal children in my area has proved very successful in relation to the health problems associated with Aboriginal schoolchildren. I have been asked to put this proposition to the Minister to see whether something cannot be done for Aboriginal schoolchildren.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for that question. The point of view he expresses is one I would support. How far we can get with it I am not sure at this stage, but I shall be pleased to take up the matter and investigate it thoroughly.

WHYALLA EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ask his department to approach Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited to see what success the company has obviously had with the employment of women in heavy industry; the possibility of further employment of women; and whether problems are being encountered because of the employment of women? I believe that problems may arise with awards some of which are

State awards. The company, which already employs over 300 women in its steelworks at Whyalla, is currently advertising for more. I see this as an experiment mainly because of the obvious problems associated with the development at Red Cliff Point. I believe the State Government should keep a watchful eye on the situation to see that the overall interests of the women employed in heavy industry are protected.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I agree with the honourable member: a watchful eye should be kept on women employees in heavy industry to see that they are paid the correct rates. However, as a member of the Select Committee that is currently meeting and taking evidence on sex discrimination, I think that the honourable member will agree with me that several witnesses who have appeared to give evidence have indicated their willingness to work in any type of industry. Nevertheless, the question asked is an interesting one, and I shall be pleased to obtain the information sought.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say for how much longer he expects the present session of Parliament to last?

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're wasting your time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know why the Minister says that, when I ask a sensible question on a matter that concerns everyone in this place and also the general public of South Australia. There has already been comment about the lack of work during the past three sitting weeks. I know that the Government has put a few more Bills on the Notice Paper. It has several today for which notice has been given, but, as not much work seems to be about, I desire to know how much longer we are to be kept here. It is noticeable that Government members have almost given up asking questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked a question and gave a brief explanation, but he is now deviating greatly from the question he asked and from the explanation required in connection therewith. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: March 28.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Health a full and detailed report on current measures being adopted to deal with the continually increasing problem of drug dependence in South Australia? The Commonwealth Attorney-General (Senator Murphy) said recently that there was an alarming increase in the availability of drugs illicitly entering this country, and this must be taken as an indication of an alarming increase in drug dependence. The treatment of drug dependence is important from the point of view of indicating the number of people dependent on drugs, anyway, although many authorities point out that the numbers treated merely represent the tip of the iceberg. More important are the preventive measures adopted. A statement was recently made that drug dependence in this State had reached epidemic proportions, and advice was given that the Government should tackle the matter as a public health problem. For this reason, and because of the statements made recently, I believe that members of the community wish to hear exactly what is being done to try to solve this problem.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Transport say whether an inquiry has been held into the operations of the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board and into controlling the operations of taxis generally? If it has, is the inquiry completed and can the Minister say what are the results of such an inquiry?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know of no inquiry into the operations of the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board.

Dr. Eastick: What about the operations of cab drivers?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board is charged with the responsibility of supervising the operations of taxi-cabs throughout the area under its control, that area having recently been extended. It is Government policy for the board to encompass the metropolitan planning area. The board continually keeps the operations of cab drivers under surveillance. Although I am not aware of any special investigation taking place, now that the honourable member has asked the question I will refer it to the Chairman of the board to see whether he can throw any light on the matter. I am afraid I cannot do so at present.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will assist by meeting all or at least a substantial part of the cost of obtaining a High Court decision for the fishing industry with respect to the taking and marketing of prawn fish from South Australian waters which apparently cannot at this stage be defined as being under the control of either the State or the Commonwealth? In the interests of the State generally and of the fishing industry specifically, it would seem desirable that a test case be heard as soon as possible to determine whether or not certain fishermen holding Commonwealth fishing licences may take prawns from offshore areas and enjoy free marketing of their catch in South Australian ports. It has come to my notice, and I think the Premier is probably aware, that there is considerable uneasiness within the industry, especially since the State Fisheries Department has restricted prawn-marketing licences to a few selected large operators. This uneasiness applies more especially now that we are informed that four of the members of the five-man committee that has been set up to examine future applications are Mr. Olsen, Mr. Poole, Mr. Carigliano and Mr. Jensen, the latter members being two of the selected prawn fishermen to whom I have previously referred.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has previously been announced that the matter of the State's involvement in any test of offshore rights before the High Court is still being considered. When a decision has been made, it will be announced.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say why, during its four years of office, the Government has failed to license swimming pool builders? Yesterday, in a question, I asked that swimming pool builders be licensed. This morning I have been in touch with the Builders Licensing Board, and I understand that pool builders do not come under that board. Therefore, there is no requirement whatever for a builder of swimming pools to be licensed. That information is different from what I was told in reply to my question yesterday. This morning I also contacted the President of the Swimming Pools Association (South Australia) Incorporated (Mr. Bull). His executive, which met this morning, endorsed what I said in explaining my question yesterday. Mr. Bull also pointed out that on seven occasions since 1970 his association had requested the present

Government to license these builders. Yet, at this stage, four years later, after many unfortunate cases have occurred, these builders have still not been licensed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are investigating the matter. There is a difference of opinion administratively whether or not these people should be covered under the Builders Licensing Act.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Or whether they are.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, or whether they are due to be registered. We are trying to sort out this matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: Your own department says they aren't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may be the opinion of some officers, but it is not always agreed to by other officers; we are trying to sort out that matter. Until recently, I was administering the Builders Licensing Act, and I did not see a submission on this score. Although I will inquire about the matter, I have no recollection of such a submission. I am most grateful that we obviously have on the Opposition benches a convert to the view that people in this area should be licensed. Before the honourable member came into this House, there was constant opposition from all members opposite to the principle of licensing builders, or other people in trades, in South Australia. I am glad to see that the honourable member differs from his colleagues on this score, apparently sharing the belief of members on this side that members of the public should be protected by a licensing system where people are carrying out work of this kind for them.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say what is the policy of the State Government in relation to the case being put to his Commonwealth Government colleagues about the future of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act? The Premier will be aware that the first proposal put to the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation was rejected out of hand because it grossly discriminated against the wheat-growers of this country. As negotiations are still taking place, can the Premier say whether his Government will support the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation in its efforts to obtain a fair deal for Australia's important wheatgrowing industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will confer with the Minister of Agriculture, but the position of the Government is that we support orderly marketing.

WINE AUCTIONS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Attorney-General consider amending the law to vary the conditions that presently apply to the sale of wine by auction? I am led to believe that, at present, if a person wishes to sell wine by auction, this can really be done legally only if it is sold from licensed premises. In the past, this has not mattered greatly, but nowadays, with so many people owning their own supply of wine and with many people collecting wine, when there is a deceased estate and the remaining partner of the marriage wishes to sell the wine, because of the legal position it is not easy to dispose of it by auction. Will the Attorney-General see whether it is possible to amend the law so that wine can be sold by auction from other than licensed premises?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter and give the honourable member a reply.

HOTEL GLASSES

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say whether the Government intends to legislate to tighten up the health regulations

relating to the method used in hotels to wash dirty drink glasses? At present, I understand that under the regulations all that hotels are required to do is wash the dirty glasses in cold water. I have been told that in other States, by law, the dirty glasses are required to be washed in hot water. The washing of glasses particularly affects a person who brings back to the counter six glasses which, under the practice in South Australia, are refilled with the amber liquid and returned to the people who were drinking from them, so that no-one would know which glass was his.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say what stage has been reached in work on the Hackney redevelopment scheme; when building work will commence; and when it is expected that the project will be completed?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As I have not received a report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust on this matter recently, I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

HILLS RESTAURANT

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier say what are the Government's present plans with regard to the establishment of modern restaurant facilities in the hills face zone? Some time ago plans were announced for the establishment of a restaurant at Windy Point, but I have seen no further development in that regard. Also, the Mount Lofty restaurant needs to be modernized. Will the Premier say what are the Government's present plans in this respect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The contract for the erection of the Windy Point restaurant is currently under negotiation, and I cannot offhand give the honourable member a date for the refurbishing of the Mount Lofty restaurant. Certain kiosks and restaurants in national pleasure resorts need to be examined. Indeed, alterations have recently been effected to the Waterfall Gully restaurant. However, I will confer with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say what criteria are used in this State for identifying disadvantaged schools that attract Commonwealth assistance? One or two press reports in the last week have dealt with this grant of money by the Australian Government, and one of them has suggested that in one State, anyway, the money so provided has not gone to disadvantaged schools and that the Prime Minister is demanding of Ministers of Education in each State a statement regarding the criteria used to determine which schools are disadvantaged. Will the Minister therefore say what criteria are used in this State in deciding which schools qualify for this assistance?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The programme regarding disadvantaged schools in South Australia has been approved by the Commonwealth Government. I understand that New South Wales was the State with which difficulties were experienced; I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to know that it was not South Australia. In its initial report on this matter, the Australian Schools Commission obviously desired that all schools should be considered disadvantaged or otherwise in terms of the social and economic conditions of the area being served

by those schools, and that, in deciding which schools were disadvantaged, States should operate in that way rather than consider what facilities were available at these schools. The criterion that the commission therefore asked us to assess was that of the social and economic disadvantages being suffered in a certain area. The commission gave us computerized lists of the rank order of various areas that had been provided by the Bureau of Census and Statistics, using income figures and certain other indicators of the disadvantages being suffered. South Australia used, from its own sources, the information that it had obtained from all of its schools on the percentage of students receiving free books. The honourable member would realize that, to obtain free textbooks, stationery and other items, one must apply to the department and, in assessing whether or not someone is eligible for this assistance, a fairly strict means test is imposed. The Government believes that the percentage of students receiving free books is a fairly reliable guide to the disadvantages being suffered in various areas of the State. In making an assessment and recommending certain schools to the Government for approval as disadvantaged schools, we relied fairly heavily on that indicator. I, and all other State Ministers of Education, have received from the Australian Minister for Education a request for further details of the criteria that have been applied. If, when answering that letter, I can give the honourable member further details, I will do so then.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Fisheries say how many miles of the total length of the Murray River in South Australia is allotted to fishing reaches, and how many miles to public reserves? Will he also say how many individuals have been granted licences, and whether the Government intends to withdraw all licences for fishing between Murray Bridge and the River mouth? If so, when will this be enforced?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As I cannot recall these figures exactly, I will obtain the information for the honourable member and let him know in due course.

MONARTO

Mr. RODDA: My question is consequent on the one asked by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday regarding the transfer to Monarto, in 1977, not only of the Agriculture Department but also of the Lands Department and the Environment and Conservation Department. Will the Premier say whether any of the officers or sections of these departments will remain in Adelaide? Three-quarters of South Australia's rural population will continue to travel to Adelaide, which is the main centre for services in this part of the State, to deal with these departments. That is not meant to be a reflection on the new city of Monarto. If these facilities are not available in Adelaide for the people who deal with the departments to which I have referred, they will have to travel the extra distance to Monarto, which would be a distinct disadvantage. Will the Premier say what will be the future position and whether consideration will be given to the 75 per cent of South Australia's population, particularly residents of the South-East, to whom I have referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The relocation committee is examining the necessity for these departments to remain in Adelaide to service those people who will seek assistance in Adelaide.

STRATHMONT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain why the necessary modifications to a section of Strathmont Primary School to provide for a kindergarten have been delayed, when the work will proceed, and when it is expected that the pre-school children will be able to attend the school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The department could not proceed with the conversion work until approval had been obtained for the expenditure of Australian Government funds, and that took a little time. The allocations in the Budget had to be approved in relation to separate programmes in each State. The honourable member will be pleased to know that the South Australian programme was the first approved. I will get for the honourable member as soon as possible the latest information on when pre-school children could be admitted to that centre.

THIRD UNIVERSITY

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Education say whether a positive decision has been made regarding the establishment of a third university in South Australia? I ask the Minister specifically whether Smithfield is still the most favoured site and, if it is, when the owners of land in that area who have been denied the opportunity of selling their land, except to the Government for education purposes, will be allowed to sell and when they will be so notified. Before the present Government came to office, it was suggested that the third university in South Australia would be sited at Smithfield. Replies to subsequent questions asked of the present Government have indicated that certain action has been taken regarding land in that area, preventing landholders from selling on an open market, because in effect there is an embargo on the use to which the land may be put if it is sold. As a result, the market value of that land is completely destroyed, notwithstanding that landholders are responsible for paying rates and taxes, including council rates, at a level related to the selling price of adjacent properties. The owner of one property is paying, in effect, \$11.50 an acre (·4 ha) a year in combined taxes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government will make an announcement on this matter when it can, and I assure the honourable member that this will be done as soon as possible so that, if the land reserved for university purposes at Smithfield is no longer required, the owners there can be notified as soon as possible. It is not yet possible to do that. If and when it is decided—

Dr. Eastick: It might and it might not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is correct.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress is being made in preparing regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and will he say what aspects of this legislation or what trades are being considered? Further, I ask whether any regulations have yet been forwarded to the Subordinate Legislation Committee for scrutiny and, if none has been, when the Minister expects that regulations will be ready for submission.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Doubtless, the honourable member would have read the statement I made today regarding the building and construction section of industry. Regulations have now been proclaimed and that area of industry has been proclaimed to come under the Act. A committee that has been considering that matter for some time is now considering other forms of industry. Regulations will be submitted from time to time as the committee sees fit to submit them, and most of the industries

throughout the State should be covered in, say, 12 months time, as the committee is able to reach agreement on the various aspects of the regulations.

FESTIVAL CENTRE FLOODLIGHTING

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether it is intended that the festival theatre and associated buildings will be floodlit, particularly during the Festival of Arts? It was noticeable from North Adelaide last evening that it was not possible to see the festival theatre. The theatre is a fine building of which we all are proud, and I should like to think that it could be suitably floodlit during the Festival of Arts and at other times.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take the matter up with the Chairman of the centre.

NATIONAL FITNESS COUNCIL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say why the Government has acted so unilaterally and ignored the experience of Mr. Albert Simpson and his staff in forming the department over which he now presides? I am prompted to ask the question by a letter that I have received from a constituent who, I should have thought, would be well known to the Minister and to other members on both sides of the House. Part of that letter states:

As a member of the National Fitness Council you will know something of the Gilbertian moves of brother Broomhill in setting up a division or Department of Sport, Recreation and Tourism quite separately from the National Fitness Council.

He then refers to a newspaper report and suggests that I ask the question that I have asked. The letter also states:

The recreation council mentioned in the press report apparently gives one seat to a representative of the National Fitness Council, while the Education Department, for instance, gets two seats.

As the letter states, I am a member of the National Fitness Council. I represent the Opposition on that council, and I am indebted to the Minister of Education for that nomination, but I make clear that I have asked the question despite rather than because of my membership of the council. In fact, I hesitated to ask the question, because I thought it might be said that in some way I had been influenced to do so by Mr. Simpson or another member of the council. However, I assure the House that I have not discussed the matter with any other member of the council, but I have noticed that there seems to have been a deliberate snubbing of the council and staff in setting up the new department.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting in the course of his explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have finished. I have put the question, and I hope for a reply as clear and precise as a reply I received earlier.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is clear that the honourable member has not spoken to anyone with any knowledge on this matter. Otherwise, I am certain he would not have asked the question. The Government and the department will be relying strongly on the council in respect of the activities of my department. The honourable member may be pleased to know that I will be spending all tomorrow morning with officers of the council.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1971. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

In 1966 amendments were made to the Industrial and Provident Societies Act under which no new society could be registered if the rules provided for any member of the society to exercise more than one vote at meetings of the society. Additionally, no amendment could be made to the rules of a society existing at the time of the amendments, or of a society subsequently registered, expanding the voting rights of any member or class of members of the society.

These amendments provided, however, that in the case of any society registered after the commencement of the amending Act of 1966 the Minister could upon application by the society approve a differential scale of voting. It appears that Parliament, in granting this power of exemption, may have overlooked the case of a society that was already registered at the time of the commencement of the amending Act of 1966. The present Bill seeks to overcome this deficiency by enabling the Minister to grant exemptions, in appropriate cases, in respect of societies registered before or after the commencement of the amending provisions.

The amendments are particularly important in view of a projected take-over of the Jon Preserving Co-operative. If this take-over is to proceed there must be an amendment to the rules providing for differential voting. Such an amendment is, however, impossible as the law stands at the moment. I should point out that the Government has not at this stage decided to approve alterations to the rules of the Jon Preserving Co-operative, but this case does point to the need for the Minister to have general powers of exemption.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals subsection (8) of section 12 and inserts new provisions in its place. The new subsection (8) provides that the rules of a society must provide for each member to have one vote at meetings of the society and that no amendment can be made to the rules under which the voting rights of any member are expanded. This largely follows existing provisions. New subsection (9), however, gives the Minister a general power of exemption in respect of the foregoing restrictions.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1972. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. Coumbe: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It makes amendments to the Juvenile Courts Act upon two separate subjects. First, the Bill deals with the award of compensation under section 52 of the principal Act. This section contains power to award compensation against a child or his parent, where injury is caused as the result of the commission

of an offence by the child. The amendments increase the amount of compensation that may be awarded to \$2 000. The Bill attracts the operation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act when an award is made under section 52 in respect of a personal injury.

Secondly, the Bill deals with the release on licence of persons convicted of murder under the Juvenile Courts Act. The provisions of section 55 of the principal Act are amended so that the Governor will act in future upon the advice of the Parole Board in determining the conditions upon which a convicted person will be released on licence. A further provision is inserted enabling a justice to issue a warrant for the arrest of a person released on licence where the licence has been revoked in pursuance of section 55.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 inserts a definition of "the Parole Board". Clause 4 fixes the maximum amount that may be awarded as compensation under section 52 at \$2 000. An amendment is inserted providing for applications for compensation to be made within 12 months after the day on which the court finds the offence proved. A new subsection is inserted attracting the operation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act to awards made pursuant to the provisions of section 52.

Clause 5 amends section 55 of the principal Act. The amendments provide that the Governor will act on the advice of the Parole Board in discharging any person on licence who has been found guilty of murder. Paragraph (b) of subsection (8) provides for a justice to issue a warrant for the arrest of the person and for his return to a place determined by the Governor. This amendment will enable the provisions of the Service and Execution of Process Act of the Commonwealth to be used to facilitate the return of an offender to custody where he has committed some breach of his licence.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRIVACY BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to create a right of privacy, to provide a right of action for an infringement of that right, for matters incidental thereto, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

For some time now, law reform commissions, commissions of inquiry and legislatures in various parts of the world have concerned themselves with the question of the preservation of personal privacy. The demand that more systematic attention should be paid to this problem has been growing since the end of the Second World War. Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations 1948 stated that "no-one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence, or to attacks upon his honour and reputation". The terms of the declaration emphasized protection against the activities of secret police and the officers of public authority, experience of totalitarian regimes being in the forefront of the draftsmen's minds.

But the terms in which the right was expressed were broader than that. The same principle is expressed in Article 17 of the United Nations Covenant on Civil and

Political Rights of December, 1966, which further provided that "no-one shall be subject to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation" and that "everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks". At a non-official level an international conference of distinguished jurists from many parts of the world organized by the Swedish section of the International Commission of Jurists held at Stockholm in 1967, made a more comprehensive and specific examination of the right to privacy and of the steps necessary to protect it. Amongst its conclusions were the following:

(1) The right to privacy, being of paramount importance to human happiness, should be recognized as a fundamental right of mankind. It protects the individual against public authorities, the public in general and other individuals.

(14) . . . (a recommendation) that all countries take appropriate measures to protect by legislation or other means the right to privacy in all its different aspects and to prescribe the civil remedies and criminal sanctions required for its protection.

In Australia this question has, over the years, occupied the attention of the Standing Committee of Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General and, in this State in particular, some aspects of the question have been referred to our Law Reform Committee. The reasons for this growing interest in and discussion of the protection of personal privacy are not hard to find. There are growing pressures exerted by modern industrial society upon the home and daily life that produce a demand by the urban dweller for anonymity and seclusion. There is the growth of the various forms of "mass media" which, in catering to the tastes of an increasingly broad public, furnish descriptions of extraordinary events of all kinds containing detailed information about the life and habits of a variety of people. The development of technological and scientific means of invading privacy is also a factor.

Already, in the last Parliament the Listening Devices Act, 1972, was enacted into law and that measure afforded the individual some protection from invasion of his privacy by mechanical means. The measure now before you proposes to create a general right of privacy, a right that has in the terms proposed not been previously recognized by law in this country. Such protection as privacy enjoys under our law is the fortuitous by-product of laws designed for other purposes, such as the laws of trespass, nuisance, breach of copyright and breach of confidence, or defamation; but the protection is incomplete because it is only incidental to the protection of other aspects of the citizen's life.

The concept of privacy causes little difficulty to the ordinary citizen. He can readily identify the part of his life which he considers to be peculiarly his own and for which he claims the right to be free from outside interferences or unwanted publicity. But a man's privacy requires protection from the law only to the extent to which it might be unjustly infringed. What must be balanced against the individual's claim for privacy is the "public interest", society's interest in the circulation of truth. There can be no doubt as to the importance to be attached to truth in a civilized society. But that is not to say that the public is entitled to know all the truth about an individual or group. Some areas of a man's life are his business alone. Thus the privacy this Bill is designed to protect is that area of a man's life which, in any given circumstances, a reasonable man with an understanding of the legitimate needs of the community would think it wrong to invade.

To consider the Bill in some detail: clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes it clear that given a choice

between the public good and the assertion of a private right, the public good must prevail and, in aid of this, provides that the exercise in good faith by a person of any duty or obligation imposed on him by law will not be touched on by this measure. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act, and I draw members' particular attention to the definition of "right of privacy" which is of course, crucial to the measure. The right proposed is the right to be free from a "substantial and unreasonable" intrusion upon a person's private affairs. It is not intended that this protection will extend to insubstantial and trivial incursions.

There have been many attempts in the past to define "privacy". Perhaps the most succinct was the one adopted by the U.S. Judge Cooley last century when he called it "the right to be let alone". Rather than search for a precise or logical formula which would either circumscribe the meaning of the word "privacy" or define it exhaustively, a broad concept of privacy has been used in this Bill. This is to allow the law to keep pace with changing social needs. The scope of what is considered should be private at any given time is governed to a considerable extent by the standards, fashions and mores of the society of which we form part, and these are subject to constant change. The definition of privacy which has been used in this Bill will allow the courts to preserve a degree of flexibility and so to decide from case to case, and from time to time, what should or should not enjoy the law's protection. The courts already exercise this sort of flexibility for instance, in interpreting what is "reasonable" in relation to negligence and nuisance or in assessing the defence that a statement complained of in actions for defamation is "fair comment on a matter of public interest". Clause 5 establishes a statutory right of privacy and gives a right of action against any infringement of that right. Subclause (3) does not limit actions to cases where special damages, such as actual pecuniary loss, are claimed.

Clause 6 makes it clear that a person who knowingly benefits from an infringement of the right of privacy of another person will be liable to the same extent as it would be as if he were the author of that infringement. Clause 7 sets out the statutory defences that are available to an action for an infringement of a right of privacy. In effect these defences delineate the circumstances where a *de facto* infringement of a right of privacy is, in effect, justifiable. Paragraph (a) provides that where a person did not know and could not by exercising reasonable care have known that he had infringed another's privacy he will have a complete defence to any action brought against him. I draw member's particular attention to paragraphs (b) and (c) of this clause since these two paragraphs represent a compromise between the need to preserve a right of privacy in an individual person and the need to ensure that the public interest is preserved.

The defence set out in paragraph (d) again is an attempt to strike a balance between what might be called a "conflict of rights", and this defence makes it clear that the right of privacy is a shield not a sword that may be used to attack another's lawful interests or to deprive a court of law of evidence that should properly be available to it. Clause 8 sets out the powers of the court to grant relief in an action for infringement of a right of privacy. Subclause (2) enables a defendant to mitigate the effects of his infringement by apologizing for his conduct and tendering suitable amends. Subclause (3) sets out some of the matters that the court is enjoined to take into account in considering an award of damages.

Clause 9 is intended to enable the court to refuse to award what may be in effect "double damages". Clause 10 provides that in actions under the measure an appropriate degree of protection from publicity can be afforded the litigants by the court. Much thought has been given to the implication of this clause and its inclusion is advocated for the reason that without it, in many cases, injured persons may have no real means of claiming relief from invasions of their privacy as the publicity attendant on legal proceedings of this nature could well exacerbate their situation, rather than provide a proper remedy for it.

In conclusion it is conceded that a measure of this nature can only, as it were, plant a seed in the soil of the common law. To a considerable extent it is for the courts, in the consideration of the cases that come before them, to ensure that this seed grows and flourishes and proves a real value in the protection of the rights of the citizen. The problem of protecting the citizen's privacy by legal measures is complex. It is not to be thought that either this measure or any other single measure will provide the needed protection of itself. There must be a multi-pronged attack on the problem.

The Government has already given attention to the matter in relation to listening devices, the regulation of bailiffs and inquiry agents, and in other ways. Legislation is planned to deal specifically with information storages and data banks and probably with regard to electronic devices which may be used for surveillance of the activities of the individual. All of these and other measures are necessary. They will be progressively enacted as their efficacy is demonstrated and the difficulties inherent in drafting such legislation are mastered.

The creation of this new tort of invasion of privacy must therefore be regarded as but one prong of the attack on the problem of protecting the privacy of the citizen. By development of common law principles, the courts have already gone some distance towards providing remedies for certain types of infringement of privacy. It is plain however that without legislative impetus, the law cannot be developed by the courts to a sufficient extent to deal with the problem. The effect of this measure will be to provide the legislative impetus which is needed to set the wheels of the judicial process moving in the direction needed. Just as the courts have applied concepts of reasonableness in the law of negligence and nuisance to concrete situations, so they will apply the general concepts expressed in this measure in a way which will in time provide a coherent body of law covering the subject.

The judicial process by which the common law develops is particularly suited to the development of a new tort of invasion of privacy after receiving the necessary legislative impetus provided by this measure. As I have indicated above, it is not to be thought that the creation of a new tort and the provision of civil remedies for its infringement are more than a partial answer to the problem of effective protection of the citizen's privacy, but the measure fills a gap which exists in the existing law and will give protection and justice to many people who have hitherto been denied it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. Millhouse: That's no point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I looked for a member to move the adjournment of this debate. According to Standing Orders any member has the right to move the adjournment of a debate, but no-one had made any move whatsoever. The

member for Mitcham rose and moved that the debate be adjourned, and he is in order in doing so. The honourable member for Mitcham has moved that the debate be adjourned. Is that motion seconded?

Mr. Hall: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Monarto Development Commission Act, 1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal Act, the Monarto Development Commission Act, 1973, provided at section 17 in effect that persons employed by the Monarto Development Commission were to be employed outside the terms of the Public Service Act. The commission has come to the conclusion, with which the Government agrees, that there are considerable advantages both to the commission and to the officers involved if, in some cases at least, employment under the Public Service Act can be offered in the commission.

From the commission's point of view it would mean that it could draw on some of the specialist skills already available in the Public Service, and from the proposed appointee's point of view it would mean that his appointment for future promotion and advancement would not be diminished by accepting an appointment with the commission. At the same time it is realized that not all appointments to the service of the commission should necessarily involve appointment under the Public Service Act, and this Bill makes appropriate provisions to cover such cases. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

To consider the Bill in some detail: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 merely makes it clear that the commission will hold its property for and on behalf of the Crown. This statement of intention will free the commission from liability for certain stamp duties. Clause 3 amends section 12 of the principal Act and is in standard form and relieves members of the commission from personal liability for acts of the commission when those acts are done in good faith.

Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 17 of the principal Act. The section proposed to be inserted follows closely the standard arrangements that have been worked out to meet circumstances such as this. Proposed subclause (1) provides for the creation of offices under the Public Service Act. Proposed subclauses (2) and (3) enable appropriate modifications to be made in the application of that Act to the officers involved. These modifications are necessary to meet the situation of employment with a statutory authority which is somewhat outside the usual departmental structure of the Public Service.

Proposed subclauses (4) and (5) provide for employment with the commission outside the Public Service Act and are intended to cover the situation where employment under that Act is considered inappropriate by the commission. Clause 5 merely corrects a clerical error in paragraph (c) of subsection (1) of section 22 of the principal Act, the word "by" first occurring in that provision should, obviously, be the word "to".

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1974)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1973-74 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), 1974.

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

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending on June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Before we proceed, I believe that it is necessary to consider several aspects of discontent existing in the community concerning the administration by various Ministers, and in particular I refer to the situation of water supply on the Northern Adelaide Plains. This situation is clearly set out in a letter from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, dated December 14, 1971, which states:

I have attached 20 copies of a statement setting out the policy regarding water supply in an area on the Northern Adelaide Plains that is defined on the plan appended to the statement. The statements are intended for distribution to interested parties and, should further copies of this statement or the plan be required, they could be made available on request to Mr. R. E. Lewis, Mains Extension Officer, State Administration Centre, Victoria Square, Adelaide.

This letter is accompanied by another document regarding the water supply on the Northern Adelaide Plains, which states:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is only able to provide restricted service in the area shaded on the attached map. Outside of township areas service will be limited to one $\frac{1}{2}$ in. (1.27 cm) service to each landholder, and this will only be available on properties directly abutting a main. This policy was adopted for the whole area shown on the map in August, 1968, and no variation in the practices outlined are possible. Should any doubt exist as to the precise definition of the area, or to the existence of special conditions within the area, inquiry should be addressed to the Mains Extension Officer, Engineering and Water Supply Department, State Administration Centre, Victoria Square, Adelaide.

The map attached to the documents shows portions of the hundreds of Port Gawler, Mudla Wirra, Port Adelaide, Munno Para and Yatala. Towards the close of last session I placed on notice a question asking the Minister of Works about a specific instance brought to my attention concerning the area to which I have referred. The questions and replies appear at pages 2109-10 of *Hansard*, as follows:

1. Has the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, adopted in August, 1968, that allows only a 1.27 cm service to each landholder abutting a main in a defined area of the Northern Adelaide Plains, been altered?

2. If so, when was it altered and what is the new policy?

3. If it has not been altered, what likelihood is there of a review of the 1968 policy and when?

4. If there has been no alteration of policy, on what basis has a 5.08 cm connection been provided to a Womma Road property, being section 4116, hundred of Munno Para?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The policy is to allow only one 1.27 cm service for each allotment in Virginia township; elsewhere in the Northern Adelaide Plains area 2.9 cm services for properties which abut a main are allowed.

2. No alteration.

3. The position is being examined.

4. Following investigation a 5.08 cm industrial service was granted to Peter Copas Rose Nursery Proprietary Limited supplying sections 4116 and 4115 Womma Road, hundred of Munno Para, subject to the conditions that a 546 Ml capacity storage tank was installed and that the supply to this tank was taken only at night.

I suppose the truth of the statement in the reply to question No. 2 is quite obvious from the documents to which I have referred and which have been circulated to members of the public and members of this House. Concerning the reply to question No. 3, we could accept that an examination is being undertaken, but it does not alter the fact that the replies differ from the information contained in the document. We now know that one person successfully applied for an industrial service, although in recent years a similar service has been denied to dozens of other people in the same area.

It has also been drawn to my attention that another application has received special consideration. This involves a person who wishes to establish greyhound kennels. This is a legitimate business and, if that person is able to obtain this special consideration, all well and good. However, many people with more legitimate business reasons have been denied an additional water supply. Representations have been made to the Minister indicating the real danger to homesteads on five-acre and 10-acre (2 ha and 4 ha) properties in this area, which was previously known as the Smithfield bomb dump, and for which there is little water for fire protection. Additional water supplies have been denied many people who have undertaken agricultural pursuits in the area for many years, these people no longer being able to obtain some of their water supplies from the underground basin. Following the reply that I received on February 19, I received a letter from a person who is well known in the area and who holds a responsible administrative position in local government; the Chairman of the Munno Para District Council (Mr. Ron Baker) wrote to me as follows:

The reply given for question No. 1 is inconsistent with notices served on landowners in this district at the time the Womma Road water main was constructed, and also the letter provided by the E. & W.S. at a later date setting out a policy adopted in August, 1968, to apply to land west of Andrews Road in the District Council of Munno Para. The notice over the signature of the Chief Revenue Officer (original enclosed) which refers to a parcel of land owned at that time by my late brother, A. E. Baker, clearly sets out that all services will be restricted to $\frac{1}{2}$ in. size, with flows limited to 5gall. per minute. The notice offers a reason for the restriction noting, "The limitations of supply sources are such that it is only possible to provide works on a scale sufficient to meet normal domestic stock and gardening requirements." The E. & W.S. notice setting out the August, 1968, policy decision mentions in the first paragraph, "The Engineering and Water Supply Department is only able to provide restricted service in the area shaded on the attached map. Outside of township areas service will be limited to one half-inch service to each landholder and this will only be available on properties directly abutting a main." Two landowners, Mr. E. Russo (lot A Ps 3035) and Mr. C. Rullo (lot E Ps 3035 hundred of Munno Para), have during the past 18 months made verbal approaches to the E. & W.S. asking for an improved service to their properties; in each case the request was refused on the grounds that only the $\frac{1}{2}$ in. restricted service could be supplied. If it is possible I would like to see the Minister given an opportunity to explain the variation between the stated E. & W.S. policy and his reply to your question.

The opportunity now exists for the Minister to meet that request from a person with a good knowledge of the problems in the area. The letter continues:

It may be of interest to you to know that the Copas property was advertised for sale in the *Sunday Mail* of March 3, 1974 . . .

Here, a property which previously had insufficient water is being put up for sale almost immediately a water supply is available, and undoubtedly that availability of the water is emphasized. More can be said about the serious social and economic problems associated with the diminishing underground water supply. People involved in market

gardening or other activities in this area were asked to say truthfully how much water they used. The Premier told them that they would not be disadvantaged if they stated the actual quantity, rather than the quantity that they were permitted to use. However, subsequently they were tied to the actual quantity that they had stated they used, not being given access to the entitlement they had previously enjoyed. On the other hand, people who had claimed that they were using their total entitlement were permitted to continue to use that as their basic allocation.

Cases of this type have been referred to before in this House and another place. The failure by the Government to give a lead in relation to the water needs of this area has caused much concern to these people, often involving financial loss to those who purchased properties on the Government's assurance that certain action would be taken. I particularly refer to the ability of some people to obtain specific advantages over the applications of all others. I do not decry the good fortune of those who have been advantaged by the decisions taken but, in the interests of all the people involved, there must not be a policy that makes fish of one case and flesh of the other. We must have one policy that relates to all applicants, not a series of policies resulting in advantages to one person over another.

This afternoon, in reply to my question, the Minister of Education frankly said that no final decision had been made in relation to the Smithfield university project; no announcement could be made whether or not it might come to fruition. As I said in explaining my question, several people in the community are affected by this situation, particularly J. B. Smith and Son Proprietary Limited, whose Managing Director is Mr. C. J. Smith. This company's land has been held for many years in what was earlier described as the centre of the site for this university. The company has been told that the land may not be sold on the open market without the owner's making perfectly clear to potential purchasers that the land may be acquired as the site for a university or for use for educational purposes. Other land immediately adjacent to this land has been acquired for future educational and recreational purposes.

Although this land may be sold, the owner must relate the fact that it may be acquired by the Government; therefore, in reality the company is denied an open market for its land. Over the years, other landholders have been able to put their land on the market for the going price, these sales having had the effect of increasing the overall valuation of the area. However, this company has no effective means of selling this land and moving to another area to undertake its agricultural pursuits. I point out that, associated with holding this land, there has been a charge of \$11.50 an acre a year. The forced holding of this land has caused great concern. I have a well presented document from the Managing Director of J. B. Smith and Son (Mr. C. J. Smith, of Smith Road, Smithfield). This company, which has been placed in this invidious position, has been in the area for almost a century. The document states:

Please find enclosed copies of all documentation and communication with the State Planning Authority, concerning the reservation of land for future acquisition for both recreational and educational purposes. The former began in 1966, was reintroduced in 1969, and the latest information from the secretary of the S.P.A. on February 2, 1974, by phone conversation is that the regulations for both purposes are still not gazetted.

The answers to questions in your letter of January 29, 1974, are as follows: (1) Copies of documentation and correspondence enclosed marked (1). (2) Details of land tax on property J. B. Smith and Son Proprietary Limited:

(a) Land tax assessment No. 2930966 50.5. Valuation date June 30, 1971; sections 3187, 3188, part 3184.1711. Hundred of Munno Para: unimproved value, \$141 470; taxable value under section 12c (5), \$52 070; annual tax under section 12c, \$246; deferred tax past five years, \$6 066.48; and deferred tax (annual), \$1 685.16.

Water rates for valuation No. 2930920 005, section 3187: valuation date January 1, 1973 (36.82 hectares), annual value, \$1 840 (\$36 800 total value), and annual tax, \$138.

Valuation No. 2930971 02 1, sections part 3184 and 1711 (54.83 hectares): annual value \$3 410 (\$68 200 total value); and annual tax, \$255.72.

Section 3188 (32.37 hectares): annual value \$1 800 (\$36 000 total value); and annual tax, \$135.

Section part 3184 (.39 hectares): annual tax, \$21.

Total water rates a year, \$549.72.

The council rates for sections 3187 and 3188, the valuation date for which was October 5, 1973, amounted to \$448.88. For part sections 3184 and 1711 the rates were \$712.95, giving a total of \$1 161.83 for council rates. The total land tax was \$246.75, and the annual deferred land tax was \$1 685. Water rates were \$549.72, and the total tax on the 308½ acres (about 125 ha) was \$3 643.30.

The matter of the annual deferred land tax was obviously considered, because the Minister of Education or any other authority may take action to obtain land, and that tax must be paid for the previous five years. This payment is pertinent to the actual costs relating to the land. Because of Government involvement, persons are being held to ransom in respect of land that they have held for years. They cannot put it on the market in competition with other properties, and they are being denied the opportunity of undertaking an agricultural pursuit on land that can be used for agriculture only, because it cannot be subdivided. Also, adjacent land held by the Housing Trust is being made available to persons for an annual rent of \$6 an acre (.4 ha). We have, therefore, the completely untenable situation in which the Government expects one person to pay taxes at the rate of \$11.50 an acre each year, whereas adjacent land held by the Government is being rented for only \$6 an acre.

Again, I say "good luck" to the person who has been able to rent land at the cheaper rate. However, if the scheme was costed, the value of total taxes on the land must surely amount to \$11.50 or close thereto. These matters require the Government's urgent attention, and I look forward to a frank and open statement from the Minister of Works regarding the Government's policy on the northern Adelaide Plains area. Everyone there should receive the same consideration, without one person having an advantage over another. Finally, I hope that, if the Government is unable to say quickly and precisely what use will be made of the land that is acquired in the Smithfield area, it will take steps to ensure that landholders are taxed at a rate consistent with that of adjacent land held by the Housing Trust.

Mr. COURCE (Torrens): I wish to refer, first, to the vexed question of fruit fly, which is at present affecting a certain part of my district, particularly North Adelaide. All members could not help but agree that, had it not been for the vigilance, perhaps for the past 20 or 25 years, of the Agriculture Department, many of our horticultural pursuits would have been completely ruined and we would have experienced the ravages that have occurred in other States. This is to the credit of the departments involved, which have worked assiduously. Recently, however, there has been a new twist in this matter, which has prompted me to speak now. A section of North Adelaide has been proclaimed as an area affected by fruit fly. Members may have seen the recent press reports and photographs regard-

ing the resistance offered to departmental officers by the occupants of a house in Mann Street, North Adelaide, which faces the eastern park lands.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't it Mann Terrace? Don't you even know your own district?

Mr. COURCE: It is. I am grateful to the member for Mitcham for correcting me. He is always very pedantic. However, I am at fault on this occasion. Actually, there is a Mann Lane, which runs off Mann Terrace.

Mr. Millhouse: You were talking about Mann Terrace, though.

Mr. COURCE: The occupants of the house to which I have referred complained, when the fruit fly officers wanted to spray their property, that the chemical used (fenthion) was harmful and deleterious in many ways. They claimed it was harmful not only to horticulture and floriculture but also to animals and bird life. Indeed, they claimed that it could be harmful to humans in some circumstances. As a result of the resistance of these people in Mann Terrace, several Government officers, including a wellknown social worker, approached them. Because of the views expressed by the occupants of the property in Mann Terrace (views they have expressed strongly and with the aid of placards), they have refused to permit spraying to be carried out, and they remain adamant that use of the chemical is harmful.

Also, nearby residents have expressed similar views to me in this regard. The claims that are being made regarding the use of this chemical have raised grave doubts in the minds of many people who may have fruit trees in their gardens or perhaps pets or small children, whether or not they reside in a proclaimed fruit fly area. This section of the community is fairly widespread, and there is an uneasy feeling about the Government's spraying programme in this regard which is different from previous programmes. To be fair, I say that, when the property on which my house is situated was sprayed previously because it was in the same area, this spray was not used, and baits were laid. Residents have complained to me about the method to which I have referred and I ask what action the Government look to check the chemical with the Health Department, or whatever other authority was appropriate, before the chemical was issued and used on those properties. The Government has a firm duty to ensure, before they are used, that the spraying liquids that its workmen use are completely safe.

Almost coincidental with that matter, we have had the outcry at the damage done at Cleland Conservation Park. It has been reported last week that a young lad, who apparently suffers badly from sinus, has been affected. Complaints have also been made that trees in the area have been affected or have died, some having been stunted. This spraying occurred in an effort by a Government department to control African daisy (I am not confusing that with Australian daisy, which is another problem). People are worried and are asking what the Government will do next. I ask what it has done to check the chemicals and methods used, not only before the programme commenced but more particularly since private citizens have complained. I ask the Government to check its procedures carefully and to alter them if any reputable officer in this field has the slightest doubt about the chemical or the method used. Most members know that previously the method used was to lay baits, and that method was quite successful.

A different method is being adopted now regarding fruit. Whereas previously fruit affected had to be destroyed, now it cannot be moved out of the area. That is an

administrative matter to which I do not wish to refer particularly, but I do draw attention to the spray. The Government owes it to the people of this State to make a statement clarifying the matter so that they can be assured about what is being done. An assurance should be given particularly to people who are in the area affected by the Government's proclamations and people in other areas that have been sprayed, such as Cleland reserve.

Apparently, two Ministers are responsible for this spraying work (the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Environment and Conservation), and I ask the Minister of Environment and Conservation to say in this House and publicly what the true position is. He owes it not only to this House but to all the people of this State who rightly and genuinely believe that much damage is being caused to properties, people and animals.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to raise a matter of the greatest importance, and I raise it at the invitation of the Premier given when he gagged the debate on the motion for adjournment moved by my colleague the member for Goyder recently. That matter is the relationship of trade unions and the trade union movement to the general community. I very much regret that neither the Premier nor the Minister of Environment and Conservation is in the Chamber to listen to me, because I may say something about both of them. I give Government members who are present notice of that. If they want to get the Premier and the Minister into the Chamber, this is the opportunity to do so.

I do not blame the Premier and the Minister for not having been in the Chamber so far in this debate: doubtless, the matters that the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have raised were of some importance to those members, but I do not consider that they were as significant as the matter that I will refer to, because that matter goes to the fundamental rights of members of this community and the fundamental role of this Parliament. What happened recently in this House was an absolute disgrace on the part of the Government, and I am merely doing what I can to make up for that disgrace by responding to the invitation that the Premier gave me when he told me that I would have an opportunity during this debate to carry on the debate begun by the member for Goyder. I have termed that a disgrace, and it was. It was in line with the whole history of the actions in this matter over the past few months by the Australian Labor Party and the State Government. The policy has been intended to stifle debate and to prevent discussion in the community, in the hope that the issue of trade union affairs will die and that the Government will be able to avoid any possible embarrassment. People are asking (and I ask now) what are the Labor Party and the trade union movement, on which it relies, trying to hide. Why is everything being done in this place and elsewhere to prevent a debate and discussion on these matters?

Early this year there were alarming actions, arising from quarrels and, indeed, violence in certain trade unions in this State. Then, I think in January, the member for Goyder announced that, as a result of these activities and other information that he had been given over the years, he intended to introduce a Bill dealing with the accounts of trade unions. That was announced after private members' business had come to a close, according to the Government, for this session. I point out to the Premier and to other members opposite that the immediate importance of this matter had not arisen when private members' business was closed off.

When the House met on February 19, the member for Goyder immediately tried to get the matter before the House, and the Government and the Liberal and Country League did everything they could to block discussion on this matter here. We had the extraordinary spectacle of the House being adjourned at 3.36 p.m., or one hour 36 minutes after we had met, on the first day on which the House had sat for about 2½ months. Those of us who are in this corner opposed the adjournment and every member of the L.C.L. who was present in the House supported the Government to adjourn the House, when there was plenty of business on the Notice Paper. Not only was notice of the Bill to be introduced by the member for Goyder set out on the Notice Paper: there was also on it business that L.C.L. members had had on it for a long time.

The Government and the L.C.L. preferred to block the member for Goyder, even though it meant that the L.C.L. members could not get to their own business. This shameful spectacle earned the criticism and condemnation of everyone in the community. One of the three functions of Parliament is to act as a forum of discussion on matters of controversy in the community, and that was precisely what the member for Goyder wanted to do. I hope no member will suggest that I am the only one saying these things and that I am wrong in saying that there was wide-spread protest throughout the community. The editorial in the *Advertiser* next day commenting on this matter states, in part:

The first week of the resumed session of State Parliament has left many people with an uneasy feeling that a member who wants to air what he claims to be a matter of public importance can be prevented from doing so. This is not literally so, as the Premier has pointed out in referring to Mr. Steele Hall's so far abortive effort to reveal in the House what he alleges have been malpractices in union affairs. But the impression that Mr. Hall has been gagged, if not improperly then at least unwisely, persists. The writer then continued to canvass the matters I have raised, including the time of adjournment, and dealt with the action on the following day when the member for Goyder tried to suspend Standing Orders. At least the Liberal and Country League had been kicked into supporting us by public opinion, but Standing Orders, which would have allowed the honourable member to introduce the Bill that day, were not suspended by the action of the Government. The editorial states:

If the Government's attitude was unjustifiable, as well as politically inept, the L.C.L. Opposition's was doubly so on Wednesday. It was a desperately weak effort of Dr. Eastick's to join in warding off an issue which might conceivably have caused the Government serious embarrassment on the ground that his Party had no information on it. Anyone who had read or listened to Mr. Hall's public statements in recent weeks knew what it was about. The L.C.L.'s support for the adjournment motion was not decisive, and in any case its attitude was reversed yesterday . . .

That was week one of this present sitting, with the Government desperately trying to prevent any debate on this matter in the House. I must refer to one other comment, which may have had some influence on the L.C.L. Mr. Stewart Cockburn, who is not known as a supporter of the Liberal Movement, during his daily news commentary awarded to the Leader of the Opposition the Order of the Blind Bat for his action in supporting the Government and thus denying the Liberal Movement the chance to have the matters brought into the House. However, at least public criticism had done one thing; we knew by the time the next week's sitting had begun that the L.C.L. would put some effort into supporting us in an urgency motion, and that occurred on Tuesday,

February 26. The member for Goyder spoke in the House for about 50 minutes and raised several issues of the gravest kind. Whatever one may think about the member for Goyder and what he said, there can be no denial of the fact that they were the gravest possible issues. The honourable member raised them in this House, but there has been no denial here, or anywhere else, of any of them. However, what happened on that day? Under Standing Orders the time for the urgency debate ran out when the member for Goyder sat down. The Government gagged the debate and would not allow anyone except the Premier to speak to it. We know that the Premier has directed that no-one but he is to deal with these matters. That was the first occasion on which we saw this happen.

Mr. Payne: You have a fantastic imagination.

Mr. Keneally: Who told you that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall be glad to hear the member for Mitchell and the member for Stuart speak in this debate on these matters if they will dare to speak. That is my challenge. Government members should not interject but should stand up and give their side (or their Party's side) in this Chamber. I will bet that they do not: I will bet that we do not hear one word from either of those gentlemen, or from any lady or gentleman on that side. I opposed the suspension of Standing Orders when I knew that the Premier alone was to reply. I asked him if there would be a chance during this session for these matters to be ventilated in the House, and he refused to give any such undertaking. Again, we had the situation of an overwhelming defeat for those of us who wanted the debate to continue, not necessarily on that day but at some time during this session.

I express my appreciation to the three L.C.L. members who had the guts to support the member for Goyder, the member for Flinders, and me. If the member for Bragg has forgotten who they were, I will remind him: they were his colleagues the member for Glenelg, the member for Mallee, and the member for Rocky River. They all voted with us but the other L.C.L. members obediently crossed the floor and voted with the Government. The Premier replied to the member for Goyder, but said not one thing in denial of the challenges and allegations that the honourable member had brought to the House. He poured contempt and ridicule on the honourable member and condemned him for what he had done, but he did not deny one thing. The irony of the whole afternoon was that the member for Goyder in his speech had referred to a Minister on the front bench, but that Minister was gagged in this place and was not then (nor has he since been) given the chance to reply to what the member for Goyder said. I will say something more later about what was said outside the House, but one would think that, if there were answers to the charges by the member for Goyder, or certainly if there were any against any member of this House, that member would be the first to rise and rebut the charges. Not on your life! The Minister of Environment and Conservation has not said one word in this place on the matter, and he voted obediently to gag the debate and rob himself of the chance to speak.

Mr. Keneally: What are you suggesting?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In reply to the honourable member, I invite the Minister to do what I am doing and reply in this debate to what was said by the member for Goyder. The Premier said that this was the chance to do so, but I will wager that the Minister does not

do it, although he should do it. However, the Minister said something outside the House.

Mr. Payne: This is more than you did: you haven't said anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is trying to put me off.

Mr. Payne: No, I am not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Dicken you are not! Let me quote what the Minister said outside the House, I believe to the intense annoyance and anger of his Leader.

Mr. Payne: You have some funny beliefs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do you deny that I am right?

Mr. Keneally: You were wrong yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then deny that I am wrong now! It seems that I will get no denial now, but Government members want to go off on something else. The Minister of Environment and Conservation is reported in the *Advertiser* next day as having made statements outside the House about this matter. Let the Minister deny the accuracy of that report if he wishes, because it states:

Mr. Broomhill said outside the House last night he was very concerned, and resented the allegations by Mr. Hall. "The facts are that in the late 1960's Federal officers of the M.W.U. were called to Adelaide by the State executive of the union to inquire into certain accounting aspects of the union," Mr. Broomhill said. "As a result an officer of the union did resign and repaid a sum of money."

"I considered at the time—as did all members of the union executive—that the matter had been satisfactorily dealt with to the benefit of the members."

If that is not confirmation of what the member for Goyder said in this House, I do not know what is. But let the Minister, now that he has the opportunity to do so, refute it if he wants, because this is the place to do it. He will not, I am sure. The *Advertiser* also had something to say after the member for Goyder had spoken, and I intend to refer to that so that no member will suggest it is only the member for Goyder and I who want anything done about this. The *Advertiser* is not usually given to expressing a firm opinion in our favour, but on the next day, February 27, it contains the following:

Yesterday, at last, the Liberal Movement leader, Mr. Hall, had his opportunity to give details of his allegations of malpractices in the financial affairs of some South Australian Unions.

Mr. Keneally: And failed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me continue. Let us hear what someone else thought about the member for Goyder's speech. The article continues:

The allegations he makes are serious. He presents an appalling picture of repeated acts of misappropriation and embezzlement of the funds of some unions. He claims also that when such cases arise they are invariably settled without resort to prosecutions under the law of the land. These are disturbing allegations and they require further investigation by the appropriate authorities. They are certainly not satisfactorily disposed of simply by the sort of outraged response which they drew yesterday from the Premier. It is not a sufficient answer . . . The matter cannot be allowed to rest here.

I, for one, do not intend to let it rest. The editorial continues:

It is, on the face of it, too alarming to be brushed off lightly. The Government—

and I am glad that the Minister of Labour and Industry is interjecting now: as he is the sole Minister in the House, let him listen to this—

The Government owes a duty to the public to cause further inquiries to be made, to authorize prosecutions if they appear warranted and to consider whether the incidents alleged by Mr. Hall point to the need for any change in the law.

Yet what answer did I get to a Question on Notice last Thursday when I asked what action, if any, the Government proposed to take? It was, "None as a Government." That is the only thing the Government can say, yet the Premier himself has admitted outside the House that there is a good deal, or at least something, in what the honourable member said.

Mr. Payne: I'm glad you qualified that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me go through a transcript of an interview he did with Mr. Michael Drewer on *This Day Tonight*.

Mr. Payne: Don't take bits of it out; put it all in.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is quite welcome to all of it if he wants it, but I do not intend to read all of it. If you want to speak to the debate you can have it when I am finished.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must refer to the honourable member as the member for Mitchell.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The transcript reads as follows:

MIKE: You're quite satisfied that there is no substance in any of the allegations that Mr. Hall made?

DUNSTAN: No, I don't say that. I don't say that, in relation to one particular union which he mentioned, there may not have been some fiddling of the books, or some unsatisfactory accounting. But what he is saying is that the union executive concerned, in deciding to leave the person concerned in a position where he could pay back some of the money, rather than send him to gaol, when they wouldn't get any of their money back for the members, they were being quite wrong in their union management. Now, I don't think that that is a proper allegation.

He then went on to another point. The member for Mitchell may have this. In fact, I will give it to him now, so that he may speak next in this debate, and try to rebut anything I have said. The same tactic of trying to avoid this issue has been used ever since, but not one of the allegations has been denied either in this House or outside of it. There has been a consistent refusal by the Australian Labor Party to have the matters ventilated at all, and that is the most eloquent confirmation we could have that there is a lot in what the member for Goyder says: otherwise, they would be the first ones on their feet to deny it. There could not be any more eloquent confirmation of what he said than their fear of having the matters debated in this House, where they should be debated. They are going to see, if they can, that these matters are never ventilated in this House, because I believe they are afraid of what will come out.

This part of the session has so far been an absolute washout; we have had three weeks of sitting and hardly any work has been done. All we have had in these three weeks has been a determined effort of the Government, by adjourning the house early, to see that these matters were not raised. We have found out today that the House will sit for only another three weeks, until March 28, two weeks before Easter. That is two weeks earlier than we have adjourned in the past. Why cannot we go on at least for another week after that date to deal with private members' business on the Notice Paper, the first item of which is the Bill of the member for Goyder. There is no reason that I know of why we should not sit. I am willing to come in and sit here and I hope that other members on this side are.

Mr. Keneally: Where were you last night?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will tell the honourable member where I was last night. There is no concealment of that. I was with the Army last night. I ask whether the honourable member was here last night. As far as I know, the House did not sit last night.

Mr. Hall: He didn't even know it wasn't sitting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. Why cannot we go on for a little longer and deal with these matters? I will listen with great interest to the member for Mitchell; I have given him the information so that he can check what I have said today if he wants. Why cannot we get from members opposite some denial of what has been said? Why cannot we have a debate on these matters? There is plenty of time to debate these matters if the Parliament gets up at the usual time of the year, that is, just before Easter. What is the Government trying to hide? The irresistible conclusion must be that it has something to hide and it is not willing to have these matters dealt with in this House.

I got up to mention these matters in this debate because of the invitation of the Premier to do so, and to ask two things. First, I ask that time be given to debate the Bill that the member for Goyder wishes to bring in, which is a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and, secondly, that there be a public inquiry at least into the affairs of the four unions which were mentioned by the member for Goyder, so that they will have an opportunity, if they want it, to clear themselves of what he says. Let me remind the Minister of Labour and Industry and members opposite which unions were mentioned: the Storemen and Packers Union, the builders laborers federation, the Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Australian Government Workers Association.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Mitcham that he has mentioned a certain trade union. As far as I am aware, it is *sub judice* because there is a case before the Criminal Court involving one official of the union. Therefore, any reference at any stage to the union involved in the matter now before the Criminal Court is *sub judice*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly will not argue with you, Sir, on that matter. I did no more than remind honourable members of the names of the unions referred to last week by the member for Goyder; I do not intend to take it further.

The SPEAKER: Order! It does not matter whether or not the honourable member wants to dispute this question. At the time this subject was previously before the House, there was no case before the Criminal Court involving this union. I have been informed that there is now a case before the Criminal Court in which the union is involved. At the time that case commenced, the matter became *sub judice*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is nothing more I want to say on that matter anyway; I thought I had made that clear. In conclusion, I shall repeat my requests. I ask, first, that time be given (now that we know we have plenty of time) for a debate in this House on the member for Goyder's Bill and an opportunity made available for it to go to another place, if it passes this House. Secondly, I ask that the Government institute an inquiry at least into the affairs of the unions named by the member for Goyder. As I have said, I believe these matters are of fundamental importance to this Parliament; they are the sort of thing we should be considering. Whether they hurt or not, it is our duty, as members of Parliament, to raise them here and have them ventilated; that is what we are here for.

I believe this is of great importance to the whole community. Perhaps the most significant issue in Western democracy today is the relationship of trade unions to the general community and particularly to the Government. Trade unions have now become so powerful that,

in the interests of the general community, they must accept scrutiny of their affairs. That is the crux of the whole matter. I know that, because they are dependent on the trade unions for their places in this House, members opposite will resist this scrutiny to the end, but I will not rest until there is a proper scrutiny of the affairs of trade unions, as there is a proper scrutiny of every other organization of similar magnitude and importance in this community.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I wish to refer to Hillcrest Hospital and to mental health services generally. On another motion such as this, I spoke at some length about the situation at the Glenside Hospital, stating that the buildings were so old that it was impossible adequately to rejuvenate them. They were relics of a bygone age when people who were mentally ill were locked away by themselves in little cubicles and cells, and, because of that and because of the architecture involved, the only solution was to knock the buildings down and build new ones. Now the matter of the Hillcrest Hospital and the replacement of Litchfield House has been raised publicly over the past few weeks. There is no question at all that, although the facilities at Hillcrest Hospital are not as old as those at the Glenside Hospital, they have been allowed to fall well below acceptable standards for general hospital accommodation, and they are quite unsatisfactory.

I shall quote from comments that have been made available by members of the staff of the hospital. It is pointed out that the hospital admits patients from half the northern area of the State, which has a population of about 300 000 people. Members of the staff express their disappointment at the fact that the new outpatient day centre and admission ward that had been announced will not be built this year. They say that the conditions at present are deplorable. These comments continue:

At present there is no nursery at all in this ward. An 11-day-old baby, whose mother is sick, is being kept in a doctor's office, bathed in the tiny general surgery, its formula being prepared in this poor setting, and kept in the same environment as 40 other ladies. Under these conditions, the nurses are attempting to encourage the mother to care for her baby. At times there have been three mothers with new babies in this ward with no facilities.

One aspect associated with this form of mental illness is that immediately after the baby is born it is important for the mother to look after the baby and to keep in close contact with her baby as far as possible. Yet, under these conditions, it is almost impossible for her to do that. The comments continue:

A doctor's office has to be used as a nursery, and we have only one other office. If two doctors wish to interview patients concurrently, one doctor has to use a bedroom for examinations and interviews. This ward is 40 years old, was not built for acute psychiatric population but built for overflow of long-stay patients from Glenside to work on the hospital farm. It has had no renovations, except painting, some new floor covering and one bathroom updated in all that time. There is no sitting room for patients to see their visitors privately, there is a small day-room each end of the ward, both of which are naturally over-crowded. Patients and their visitors must vie with music and a regular din in an effort to carry on a private conversation.

The dining-rooms are large enough to accommodate only 72 patients, yet on five days a week at mid-day, we must cater for industrial therapy patients, day patients, plus extra ward patients, which amount to about 20 extra in addition to the patients who occupy the 80 beds of the ward. The small pantry squashed between the dining-room is used for serving up the meals and due to lack of space patients must queue along the corridor whilst waiting to collect their meals.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Did you ever have a look through Parkside Hospital during the term of office of the Liberal Government?

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister probably does not realize that I was a visiting medical officer at Parkside in the old days, and I know exactly what he is talking about. I know that place far better than he will ever know it, I hope. I am not in any way excusing the situation at that time. However, what Government was in power at a certain time is not the point: the present situation is what is important. The comments continue:

This same pantry is equipped with only one sink and no dishwasher, and one needs no imagination to realize the difficulties experienced by the pantry maid and patients in washing up three times a day. Neither end of the ward has a drive-in entrance, and ambulances and other necessary vehicles have to park at the back door amidst dustbins and laundry bags in order to admit patients, what a reassuring sight for a frightened and mentally sick person!

Litchfield House "B" (men's section), has to use a converted store room as a surgery, with no windows and no handbasin. To do dressings (sterile procedure?) and dispense medication under these conditions is absolutely appalling. Staff facilities are as archaic and in the same state as when the ward was built. One toilet at each end measuring 9ft. x 4ft. containing toilet pan, one elderly wash basin (the same goes for the plumbing) and a few wooden pegs on which to hang capes, coats, handbags, etc., for mixed staff, nurses, doctors, social workers, physios, domestics, and anyone else who may be employed in this ward. One must keep one's keys in the lock as there is no indicator of occupancy on the door. As there are no facilities for staff to have morning and afternoon tea, they must use the patients dining-room for this purpose.

The patients have no laundry, and use the downstairs bathroom (still as it was 40 years ago apart from a coat of paint) for washing their clothes, and must do their ironing in the upstairs dormitory corridor. We are endeavouring to employ the latest methods in psychiatric care and treatment, including groups—

I take it that refers to group therapy—

but are at a grave disadvantage as these groups have to be spread throughout the hospital wherever one can find the room. How can any treatment have maximum benefit for the patients when the conditions under which they receive treatment are so deplorable? The staff ask: what does one tell patients when they criticize the hospital regarding the appalling conditions and wondering why nothing is being done? Does one tell them that it appears the Government does not feel these patients warrant the same attention as the patients at Glenside Hospital? We are disappointed, disillusioned, and feel we have been neglected and let down by the South Australian Government, and strongly feel that the money allocated to Glenside should have been shared with us.

That has been signed by the staff of Litchfield House, Hillcrest Hospital. I do not believe that that state of affairs has changed for some time. It seems that nothing but promises have been made. On April 10, 1973, representatives of the Public Service Association and the Australian Government Workers Association comprised a deputation to the Minister of Health (Mr. Banfield) following staff protests at conditions at the hospital. At their meeting with Mr. Banfield and the Director-General of Medical Services (Dr. B. J. Shea), the Minister acknowledged that the Northfield wards needed immediate attention. Mr. Banfield said he hoped that redevelopment of the wards would begin next year. However, because of the expenditure required for Flinders Medical Centre, he said that it might not be possible to make any substantial progress until 1976. The general secretaries, in a joint statement, said that they had asked the Minister to inform them of the exact nature of the Government's plans for Northfield wards within the next three weeks so that meetings of members could be told of progress. At a

staff meeting in February about 150 sisters, nurses and domestics employed at the wards said that floors were uneven, plaster and paint were flaking from walls and ceilings, and electrical wiring was in danger of being overloaded. Claims for redevelopment of the wards had been constantly by-passed in favour of other projects.

I wonder why it is so necessary for the staff to draw attention to these conditions. It is always the staff members who become so appalled, fed up and disgusted with the conditions obtaining and who must draw attention to those conditions publicly. Certainly, these conditions cannot be unknown: they must be known to the Minister and the Cabinet, and I cannot understand why action is not taken. In explaining the Loan Estimates for 1973-74 the Treasurer said that \$408 000 was required to complete work on the upgrading of various wards and dayrooms for severely retarded adult patients at the Hillcrest Hospital, to begin construction of a new admission ward and outpatients department, and to carry out major alterations to the existing administration building. That is a firm proposal. It was not like the "certain other projects" referred to later on the same page. In this respect, I refer to the redevelopment of the Glenside Hospital at a total estimated cost of \$4 000 000, with the first stage requiring an expenditure of \$36 000, and to the major development of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Northfield wards, in three stages. The Treasurer stated that these projects had not been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, and that no provision had been made in the Loan Estimates for their financing. The Opposition could not see why those projects were included in the Treasurer's statement.

Mr. Jennings: The Northfield wards project has been referred to the committee. We are going out there next Tuesday.

Dr. TONKIN: I am merely quoting from the document presented to the House by the Treasurer. I am pleased to hear the member for Ross Smith say that the Public Works Committee is currently investigating that project. However, that was not the case when the Loan Estimates were presented. The position has been completely reversed. Now, the Northfield wards project is to be investigated but the Hillcrest Hospital project, which was a firm project previously, has been deferred. Why? This is what the Opposition cannot ascertain.

Mr. Rodda: There's not enough money to go around.

Dr. TONKIN: The trouble is that the Government has squandered the money that it has had.

Mr. Jennings: How?

Dr. TONKIN: I will come to that. It is all very well for the Government to blame preceding Administrations for the lack of hospitals and mental health institutions, but it is not without blame. The Hillcrest project was given a higher priority than the Northfield wards initially, but now one sees what the situation really is. The staff has been told that the money is not to be spent. On February 25 they took public action and said, among other things, that the planned building with 38 to 42 beds and facilities for effective treatment of patients was urgently needed to replace the hospital's outdated Litchfield House, which admits about 600 patients a year. A report headed "Nursing staff seeks action on 'archaic' hospital" in the *Advertiser* of February 25 states:

Staff at the Hillcrest Hospital were told last week of the Government's decision to defer construction of the new \$700 000 building to replace Litchfield House. Nurse Barbara Wieland, the spokesman for the nurses group, said last night, "Despite the obvious need, the Government has decided to defer construction of the new admission ward outpatient block in favour of renovation of long-stay

wards at the Glenside Psychiatric Hospital. The staff here would not deny that there is also a great need for renovation of some existing wards at Glenside, but we disagree that this should take priority over the needs of the acute psychiatric population at the Hillcrest Hospital's region."

The Minister of Health reacted by supporting demands for upgrading Hillcrest Psychiatric Hospital and earned himself many first-class marks in so doing. It was only when we got further on and he said that he did not have the money to do anything about it that we realized his hands were tied. However, we must give him credit for showing some concern about the situation. I think that he would perhaps have liked to do something about it but the money was not available. I refer now to a report in the *Advertiser* of February 26 headed "No Government funds for Hillcrest", part of which is as follows:

Mr. Banfield inspected Hillcrest yesterday morning. "I am very concerned about it", he said. "But we had only so much money and I had to make a decision between works at Glenside and Hillcrest. I came down on the side of Glenside." Mr. Banfield said it would take between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000 to bring Hillcrest to a satisfactory standard. More than \$750 000 had been earmarked for the hospital, and \$200 000 was being spent on upgrading bathrooms and lavatories in wards one, two and six. There were plans to spend a further \$500 000 on conversion of the administration building, a nurses training school, improvements to bathrooms and lavatories in ward four at Litchfield House, and room dividers in wards one, two and six. "The Government has detailed the urgent need for capital funds to replace obsolete wards in both Hillcrest and Glenside Hospitals in an approach to the Hospitals and Health Services Commission of the Federal Government. We have asked for a \$60 000 000 grant for hospital buildings in South Australia", he said.

Here we go again: off to the Commonwealth Government. The fact that an article in the *Advertiser* written by Bernard Boucher backed up everything that members of the staff had said in their various letters convinced the public that there was something badly wrong at Hillcrest. He confirmed everything the staff had said. However, it is to the Minister's credit that he allowed members of the media to inspect the hospital with him. At least he is not backing away from the problem. My complaint is that the Government is doing nothing about it. The announcement that this project would be deferred was particularly ill timed. It was made concurrently with another announcement that a large sum, considerably greater than that spent last year, was to be spent on grants to the arts. I do not think this went down very well with the public, and it certainly did not go down well with the Opposition. At this stage the *News* editorial reflected the attitude of most people on this matter. I will read it because it sums up the whole situation fairly well. It is as follows:

It is obvious that the facilities at Hillcrest Psychiatric Hospital badly need upgrading. The doctors, staff and nurses working there are outspoken against the depressing and appallingly outmoded conditions. Patients who still need treatment are leaving the hospital because they cannot tolerate the conditions. The Health Minister (Mr. Banfield) himself says he is "very concerned" about it all. He wants to update the place but says he just doesn't have the money at the moment to do anything about it.

Altogether, it is an extraordinary situation. Surely there are other avenues of Government spending which could be curbed to make sure this important hospital work is carried out quickly. The Government has just announced an arts grant of \$789 900. Couldn't this wait, and the money be put to helping Hillcrest out of its dilemma? The arts grant is precisely \$89 900 more than the cost of a replacement project for Hillcrest's Litchfield House, which has been deferred indefinitely in favour of improvements to Glenside Psychiatric Hospital. Where so many people's health is involved the Government should have a good look at its spending priorities.

I agree that the Government should so consider its spending priorities. Although I understand that money from general revenue cannot be applied to capital works, perhaps there is some way in which this could be done. Following this announcement, the Premier was quick to defend the Government's action. A press report states:

Cutting expenditure on the arts in South Australia to allow urgent rebuilding work at Hillcrest Hospital was out of the question, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said today. We have an overall programme for both health and hospitals and the arts, he said. We have given health, hospitals and education a high priority in our Budget allocation, but we have to spend money in other areas. If the argument was followed through logically, we would not have museums or art galleries in South Australia. The Government regrets the situation at Hillcrest but the work programme has only been deferred, Mr. Dunstan said.

It seems to keep on being deferred, and it seems to have no claim on the priority list. The staff of the hospital and the people generally are becoming more and more concerned about that. Considering this Government's record, who knows whether it will be deferred next year? What will be more important next year? When will Hillcrest be attended to? I asked a Question on Notice of the Premier about the relative priorities of building projects in South Australia, and in his reply last Tuesday the Premier said:

Building projects in South Australia are normally undertaken from Loan funds.

Because the word "normally" is used, I assume that building projects may be undertaken in some other way, and I should be grateful to hear about it if that can be done. The people of South Australia, including those at Litchfield House, also would be grateful. In his reply, the Premier also said:

In determining priorities in relation to the expenditure of moneys from Loan funds, the major essential things are taken first.

That is fair enough. Later in the reply, the Premier said:

Grants to the performing arts of South Australia are part of the Revenue Budget. Money is not expended normally from this source for major building projects.

Again, presumably there is some abnormal situation in which that money can be spent for major building projects. The Premier also said in his reply:

Priorities are determined on the view of the Government as to the relative importance of spending . . . limitation of Loan funds has necessitated a close examination of each project in accordance with priorities determined as in 2 above.

The reference to what is stated in paragraph 2 of the reply is a reference to relative priorities for individual hospital building projects being established on the basis of service needs and the physical condition of existing buildings. The Premier's reply also states:

In the case of the two projects mentioned, namely, Litchfield House at Hillcrest and the new locker room at Royal Adelaide Hospital, which were considered to be of equal priority, the determining factor was the extent of the funds required for the work, which were \$825 000 for Litchfield House compared to \$84 000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

I cannot imagine how the Government could consider the provision of a locker room in a relatively new, up-to-date and modern building to be of equal priority to the replacement of Litchfield House at Hillcrest. It seems to me that the Government is being less than honest and that it really means that it did not have the money for the hospital. How can the Government say the two projects are of equal priority? What a load of codswallop!

I consider that it is necessary to ensure some sort of urgent action on the facilities at Hillcrest, but it may

be too late to do it in the current financial year. The increase in the cost of Flinders Medical Centre certainly will take up more money, and that must have absolute priority. It is certainly too late to reallocate funds that have been spent on Modbury Hospital, where about \$12 000 000 has been spent on an over-sized hospital that is ahead of its time. That hospital was built for the reason that it would provide training for medical students and nurses, but I wonder just how much training of medical students is going on there.

Those funds could have been diverted, perhaps, towards speeding up completion of Flinders Medical Centre. If that could not have been done, perhaps part of the funds would have been better spent on upgrading facilities at Hillcrest and Glenside. All that the Modbury area needed was a community-type hospital, with facilities for enlarging it as the need became apparent. We did not need the full-scale development that is there now. I still maintain that that hospital was built primarily for political purposes, to satisfy a political promise, and to further the political career of a member of this House. In the reply to the Question on Notice to which I have referred, the Premier also stated:

The suggestion that a building project in hospitals should be weighed against current expenditure for the performing arts and/or other areas of art expenditure assumes that we would always say that expenditure on hospitals or schools would exclude expenditure on art galleries, public libraries, museums, or performing arts.

In other words (and this is the crunch line), we would have a completely unbalanced community. I maintain that we will have a completely unbalanced community if we do not upgrade our mental health services, and do it quickly.

Mr. Wells: Why didn't your Liberal Government do it in its 32 years?

Dr. TONKIN: I do not have a crystal ball.

Mr. Millhouse: Be honest. We all have to stand up to what wasn't done.

Dr. TONKIN: I freely admit that it was not done. I do not know why it was not done, but I want to know why it is not being done now. The statement that we will have a completely unbalanced community can be applied to the two regions north and south of the Torrens River, served respectively by Hillcrest Hospital and Glenside Hospital. If we are not careful, the situation will certainly lead to a state of imbalance with the facilities available. We must balance Hillcrest and Glenside.

Preferably, we should undertake rejuvenation and replacement, where necessary, of both at the same time. With the increasing stress and strain of life and our way of modern life, the need for increased mental health services is escalating rapidly. I support the arts, as I believe many other people do, despite the statement apparently made last evening. However, I also consider that priorities must be established, and the people in our community would be willing to do with a little less of the arts if they considered that the money would benefit unfortunate people who needed help and treatment for mental illness. The Government's attitude should reflect the same concern as members of the public show when the Government allocates priorities for spending. I understand that it is not possible to apply, from the general revenue, funds for capital works. Perhaps it should be made possible. I believe that the unbalanced community referred to by the Premier in reply to my question will become a reality if mental health services are not continually upgraded at a realistic rate.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I thought that the speech of the member for Mitcham this afternoon was a commendable one when he drew members' attention to the Government's failure to stand up to its Parliamentary responsibility to clear up charges made in this House. The only response we have had is one that amounts to intimidation by the Government and of getting the names of witnesses made public so that they can be prosecuted. I agree with the member for Mitcham's contention that there should be a public inquiry into the allegations made in this House so that people's reputations can stand or fall as a result of that inquiry.

Mr. Wright: Why don't you go to the police?

Mr. HALL: The member for Adelaide should know that many of the relevant facts have been in the hands of the Police Department since last October, and the question is why they have not been acted on. There should be an inquiry into this matter, and also a further inquiry as a Royal Commission into the freedom of the individual in the industrial community in South Australia. We need a Royal Commission at which witnesses cannot be intimidated by the type of response that has come from the Government in this House, and at which people will be able to produce facts free from that sort of intimidation.

Further, the Minister of Labour and Industry should resign as a Minister (and I call on him to do so) because not only has he failed to protect individuals in the industrial community: he has also deliberately misled this House and those in the community who read or listen to the debates in this House. If an additional reason is needed, it would be the conduct of the Minister and of Government affairs in his District of Port Pirie, the on-and-off port. Government members should travel to Port Pirie now and hear what the public thinks of the Government's failure to live up to the promises of the Government as pronounced by various Ministers. However, that is a local matter, and I refer to the serious matter of the Minister's misleading this House and the public.

On February 20, 1974, following information personally put to me that several truck operators carting bricks from the brick-producing industry to the building industry had been forced to join the Transport Workers Union, I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry a question. It was a reasonably lengthy explanation, and the *Hansard* report of the exchange is as follows:

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: I shall have no difficulty in getting out of it. It has nothing to do with me because—

Mr. Millhouse: You're going to slide out of it that way, are you?

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: —it is a matter between the union and its members. If the honourable member wants the facts I will take up the matter with the union, but it is a matter between the union and its member.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you approve?

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: Of course I approve of people joining a union.

Mr. Hall: Under those circumstances?

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: I am not anti-union, as is the honourable member.

The Minister went back on the same old lame response that, because one digs up something crooked, one must be against the organization, but nothing could be further from the truth. I remind the Minister and Government members of the substantial response from the community, including members of trade unions, approving my moves in this House to help clean up their organizations. They seemed to suggest that this Government would not act on their behalf. However, the Minister goes further because he is deliberately misleading the public. In his reply he said that he would take up the matter with the union.

I asked him a further question yesterday, and the report in *Hansard* is as follows:

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry give me the report he promised me concerning the intimidatory tactics used to force tip-truck owner-drivers to join the Transport Workers Union? The Minister will recall the answer he gave me previously in which he promised to give me that report.

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: I thought I answered the honourable member's previous question satisfactorily when he asked it and when I said that this was a matter between the parties concerned and the unions. I understand that they are now all members of the union and that—

Mr. Hall: Of course they are!

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: —they were not forced to join the union.

That is deceitful and untrue.

Mr. Millhouse: And Government members know it.

Mr. HALL: What is at stake is a person's liberty and freedom in this community: citizens of totalitarian communities do not have freedom and liberty, nor do people at the hands of this Government. It seems that the Minister of Labour and Industry will not protect people. He is bringing South Australian society closer and closer to a totalitarian organization, the sort of system that is so bitterly discussed in the media from time to time. The Minister said that these people were not forced to join a union. I had a telephone call this morning from a gentleman who gave his name, and I am sure the Minister would like to know it so that he could intimidate this person. He is a part-owner of a truck driven by a close relative, and was forced into the Transport Workers Union last July. He told me that at least three or four people in similar circumstances were forced into that union by straight-out intimidatory methods such as the following statement: "You will join the T.W.U. or, brother, you are out of business." If anyone contradicts that statement they would be telling an untruth.

Mr. Duncan: That's nothing but hearsay.

Mr. HALL: I challenge the Government to set up a Royal Commission in order to have members of the community come forward and say what they know without being troubled by intimidation. I want people to speak freely, and I do not know why Government members resent the fact that members of the community should be allowed to speak freely without intimidation. Why do they resent it? If these things are happening, let us discuss them in the open. I ask for the resignation of the Minister who sits there now and condones such totalitarian tactics.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: As long as the Government's Ministers, and this Minister in particular, hold their positions, we shall not be able to live in a free society, because they will do nothing about these matters. In addition to the call for a general inquiry into the four unions referred to previously, I call for a Royal Commission and for the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Industry. I said previously that there were other reasons in relation to the maladministration of Government affairs in the Minister's own city of Port Pirie, but it is generally recognized in the community that the Minister is not competent to hold his post. That is a well recognized fact in the industrial community in both unions and management in this State. The evidence is here in this House when he fails to protect in any way innocent people in the community. We shall have to wait and see what course this House will follow eventually on this matter. Certainly the matter will not end with this debate or with this session of Parliament, and Government members are naive if they think it will.

I leave that issue for the time in order to see what response the Government will give to a call for an inquiry

at which citizens can give information free from intimidation, both financial and physical, and we will see what response the Government will make to a call for freedom. Despite the letters organized in newspapers, there is an enormous body of opinion in South Australia that is deeply concerned about this matter, and that body of opinion grows daily while the Government delays taking any action.

I refer now to the tomato growers at Virginia, many of whom are not in good financial circumstances. They are involved in one of the most important parts of the vegetable-growing industry in South Australia. Some months ago they were subjected to damage to their glass-houses which was caused by a freak hailstorm. This caused hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage to about 180 growers. Following that storm, attempts have been made to ask the Government to assist the growers to enable them to bear the financial burden involved.

At first, those attempts were not successful. Two were made, one involving the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and one involving representatives of the industry. The Government's offer at that time was as follows: "Yes, we will lend money at something like bank interest to those who need it." That offer, however, was of no use to the growers. A public meeting was held in the Virginia hall, attended by over 100 people, at which I, along with other people, spoke. A deputation was taken to the Deputy Premier, who almost immediately promised assistance. His written promise of help was that growers would be able, if they needed assistance, to continue in business and would be able to get loans from a certain fund (I cannot remember which fund) standing to the credit of the Government, on the basis that for the first 12 months the loans would be interest-free and after that they would be subject to review.

It is some months since that damage was incurred, and many people have applied for assistance, but I understand that not one payment has been made by the Government to assist those Virginia tomato growers. The form they have to fill in is indescribably complicated. In fact, bank managers are telling them, "Do not bother to fill it in, it is too complicated." I know that the Government has refused to assist one grower because it says he has not enough security to back up a loan. I do not know what greater reason there could be for him to get a loan. Apparently, some growers who have a little money put aside are told they have too much to qualify for a loan. Whom on earth is the Government going to help if it is to adopt this penalizing attitude to producers in the Virginia area?

The promise was made by the Deputy Premier and avidly listened to by the Virginia growers, but it turned out to be a lot of puff, as it is too hard to get the assistance. I am told authoritatively by one person involved in the industry at Virginia that some people, because of the damage, have gone out of business, and some of them are receiving social service benefits, thus costing the Government money, because they could not get financial assistance to cope with the damage caused by the hailstorm. It is an appalling situation that a Minister should have the gall (as the member for Mitcham often says, and most effectively, too) to make an open-handed promise like that and not carry it out.

Mr. Payne: Have you made representations on their behalf?

Mr. HALL: I was surprised at the Deputy Premier, who I thought was made of sterner stuff. There are some of his colleagues at whom I would not be surprised, but not the Deputy Premier. I speak on this matter because it is of great importance to those growers. I wonder just how badly affected one has to be to get help from

a Government whose assistance fund is overflowing: it is in credit. The Government does not have to go to the Commonwealth Government to get the money; it does not have to get a subvention passed by that Government, as the money is there for allocation.

Mr. Payne: Have you—

Mr. HALL: If the member for Mitchell is to adopt this stupid attitude in this House, he will descend to the level of members of the Liberal and Country League, and that is saying something! We could get up and speak for hours on many things if Standing Orders permitted it in this debate. The Government will continue to try to get out of its responsibility as long as the Opposition is quiescent. I wonder whether the tide will ever turn so that the people will see revealed before them what sort of Government this is, so that eventually it can be defeated. Unless this Parliament can get an effective Opposition, this Government will go on and on and the freedoms in the community will continue to decrease. That will be the result if the present position in Parliament continues.

I have spoken briefly about two matters, one being the union challenge. It is the Government's challenge: it is not for us on this side. The Government should govern to give effect to administrative decisions. It has ignored this matter, and that is a good political tactic. I surmise it cannot afford the facts to come out and be made public. The member for Mitcham has given his view, which is a proper one. Government members are preventing the airing of views publicly. If they had wanted to demolish the member for Mitcham and me in this debate because of what we have said, there was an easy way to prove we were wrong, but not one member opposite, from the Premier downwards, would accept the challenge. I leave that challenge with the Government, where it belongs.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The member for Goyder finally got around to attacking the unions, although it took him a long time to get the right method of accomplishing that, under the Standing Orders of this House. He was acting like a novice in this House instead of like a member of many years standing. I consider that unions present the biggest problem in Australia today. I do not oppose them generally, but what the member for Goyder has brought forward is only chicken feed compared to the real harm the unions are doing. There are provisions in the Industrial Code for the books of unions to be audited, but the honourable member has not yet brought forward any clear or precise evidence of something that can be properly handled. What worries me about the unions is that, once one becomes a member of a union, it is the devil's own job to get out of it. There was the cruel case of a member of the transport union who was smashed up in an accident; the union knew it but brought him before the court four years later and sued him for his back payments.

If a person borrows money on hire-purchase and cannot pay it back, it means he is a criminal, yet that is what goes on in the unions. Privacy and the rights of the individual are dealt with in a Bill to be introduced, and I shall be interested to read what is in it because the unions are now interfering in things in which they have no concern or interest. What I object to most of all is picketing. There was a recent example of this with the Monier tile firm. The tiles were available and people had paid for them, but the unions put in a picket and said that the tiles could not go out. What business was that of the unions? What right had they to do that? I must

admit the Minister of Labour and Industry and other Ministers said, "It is a shocking thing, and we agree with you." I asked why they did not do something about it, and they said, "We would have strife".

What a gutless lot of people we have in Australia! When the freedoms and rights of people are being interfered with, people say that nothing can be done about it because certain people will kick up a row. Do members opposite say that it is right to picket or damage other people's property? I do not deny that unions have the right to go on strike. However, it is a different situation when essential commodities, such as food, are involved and when the people of Australia would suffer. Only a fortnight ago milk had to be poured down the drain because of a dispute involving a chap who wanted to play cricket, when he had an obligation to work. There is an Arbitration Court to settle disputes. When property is destroyed, the Government of the day, whether State or Commonwealth, is weak if it does not take action. Although unions have a right to go on strike, they do not have a right to destroy property in the process.

In certain circumstances, people are forced to join unions. In many cases a union organizer gets people to join a union, until ultimately a minority is left. These people have the right not to join a union if they do not want to do so, but great pressure is placed on them to join; they are told that they cannot work in that place unless they join the union. In such circumstances, it is hypocritical to introduce legislation relating to infringements against people's rights and other matters. How can that be reconciled with compulsory unionism? People are being pushed around, and the unions are taking political action. Surely, if democracy is to survive, the people elected to Parliament will have to make the decisions, not a pressure group or a minority group.

While the member for Bragg was speaking, there was an interjection to the effect that nothing had been done about hospitals 10 or 15 years ago. In those days we had not long recovered from the war and we were getting behind in production. There was a tremendous increase in migrants, who were badly needed to help develop the country. In the 1950's, at one stage there was a 50 per cent increase in the number of primary school students; that increase flowed through to the secondary schools. Therefore, great expenditure was necessary in providing schools during this period. Although primary school enrolments have dropped by 1 000 this year, there is still a problem in this area, but it is a small problem compared to the problem in earlier days. The Government should be able to cope with the present situation. However, we do not seem to be catching up in the housing field. Although unlimited money is not available, the Government does not have its priorities right.

Inflation has increased at a rapid rate. Previously, we have had to deal with inflation resulting from what happened to the prices of foodstuffs overseas. Naturally, this would increase the cost of living in any country. When people stopped producing lamb, it became scarce and the price increased. The price had become so low that it had caused people to stop producing and this, in turn, caused the price to go up because the product became scarce. Naturally we had inflation. Now, we are getting inflation of another type. The present Commonwealth Government came to office and increased all interest rates, with the effect that people could no longer afford to build houses or keep up their commitments. It was necessary for the Commonwealth to increase interest rates because it had spent much more than it was taking in. Pressure for goods was causing inflation. If that Govern-

ment really wanted to take money out of circulation, instead of increasing interest rates it should have floated short-term loans.

Although the increase in interest rates benefited wealthy people, it was harmful to the poorer section of the community. In addition, the Government got a return from the increased taxation paid by wealthy people who had benefited. However, working men suffered, because they could not dodge the effect of the increased interest rate. Increased taxation returns meant that the Commonwealth Government was hundreds of millions of dollars better off. The effect of these higher rates was that the cost of living increased, as well as the inflation rate. The Government was spending more money than it was taking in. I concede that, when the present Commonwealth Government came to office, it faced a difficult situation. Because of its promises, it had to spend money and budget for a deficit.

At the time of the last Commonwealth Budget, the stage in the economy had been reached where the demand for goods was greater than the supply available. Strong and wise action was necessary, with the amount of credit being restricted. Even though that Government had made promises, surely it should have acted in the best interests of Australia and attempted to stop inflation. If it thought that there was too much money around, it should have offered a short-term loan for three months at an interest rate of 10 per cent. If necessary, another loan could have been floated for another three months. However, that was not done, and costs are increasing in Australia, one reason being that in some cases it takes up to a year to build a house.

Mr. Wells: You should have told people this before.

Mr. McANANEY: For 20 years I have been saying what should be done. In the early 1950's, when Sir Robert Menzies was the Liberal Prime Minister, he imposed a wool tax. As the President of the Australian Primary Producers Union, I was asked by that organization to put a case to the Prime Minister that, if this money was held in reserve, we would go along with that. He said that that was the best idea he had heard, but his Government (and I make critical comments, irrespective of which Party is in Government) spent this money in its Budget, so that the Government, instead of the woolgrowers, spent the money.

Mr. Wells: That's Menzies for you!

Mr. McANANEY: I am getting stuck into the State and Commonwealth Governments because of the shocking standard of Government we now have. We had a Bill on sex discrimination, but the Education Department is showing sex discrimination against a man now. The most suitable person to be appointed a teacher aide at the Basket Range school was a male, but he could not be employed because of his sex. I had to obtain a decision from the Public Service Board on this matter. I always try to be fair to both sides. I encountered two or three teachers in the Hills who said to me, "You are the fairest member we have ever met. You agree if we are right, but you get stuck into us if we are not." I rang the Minister's Secretary twice, and I was referred to the Public Service Board office. Someone there said that there had been equal pay for men and women since January 1, and he could not understand what was going on. The school was without a teacher aide for about five weeks because a man had been discriminated against as a result of his sex. I hope that the Minister will come up with a good reply soon.

I am well aware of the Labor Party's attitude to costs. When the Commonwealth Government said that it would make money available for sewers, our Minister of Works

said, "We will grab it," irrespective of the fact that it was provided on the poorest terms and conditions of any loan offered to any State. The Minister said, "We must have sewers no matter how much they cost." However, the Victorian Liberal Government said that it would not borrow the money under such terms and conditions. For once, the Commonwealth Government agreed that the interest rate was too high, and reduced it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're talking about the Australian Government.

Mr. McANANEY: No, the Commonwealth Government. Victoria received its money at a lower rate of interest. I do not know whether later our Minister was given the same terms as Victoria was given. It is such an irresponsible attitude toward money that gets a Labor Government into so many problems. People are only as wealthy as the quantity of goods available for their use. This is where we are breaking down at present: labour and materials are in short supply and business people do not have to worry about being efficient: they can get anything they want. The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs is said to do such a wonderful job for the State. If anyone goes to him and shows that costs have risen, he grants an increase. The Prices Justification Tribunal does much the same thing. Like trade unions, which usually ask for twice what they expect to receive and which are happy to receive half of what they request, these people apply for more than they require. Once competition is eradicated, galloping inflation sets in, and that is what we have in the State today. Income tax has been increased during the inflationary period of the Commonwealth Labor Government's term of office.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you use the term "Commonwealth" instead of "Australia" because you prefer to regard yourself as British?

Mr. McANANEY: We are part of the British Commonwealth, but that does not mean that we are British.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is that more important than being Australian?

Mr. McANANEY: Having a great number of countries in a family unit is our only hope in the world today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're an Australian, are you?

Mr. McANANEY: I come from the greatest country of all, a country that has provided all the finest things in life, and we remain ourselves.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that, as this is a grievance debate, he must stick to his grievance.

Mr. McANANEY: I deplore what is taking place in Australia today and the fact that the unions are taking political action. That is wrong. Australia is a democratic country, but it will not continue to be one if there are pressure groups within it, whether they be trade unions, United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, or the Chamber of Commerce.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about Women's Lib?

Mr. McANANEY: We must get men's lib to protect the person at Basket Range. Women's Lib is a pressure group. The Women's Electoral Lobby wanted to know whether, if my Party got into Government (which they thought it would do), it would pay maternity allowances. I said, "Possibly, but not to only one sector of the population. All those entitled to it should receive it." Lobby members also asked whether my Party when in Government would provide child-minding centres. I said, "Yes, but women are going out to work and have more money than the housewife who stays at home." I said that they would have to pay for the centres. I got full marks! That is a different attitude from the Labor Party's attitude. We are becoming worse and worse as a result of handouts. We will reach a situation similar to the way in which England has developed. My youngest daughter, who is on a working holiday, is working in a tourist office in Piccadilly Circus. She was instructed to report for duty at 9.30 a.m., at which time she arrived for work, but the rest of the staff arrived at 10 a.m., and had tea at 10.30 a.m. We are coming to this sort of thing in Australia. People's liberties are being interfered with. The only way in which we can cure inflation and give the South Australian public better living standards will be to stop these practices. At times the Government looks guilty, particularly when one refers to picketing and other obnoxious practices that have developed. If young people do not have the courage to stand up for their rights, this country will deteriorate just as other countries have deteriorated.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

OMBUDSMAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LAND VALUERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WAREHOUSEMEN'S LIENS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 12, at 2 p.m.