

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 27, 1976.

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 2),
Supply (No. 1),
Off-shore Waters (Application of Laws).

GOVERNORS' PENSIONS BILL

The SPEAKER: His Excellency the Governor informs the House of Assembly that the Royal Assent was proclaimed to the Governors' Pensions Act on July 1, 1976.

SALARIES ADJUSTMENT (PUBLIC OFFICES) 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 of the Bill.

ABSENCE OF CLERK ASSISTANT

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, in accordance with Standing Order No. 31, I have appointed Mr. G. D. Mitchell (Second Clerk Assistant) to act as Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms during the temporary absence on account of illness of Mr. J. W. Hull (Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms).

PETITION: CAPITAL TAXATION

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 253 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House pass legislation to ease the burden of capital taxation and to make it apply equitably.

PETITION: FLOWERS

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 95 electors of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw permission to stage the production of *Flowers*.

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 27 electors of South Australia, praying that the House reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL presented a similar petition signed by 24 electors of South Australia.

Mr. HARRISON presented a similar petition signed by 200 electors of South Australia.

Mr. OLSON presented a similar petition signed by 59 electors of South Australia.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petition signed by 71 electors of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 29 electors of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 40 electors of South Australia.

Mr. WELLS presented a similar petition signed by 68 electors of South Australia.

Mr. EVANS presented a similar petition signed by 157 electors of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 27 electors of South Australia.

PETITION: DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 363 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to introduce legislation to bring dental technicians in South Australia into the same position as those in Victoria and Tasmania, in regard to registration, enabling them to deal directly with the public.

PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 1 689 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government not to reintroduce daylight saving in South Australia until the Government has a mandate by referendum.

PETITION: UNLEY TRAFFIC

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 329 residents of the city of Unley, praying that the House urge the Government to reopen Wattle Street between Glen Osmond and Unley Roads at the intersection of Duthy and Wattle Streets and that traffic lights be installed at this intersection.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

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

MORPHETTVILLE BUS DEPOT

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many tenders were submitted for the building of the Morphettville bus depot and who were the tenderers?
2. Was the lowest tender accepted and, if not, why not?
3. What was the accepted price for this work and did it include all—
 - (a) drainage works;
 - (b) overhead floodlighting;
 - (c) vehicle-washing machine or machines;
 - (d) landscaping and general beautification of the area; and
 - (e) supply and planting of trees?
4. What type of, and how many, vehicle-washing machines are to be installed at this depot?

5. If the supply and planting of trees is not included in the accepted tender how is this work to be done and—

- (a) how many trees are to be planted;
(b) are they to be trees advanced in growth and, if not, why not; and

(c) what are the species and the names of the trees?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Five. Jennings Industries Limited, Fricker Brothers Proprietary Limited, Hansen & Yuncken (S.A.) Proprietary Limited, A. W. Baulderstone Proprietary Limited and S. J. Weir Proprietary Limited.

2. Yes.

3. It is not the practice for the Bus and Tram Division to divulge details of prices submitted by tenderers.

4. One Dawson five star "drive through" bus washing machine, with rotary brushes and water recirculating system.

5. The Marion City Council will supply, plant, and maintain trees and shrubs.

(a) About 150 trees and large shrubs, 1 200 medium to large shrubs, and 4 000 ground cover and mounding shrubs.

(b) Varying from 1ft. to 4ft. high, depending on availability from Marion council nursery.

(c) Mainly Australian natives. The following is an indication of the varieties which will be included in the overall planting:

Trees: *Eucalyptus Leucoxydon Rosea*, *Eucalyptus Platypus*, *Eucalyptus Torquata*, *Eucalyptus Sideroxydon Rosea*, *Eucalyptus Woodwardi*, *Agonis Flexuosa*, *Agonis Juniperina*, *Hymenoporum Flavum*, *Hakea Laurina*, *Tristonia Conferta*, *Melaleuca Stypheloides*, and *Metrosideros Tomentosa*.

Shrubs: *Pittosporum*, *Callistemon Harkness*, *Callistemon Rigidus*, *Calothamna*, *Melaleuca Armillaris*, *Melaleuca Nesophylla*, *Melaleuca Decussata*, and *Grevillea Rosmarinifolia*.

Ground covers: *Gazania* (not native), *Hardenbergia*, *Correa*, *Grevillea* (low-growing), and *Anigosaanthos*.

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice): Was the public relations firm of Trojan Owen & Associates employed by the Government on the Morphettville bus depot project and if so:

- (a) in what capacity;
(b) what were the conditions of hire;
(c) what was the cost of the hire;
(d) is their job in relation to this depot now complete and if not what remains for them to do to complete their contract; and
(e) if there were no terms of hire, or their job is incomplete, what is the estimated cost of their services?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

The firm of Trojan Owen & Associates was retained:

- (a) in its capacity as social environmentalists, to provide a means of communication between local residents and the State Transport Authority;
(b) as above;
(c) \$14 150;
(d) yes; and
(e) not applicable.

TROJAN OWEN & ASSOCIATES

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice): Is the firm of Trojan Owen and Associates being used by any Government department on any projects and, if so, what projects?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The firm Trojan Owen and Associates is currently working with the Transport Department on the following projects: (a) North-East area public transport review—establishment of the communications programme; (b) matters related to the Transport Planning Procedure Committee. The South Australian Housing Trust in 1974 obtained a report from this firm on certain aspects of housing for the aged.

ANNUAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to introduce legislation to provide for annual leave for Government employees to be increased by one week and, if so, why, and when is such legislation to be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no proposal to introduce legislation to provide for annual leave for Government employees to be increased by one week.

MATERNITY LEAVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered the introduction of a scheme of maternity-paternity leave for members of the Public Service and if so:

- (a) has it decided to put such a scheme into effect and why;
(b) will this be done by legislation and when will such Bill be introduced; and
(c) what are the details of the scheme?

2. Has any estimate been made of the annual cost to the Government of such a scheme and if so:

- (a) who made it;
(b) what is it; and
(c) how is it made up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes—during the forthcoming session.

(c) Details of the scheme will be announced when legislation is introduced.

2. (a) (b) and (c) Because of so many unknown factors, it is virtually impossible to make an accurate estimate of the annual cost to the Government of such a scheme. However, some two years ago the Public Service Board estimated the annual cost at approximately \$800 000.

STATE GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Minister taken action to set up a State grants commission in accordance with the Federal Government's federalism policy and if so, will the commission be operational during 1976-77?

2. Is there any indication what Federal funds will be available for disbursement during 1976-77 and, if so, what criteria will be used for allocation of funds?

3. Has the membership of any grants commission been decided and if so—

(a) who are the commissioners;

(b) when will they be called to meet; and

(c) what remuneration will they receive?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. An interim State Grants Commission has been established.

2. A sum of \$11 924 800 will be distributed to local government in two parts—Element A consisting of 30 per cent on a per capita basis, and Element B the remainder on equalisation principles.

3. Yes, for the interim commission.

(a) Dr. I. McPhail (Chairman) and Mr. G. Foreman, Project Officer, Premier's Department. The third member will be appointed after the Local Government Association has submitted a panel of names to me.

(b) The interim commission will meet formally as soon as the third member is appointed.

(c) The matter of remuneration has been referred to the Public Service Board.

URBAN RELIEF SCHEMES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How much money has been allocated by the Government for urban relief schemes during 1976-77?

2. On what basis will allocations be made?

3. To which State and local government authorities will the money be allocated and what are the respective amounts?

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

1. In his second reading speech on Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 1976, the Treasurer explained the provision of \$11 000 000 for unemployment relief. Of this sum, \$10 000 000 will be used to fund approved schemes in 1976-77. This sum includes both urban and rural unemployment relief.

2. Projects submitted for funding will be considered in accordance with guidelines approved by the Government, with projects of benefit to the community, requiring at least 50 per cent labour content in areas of high unemployment, receiving most favourable consideration.

3. See 2 above.

PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is there a member of the State Public Service Board who specifically handles applications from handicapped people and, if not, why not?

2. Will the Government consider such an appointment and, if so, when will such an appointment be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no member of the State Public Service Board who specifically handles applications from handicapped people.

2. There is an officer in the Personnel Services Division of the board's department who has had several years experience working with handicapped people, and more recently applications by handicapped people are referred to her.

SPORTS FUNDS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What amount of State Government funds have been allocated for sport and recreation organisations for the 1976-77 financial year?

2. Which organisations will receive financial assistance and how much?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The allocation of funds for sport and recreation is still subject to Budgetary consideration.

2. Applications which have been received from a number of organisations are being assessed. The number of organisations that can be assisted will be subject to 1. above.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the current rent paid by the lessee of Ayers House Restaurant?

2. Is the rent subsidised and are payments up to date?

3. If payments are not up to date what action has been taken to bring them up to date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Rent paid by the lessee is \$31 000 a year.

2. The rent is not subsidised. Payments are up to date.

3. Not applicable.

MONARTO

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What arrangements has the State Government made to fund the Monarto project?

2. What approaches have been made to private enterprise to build and develop Monarto?

3. When will construction of dwellinghouses commence in Monarto?

4. Will there be any industries in Monarto and, if so, what type of industries have been considered?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No arrangements for State Government funding for the project can be determined until the results of the Federal Budget are known in August.

2. The Monarto Development Commission has had informal and confidential discussions with elements of the private sector on this matter, but formal approaches cannot be made until a firm programme for Monarto has been determined.

3. See 1 and 2 above.

4. While the question refers particularly to "industries", the development intentions at Monarto will be related to job opportunities and a desirable balance of job types, that is, both skills and variety. Tentative programming so far has been closely related to the appropriate levels of basic employment and service employment, which will be provided both by the public and the private sectors. The development of Monarto will itself provide one of the major sources of local employment, both in terms of the required on-site construction work-force and also in the local manufacture, storage and transport of building materials. Much of the expected private sector basic employment for the city will occur in the manufacturing sector, particularly in such fields as building materials, furniture and plastic products, and metal fabrication. Smaller numbers are expected to be employed in the food processing, farm machinery, and component-assembly industries. Additional private sector basic employment will result from farming, quarrying, the tourist trade, and the use of commercial and community facilities at Monarto by the regional population in the Murray Mallee, Riverland, and northern parts of the South-East region.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action has the State Government taken to introduce industrial democracy in the Savings Bank of

South Australia and the State Bank of South Australia and, if so, when?

2. Have the staffs of the two banks been consulted?

3. Has a special committee been appointed to investigate industrial democracy in the two banks and, if so, who are the members of the committee and when were they appointed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has not initiated any specific action to introduce industrial democracy in either the Savings Bank of South Australia or the State Bank of South Australia. However, the Unit for Industrial Democracy of the Premier's Department has responded to invitations to discuss the concept of industrial democracy as it might apply to the Savings Bank of South Australia. On February 24, two officers of the unit held discussions with officers of the Australian Bank Officials' Association about how Government policy might apply to the banks. This meeting was initiated by the A.B.O.A. officers. On April 29, four officers of the unit held discussions with the Board of the Savings Bank of South Australia. This meeting took place as a result of an invitation from the Chairman of the board on behalf of the board. At the conclusion of that meeting, the General Manager invited members of the unit to have a more detailed discussion with two senior officers of the bank. This meeting took place on June 1 with two officers of the unit, and was followed six weeks later by a meeting with 14 senior managers of the bank. It is expected that a further meeting will take place within the next few weeks.

2. The officers of the unit have not consulted with the staff of the banks because the above meetings were entirely exploratory in nature. It is Government policy to establish a joint steering committee of management, employees, and union representatives to oversee developments. When such a committee is established in the Savings Bank, this committee will have the responsibility of communicating with all employees.

3. The Government has not established a committee to investigate industrial democracy in the two banks. However, I am led to believe that the A.B.O.A. has formed a special committee.

CAMDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the cost for stages I and II of the replacement of Camden Primary School?

2. Is the project on schedule?

3. Who was awarded the contract for establishment of the oval and what is the cost?

4. What type of grasses were used?

5. What is the present condition of the oval?

6. Is the oval level or does it require further grading and levelling?

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

1. Estimated unescalated cost:

Stage I = \$762 000

Stage II = \$101 000

2. The project is slightly behind schedule because of delay incurred in the acceptance of tenders from the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department. It is planned that construction of stage I will begin by the end of August. It is expected that the project will be completed by the end of February, 1977.

3. In the initial planning of the school, it was considered that it would be advantageous if the construction of the oval and reticulation system were to proceed before the

school buildings were completed. This meant that the grassed playing area would be available for school use at a much earlier date than would be the case if grounds development did not occur until the buildings are completed. The District Council of West Torrens have undertaken the work at an estimated total cost of \$12 500.

4. Natural couch oversown with couch and clover.

5. At this stage the oval is approximately 70% grassed. It is planned that the oval will be totally grassed by the time of occupation.

6. The oval surface was graded and levelled prior to seeding.

PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What maintenance work is planned for Plympton Primary School in the 1976-77 financial year?

2. What action is being taken to repair the school yard and, if no action, why not?

3. What is the estimated cost of repairing and resurfacing the school yard?

4. Is the school to be painted and what is the estimated cost?

5. Would it be more economical to replace old wooden classrooms with Demac open space units rather than carry out costly repairs?

6. What progress has been made in consolidating the school site with the infants school and, if no progress has been made, why not?

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

1. Works to be undertaken:

(1) Paving of the site where a fire destroyed a timber classroom—funds approved.

(2) Replacement of a wet area (art/craft) at the school—estimates prepared.

(3) Floor coverings—tender accepted—work may be completed.

(4) Replacement of Hot Water Service—tender accepted.

(5) Completion of change rooms—tender accepted.

Works to be considered for inclusion in the Minor Works Programme—programme not yet finalised:

(1) Provision of shelving.

(2) Upgrading of a passage way.

2. (1) Sections of the yard in need of repair will be done this financial year. This includes those areas that have been subjected to trenching.

(2) The Public Buildings Department advises that a request has been made by the School Council to have the northern section of the school developed as an adventure playground; thus there is no intention to have the area resurfaced.

3. If this were to be undertaken it would involve an expenditure of about \$35 000.

4. Cyclic painting of the school is expected to commence in March, 1977, at an estimated cost of \$42 200.

5. Generally in the long term it is more economical to replace plant rather than continually maintain it. The Education Department is heavily committed to providing school accommodation in the expanding districts of the metropolitan area, thus of necessity, the maintenance of older school buildings is essential in the foreseeable future.

6. The consolidation referred to is contingent upon road closure. This matter is at present with the Public Buildings Department which is preparing an engineering concept plan with regard to the provision of a turning loop in Chapel Street.

Arrangements for the closure of roads in the vicinity of Plympton Primary School will commence once the concept plans have been completed and agreed upon by the City of West Torrens.

NEW INDUSTRIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many new industries have been attracted to and commenced in South Australia during the past three years?
2. What are the industries and the amount of capital contribution for each?
3. How many new jobs were created?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are always difficulties involved in determining accurately the number and characteristics of new industries establishing in the State. First, not all firms establishing in South Australia contact the Trade and Development Division, and without this contact it is impossible to identify all of the smaller yet important firms setting up in the State. Secondly, the latest detailed statistics available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics relating to manufacturing industry are for the year 1973-74. In addition, the less detailed employment figures, which are available by industry grouping, have been altered in the most recent October, 1975, bulletin and are now presented in the Australian Standard Industry Classification: the corresponding statistics for earlier years have not yet been released, and this makes comparisons even more difficult. Finally, the past two years has seen a world-wide recession in which little new investment has occurred; it is therefore meaningless to examine the South Australian situation in isolation. South Australia's performance relative to the other States has been exceptionally good over the past three years. In June, 1973, unemployment in this State was 1.73 per cent compared to 1.42 per cent nationally; in March, 1976, this State's unemployment was the lowest of all the States at 3.9 per cent, compared to 4.6 per cent nationally. Between July, 1973, and September, 1975 (the latest available statistics), the total civilian employees in this State rose by 4.6 per cent, the second highest increase of all the States and well above the 2.7 per cent nationally. Private employment rose by 1.1 per cent in South Australia in this period, whilst it fell slightly for Australia as a whole. With these qualifications in mind, the answers to the questions are as follows:

1. Number of industries identified as setting up in South Australia since June, 1973: 14.
2. The new industries covered the following product range: seed oil; lubricating oil; vehicles; food products; ceramic tiles; adhesives; clothing; jewellery/art; locomotives; concrete products; optical goods; minerals. For confidentiality reasons, it is impossible to specify the firms by name or to provide details of capital investment and employment by each industry category. The total capital investment by the new industries is estimated to be \$54 000 000.
3. The total new employment is estimated to be 770.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount of, and how many applications are pending in, all categories for Housing Trust mortgage finance?
2. What is the approximate waiting time for this type of finance?

3. What efforts are being made to overcome the delay and shortage of finance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Under the trust's single-unit bank finance sale programme, first mortgage finance is to be arranged with a bank or lending authority by the applicants themselves. However, in most cases, the trust assists in the form of a second mortgage which is readily available.

2. There is no delay for the trust's own second mortgage finance, but approximately 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the trust's purchasers elect to obtain their first mortgage from the State Bank of South Australia, where limitations on funding under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement have imposed delays.

3. The case for increased funding was argued strenuously at the May meeting of Housing Ministers. However, the honourable member would be aware that the Commonwealth Government refused to increase the allocation of Housing finance for 1976-77, despite the increase in building costs.

BANK HOUSING FINANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount and how many applications are pending for State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia first mortgage housing finance?
2. What is the approximate waiting time for this type of finance?
3. What efforts are being made to shorten the waiting time?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. As at June 30, 1976, 15 734 persons had listed their names for loans from the State Bank of South Australia. If these persons all qualified for loans from the bank, it is estimated that the total funds required would be \$270 000 000. The Savings Bank of South Australia had 455 applicants seeking \$8.8 million on first mortgage security as at June 30, 1976.

2. In respect of loans from the State Bank the waiting time is approximately: two years for new homes, and four years for established homes. This waiting time commences when an inquiry is made, and a preliminary assessment indicates that an applicant may be eligible to lodge an application. The waiting time from lodgement of the formal application to the date of acceptance or otherwise is about three months to four months.

The Savings Bank of South Australia operates differently. It does not list inquirers but accepts applications for housing loans when a person meets its requirements. The waiting time for these loans varies from five weeks to 12 weeks from the date the loan application is received. Funds for lending by the State Bank are provided mainly from Commonwealth moneys for lending at low rates of interest. The Savings Bank of South Australia uses its own funds for housing loans at rates which compare favourably with those made by other lending institutions.

3. Every effort is being made to reduce the waiting time for loans. At the beginning of the 1975-76 financial year The Savings Bank of South Australia had planned to allocate \$45 000 000 for this purpose. This was increased during the year to \$51 500 000. For the financial year 1976-77, \$60 000 000 has been allocated. Towards the end of 1975-76 the Government transferred \$10 000 000 to the State Bank for housing loans purposes. These funds were provided as a supplement to Commonwealth moneys avail-

able for housing. The bank will continue to make available at least \$1 000 000 per annum from its own funds for housing loans. However, the action taken by the Government and the bank will not significantly reduce the waiting time. This can only be achieved by a considerable injection of Commonwealth funds.

HOUSING TRUST ACQUISITIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What method is adopted in acquiring properties for the Housing Trust?
2. Has the trust discovered that properties offered to it by some land agents or acquired on the open market have been made after recent purchase by a speculator and if so, where and what was the variation in values?
3. How many properties have been acquired in the Hanson electorate, and what is their location and cost of renovations?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The method employed by the trust in buying houses either for its own rental stock under the special rental scheme, or for Aboriginal accommodation under the funded house scheme, involves a prior physical inspection by a team of two, one of whom has had considerable experience in valuing houses and the other a senior maintenance inspector able to give an accurate estimate of upgrading costs. Houses are submitted to the trust for consideration either direct by the owners, or, more usually, by agents acting for the registered proprietors. The decision whether or not to buy a house is based partly on its being available at a figure approximating the trust's view of the current market value and partly on the estimated cost of upgrading to a proper standard. The total of these two figures must be within the levels fixed by the board of the trust.
2. Under the Land and Business Agents Act, the vendor is required to disclose in the contract documents the date and price paid if the property has been bought by him within the previous 12 months. Only occasionally are houses offered to the trust following recent purchase by the vendor and in such cases the valuation would be double-checked if there were any increase in price not accounted for by repairs or renovations.
3. Six properties (nine dwelling units) have been bought in the Hanson electorate, details being as follows:—

Address	Upgrading cost per unit \$
2 Curzon Street, Camden Park	9 189
12 and 14 Melbourne Street, Glenelg North	7 731
13, 15, 17 Alison Street, Glenelg North	9 873
36 Mackay Avenue, Plympton North	3 608
24 Charles Street, Plympton	6 747
31 Elizabeth Street, Plympton	5 777

LAW STUDENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many students applied to commence law studies at Adelaide University this year and how many were accepted?
2. When will a law school be established at Flinders University and how many students will be catered for?

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

1. Students wishing to study law were able to apply for admission to either the law, law/arts or law/economics

courses. The number of applications received and offers of admission made were as follows:—

Course	No. of qualified first preference applications	Admissions
Law	430	132
Law/Arts	61	18
Law/Economics	20	8
Total	511	158

With a weighting of $\frac{2}{3}$ law for law/arts and $\frac{1}{3}$ for law/economics, the quota of 150 available places was filled.

2. The Universities Commission in its sixth report approved the establishment of a School of Law at the Flinders University. The implementation of the decision was subsequently deferred in the Commission's supplementary report for the special "non-triennial" year, 1976. The Commission's report for 1977 and the following years is still awaited.

PREMIER'S OVERSEA TRAVEL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What were the reasons for the Premier's travel overseas during the recess between this session and the previous session of Parliament?
2. What specific topics and areas of interest were studied?
3. Does the Premier intend to report on these matters to Parliament and, if so, when; if not, why not?
4. What firm contracts have been concluded between South Australian and overseas interests as a result of the Premier's tour and what are the details of each?
5. What other contracts are in contemplation, which countries are involved, and what are the details of each contract and when will each be signed?
6. What is the value to South Australia of each of these contracts, respectively?
7. On what day did the Premier leave South Australia for overseas the first time and on what day did he next arrive back in Australia?
8. What are the details of his movements with specific reference to cities and towns visited on each of the days he spent away from South Australia until he returned to Australia?
9. What persons accompanied him and/or were officially attached to his entourage at any time during his period abroad; for what periods, respectively, were they so attached; and what were the duties of each such person?
10. What specific topics and areas of interest were studied by each of these officers during that period?
11. What is the present preliminary estimates of the total sum of the expenditure incurred by the Premier, members of his staff, and others, in fares, accommodation, and other travelling expenses, entertainment expenses, and all other expenses charged to the Government during the period from the date of his departure from the State until the date of his return to South Australia on completion of his overseas tour and when is it expected that the final cost of the trip will be available?
12. Who acted as security officer for the Premier after the London section of the trip?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The reasons for my trip overseas were set out in an answer to a Question on Notice on February 10, 1976. As the Premiers' Conference was called in April,

I did not go to Iraq, Libya, and Algeria, but returned to Australia. That section of the trip was undertaken by Mr. W. L. C. Davies, Director-General for Trade and Development, and Mr. J. N. Holland, Chief Administrative Officer. Mr. R. Dempsey joined them in Algeria. Messrs. K. Crease, S. Wright and I met them in Rome to continue the original itinerary.

2. Specific topics and areas of interest studied were as follows:

In Malaysia: At the request of Tun Abdul Razak and his successor, as Prime Minister, I had discussions with the Chief Ministers and their development corporation officers in the States of Perlis, Perah, and Kedah, to identify particular projects in which South Australia could be of assistance in development as part of the next five year plan. Discussions were also held in Kuala Lumpur with the Prime Minister of Malaysia and his officers, the Minister of Information and his officers, and the Minister of Trade and Industry and his officers. A special briefing was given to us by F.I.D.A. Two areas of special interest were identified, namely, the development of concrete products industries and a special study on the use of rice straw, now being burned. Discussions were also held on assistance from the South Australian Film Corporation in the establishment of a Malaysian film industry and with Dr. Lim Chong Eu and his officers in Penang concerning our ongoing activities with that State.

In Iraq officers discussed with Government a proposal by a South Australian consortium, supported by the Government, for the development of the Mosul dry land farming project. In Libya South Australia has a very successful demonstration farm at El Marj. The project was visited and discussions were held with Ministers and their officers in the capital. In Algeria the specific topic discussed was the development by South Australia of a dry land farming area. A process verbale on these discussions was signed in Algeria. Arrangements have been made for the training of Algerians at Roseworthy in South Australian techniques. South Australia has been asked to tender for a development initially of 10 000 hectares, and proposals in relation to this are in the course of preparation.

In Yugoslavia the principal topic of interest studied was the self-management programme of employees in Yugoslav undertakings, with particular reference to those which are manufacturing under licence from foreign enterprises. In addition, discussions were held on the involvement of Yugoslavia in joint ventures in developing countries and on film exchange with the South Australian Film Corporation. In Vienna the main topic discussed was the co-determination policy in industry and the management of the Austrian economy. In addition, discussions were held with the Austrian Chamber of Commerce concerning manufacture under licence in South Australia of Austrian products.

In England discussions were held with the Agent-General, and an examination was made of Lord Rothschild's Central Policy Review Staff. Discussions were also held with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations on the worker participation policy in England, and with the Board of British Leyland concerning their establishment in South Australia. I visited the new National Exhibition and Convention Centre in Birmingham and Redditch New Town. Mr. Davies addressed the Australian Companies Group of the Australia-British Trade Association, and undertook discussions with film and television interests on behalf of the South Australian Film Corporation.

In Poland the main area of interest was in the development of arrangements for a deep-sea fishing venture based

in South Australia, and the development of additional tanning facilities in South Australia. In addition, I examined the workers participation programme in industry.

In Russia the main area of interest studied was the development of trade with the Soviet Far East. Given the nature of Russian trading corporations and their mode of operation and the fact that their areas of interest for imports from South Australia are covered here by organisations that are not themselves importers, these arrangements required discussion at Ministerial level. That was undertaken in Moscow, and in Khabarovsk and Nakhodka in the Soviet Far East. I also had discussions with the Deputy Minister of Culture of the U.S.S.R. with regard to entrepreneurial activities by the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust.

In Japan I had meetings with the Nissan Motor Company concerning its involvement in sourcing componentry for four cylinder motor manufacture from South Australia, and with the Directors of Nissho-Iwai Co. Ltd. concerning their processing of timber from Russia and its shipment to South Australia in the course of our developing trade with the Soviet Far East.

In Hong Kong I had discussions with local hotel development interests, and with local parties interested in taking over the South Australian Government agency that previously existed in Hong Kong.

3. I do not intend to report to Parliament in detail on my trip overseas. It has not been the practice for Premiers to do this previously. When trade arrangements are under discussion, the companies concerned often require that the negotiations be confidential until firm arrangements are made. In addition, I have reported on numbers of the matters that have arisen during my journey overseas publicly.

4. 5. and 6. These questions plainly misunderstand the nature of negotiations that can be undertaken by Premiers at governmental level, and the time process involved. It is certainly not possible in an answer in Parliament to specify the matters sought in these questions. But, as examples in relation to our developments, with Algeria the possibilities of benefit to South Australia are very considerable and run to many millions of dollars. While initially we are to tender for 10 000 hectares development, the Algerians anticipate World Bank funding for very much larger developments in which they are hopeful that we would be the main tenderers for whole developments involving housing, civil engineering, town planning, the sale of agricultural machinery and the like. It is plainly not possible to specify in detail at this stage the precise benefit to South Australia, nor can it be said at this stage when any particular contract forming part of such an arrangement will be signed. In relation to our discussions in Poland concerning deep sea fishing, within a week of my return to South Australia, a Polish trade mission was in Adelaide, held discussions with local fishing interests which have now been satisfactorily concluded, and these arrangements are only waiting upon approval by the Federal Government for the proposed deep sea fishing venture. In relation to the discussions with the Nissan Corporation, its Executive Vice President and Director in charge of foreign trading operations will be in Adelaide on Friday of this week to further those discussions with South Australian manufacturers of componentry. In relation to the trade with the Soviet Far East, they can only take additional imports from us if they can earn Australian dollars by export to us. Current evaluation is being made of fish samples obtained in Nakhodka, and checks are being made in the Soviet Union concerning

the now stated requirements following on the trip of South Australian timber importers.

7. April 1, 1976, April 7, 1976.

8. April 1, 1976, Kuala Lumpur; April 2, 1976, Penang; April 5, 1976, Penang; April 7, 1976, Sydney; April 17, 1976, Easter Saturday—Rome; April 19, 1976, Easter Monday—Belgrade; April 22, 1976, Kragujevac and Belgrade; April 23, 1976, Vienna; April 27, 1976, London; April 28, 1976, Birmingham, Redditch New Town, London; May 3, 1976, Warsaw; May 6, 1976, Moscow; May 8, 1976, Lenin-grad; May 11, 1976, Moscow; May 14, 1976, Irkutsk; May 16, 1976, Khabarovsk; May 19, 1976, Nakhodka; May 20, 1976, At Sea; May 21, 1976, Yokohama, Tokyo; May 22, 1976, Mashiko; May 23, 1976, Kamogawa; May 24, 1976, Tokyo; May 25, 1976, Hong Kong; May 28, 1976, Melbourne.

9. The entourage did not always move as a unit because it sometimes happened that officers had separate appointments to keep or duties to undertake at times that clashed with mine. Bearing this in mind, the persons accompanying me were:—

In Malaysia:

Mr. R. D. Bakewell, Permanent Head, Premier's Department.

Mr. W. L. C. Davies, Director-General for Trade and Development.

Mr. Steven Wright, Personal Secretary.

Ms. Adele Koh, Research Assistant.

Messrs. Bakewell and Davies have been intimately involved in our ventures in Penang and now in other northern states of Malaysia. They held discussions with appropriate Malaysians and counselled me. Mr. Wright is my Personal Secretary. Ms. Koh, as a former journalist in Malaysia, undertook press duties and was invaluable in providing background material for the many meetings undertaken.

In Italy, Yugoslavia, Austria, England, Poland, U.S.S.R., Japan and Hong Kong:

Mr. W. L. C. Davies, Director-General for Trade and Development.

Mr. J. N. Holland, Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Steven Wright, Personal Secretary (until injured in London).

Mr. R. Dempsey, Executive Assistant.

Mr. K. Crease, Press Secretary.

Mr. Davies accompanied me to many appointments. He participated and also advised me beforehand. He also undertook many engagements separately at an officer level. When I was unable to visit Libya, Iraq and Algeria, he acted in my stead. Mr. Holland accompanied Mr. Davies from Bangkok (where they met) through Baghdad, Benghazi, Tripoli and Algiers to Rome, where the whole party assembled on the Easter weekend. He was responsible for the itinerary, travel arrangements, payments and monetary records, liaison with Cabinet and departments in Adelaide, and took notes at all meetings he attended—sometimes with Mr. Davies and sometimes with me.

Mr. Wright, Personal Secretary, carried out the normal duties of that office. He was also responsible, as usual, for security matters. Unfortunately, he was injured in London and had to return home. Mr. Dempsey is my Executive Assistant, but went to Algiers independently to join Messrs. Davies and Holland in advance. After meeting me in Rome he attended appropriate appointments with me and discussed policy aspects with me and undertook research. After Mr. Wright was injured in London, Mr. Dempsey undertook the duties of personal secretary also. Mr. Crease, Press Secretary, was responsible for

press arrangements in the countries visited. He settled press releases and arranged for their transmission to London and to South Australia.

10. See 2 and 9.

11. \$42 166. I believe that the amount quoted is substantially the final figure. It is possible that one Embassy may have accounts to render, but all other bills have been paid. I am pleased that the amount is within the budget of \$45 000 announced last February.

12. No particular member of my staff undertook such duties after we left London. The Australian Ambassador to U.S.S.R. was kind enough to instruct members of his staff to accompany me whilst in his jurisdiction, and Mr. Dempsey made security checks with Embassy staff.

USED CAR DEALERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many used car dealers have been prosecuted and convicted, respectively, since September 8, 1975, for trading after hours; of those convicted, who were they and what were the penalties imposed?

2. What action does the Government propose to take to ensure that after hours trading laws are enforced?

3. How many inspectors are engaged policing the early closing laws?

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

1. (a) 2

(b) 1

(c) Bowden Ford

(d) \$10 with \$4 costs.

2. Regular inspections are carried out by inspectors, and all complaints regarding after hours trading are investigated.

3. Four are rostered each week.

MOTOR CYCLE SPEEDS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Road Traffic Board recommended an increase in the speed limit from 70 km/h to 110 km/h for motor cyclists with pillion passengers and if so:

(a) when was this recommendation made;

(b) has the Government agreed to the recommendation and, if so, when will the new regulations be gazetted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

(a) May 24, 1976.

(b) Yes. It is proposed to introduce a Bill in the current session to give effect to it.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What are the expected dates when Parliament will be sitting for the remainder of this calendar year?

2. Will there be a recess of one week after every two weeks of sittings and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The House will resume sitting on July 27, 1976, and will continue to August 19, 1976, when it will rise for two weeks. When sittings recommence they will continue with one week's break after each three weeks of sitting until satisfactory progress has been made with the legislative programme.

2. Vide 1.

CHEESE EXPORTS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What are the reasons for the marked decline in overseas cheese exports from South Australia during 1974-75 compared with exports for the previous four financial years?
2. What are the export cheese prospects for 1975-76?
3. What action is being taken to increase the export of cheese from South Australia?

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

1. Skim milk powder prices on the export market were high during 1974-75, and large manufacturers in Victoria sought short-term gains by producing powder instead of cheese. South Australia, a cheese State, did not divert manufacture to skim milk powder.
2. During 1975-76, skim milk powder prices dropped, and world stocks have increased. Victorian manufacturers have again diverted milk to cheese production. The Australian quota to Japan for 1975-76 was lower than the previous year's quota, and the South Australian proportion was cut back by 13 per cent in the spring.
3. The Australian Dairy Corporation is actively seeking new and viable export markets.

STUDY LEAVE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost (i.e. salaries paid while the employee would not be at work) for a period of two consecutive years of the Government's proposal to grant to all members of the Public Service Association, 10 days leave on full pay every two years to study trade union affairs, assuming that all members took advantage of the maximum entitlement?
2. Will members of the Australian Government Workers' Association also be entitled to up to 10 days leave on full pay every two years to study trade union affairs, and, if so, what would be the cost if all members took advantage of the maximum entitlement?

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

1. To assume that all members of the Public Service Association could take advantage of their maximum entitlement of 10 days leave on full pay every two years to study trade union affairs is to ignore the reality of the situation. The trade union training scheme is limited to courses organised, run and approved by the Australian Council for Union Training and the Workers' Educational Association of South Australia. The number of courses run and organised by those bodies is restricted by their individual budget limitation. The scheme applies to all Government employees, subject to certain conditions. For Government employees to be eligible, they must obtain a certificate from the appropriate nominating union. The certificate is based upon the employee concerned having an indicated interest and potential in union affairs. Leave of absence is also subject to departmental convenience, and it is made clear that the work of departments has priority in deciding approvals. These conditions mean that it is not possible for all Public Service Association members to be granted leave of absence to attend trade union training. Therefore, the circumstances around which the question is framed cannot arise. A more realistic approach would be to look at the cost involved in the financial year 1975-76, which amounted to \$4 500 approximately.

2. Yes. The cost for the financial year 1975-76 was \$9 500 approximately.

ABALONE LICENCES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many abalone authorisations are current in South Australia?
2. How many new authorisations does the Government intend to issue, and in which zones?
3. On what research and investigation has the decision to increase these authorities been based?
4. Did the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries have discussions with the industry before taking his decision to increase the authorities?

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

1. Thirty.
2. In the past two weeks applications have been invited for eight additional abalone permits for zones A, B and C (western waters) and two for zone F (central waters including those off Kangaroo Island).
3. The decision was based on biological data from a continuing research programme complemented by an economic appraisal of the abalone fishery undertaken as a separate project. Departmental data on these matters was reinforced by catch and effort statistics supplied by abalone fishermen and processors.
4. The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and his officers discussed the intended increase with the industry before taking the decision.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): Has consideration been given to the recommendations contained in the Tonkin report on the Torrens River and, if so, is it intended to implement those findings which point out the danger of floods in certain conditions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The flood risk areas identified in the Tonkin report have been surveyed, and plans are now being prepared to determine the actual severity of inundation that could be expected with the 100-year return frequency flood. The consultant has been re-engaged to report on the effects of floods of both a lesser and greater magnitude than the 100-year event, and to report on alternative flood control schemes. The hydraulic investigations associated with this work is to be used for the development of a flood warning system within the catchment.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What are the proven reserves of natural gas in the Cooper Basin?
2. What is the estimated life of these reserves?
3. What are the estimated additional reserves?
4. What is the estimated demand for usage in South Australia?
5. What is the likely usage for the Sydney market?
6. What steps are being taken to prove additional reserves?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. "Proven" reserves, being restricted to those reserves the existence and economic productivity of which can be expressed with a high degree of confidence, are relatively small quantities. For this reason contracts are usually written on the basis of "proven and probable" reserves; "probable" reserves are those whose presence

is reasonably confirmed by existing data but whose presence and productivity have not been physically tested. The "proven probable" reserves of the Cooper Basin are 3.5×10^{12} (3.5 trillion) cubic feet of recoverable sales gas. Of this amount 0.21×10^{12} cubic feet had been produced to the Adelaide market up to March 31, 1976.

2. The proven-probable reserves are sufficient for contracts to have been written first to supply gas at specified rates to the Australian Gaslight Company in Sydney for a 25-year period and secondly to supply gas at specified rates to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia up to and including the year 1987.

3. Additional reserves are very difficult to estimate, and such estimates are meaningless without ascribing an estimated degree of probability to them. One such estimate prepared by officers of the Mines Department provides the following possibilities for additional reserves in the whole Cooper Basin including the Queensland portion:

Additional gas possible	Probability
0.5×10^{12} cu. ft.	100%
3.5×10^{12} cu. ft.	60%
6.5×10^{12} cu. ft.	15%

This estimate suggests there is a slightly better than even chance that as much gas as has already been found still remains to be discovered. Other estimates have been expressed that are not as optimistic as this and suggest that no more than perhaps another 1×10^{12} cu. ft. of gas will be found.

4. The contract with the Pipelines Authority of South Australia referred to above relates to sufficient quantities to meet the projected demand for usage in South Australia to the end of 1987. A further contract has been negotiated that gives the producers the first option to supply, and P.A.S.A. the first option to purchase, an additional 1.8×10^{12} cu. ft. gas over the period 1988 to 2005.

5. The Sydney contract referred to above has two schedules of annual supply rates. Schedule B runs for 25 years from the date of initial supply, and Schedule A runs for 30 years from the date of initial supply. Schedule B is considered to adequately meet the projected market for the first seven years. Schedule A lists quantities for years eight to 25 slightly in excess of Schedule B to meet the projected market, and extends the market for a further five years to cover a total 30-year period. Schedule B, containing the smaller quantities of gas, is catered for by the present proven probable Cooper Basin reserves. About the next 0.8×10^{12} cu. ft. of gas discovered in the Cooper Basin is contractually obliged to be set aside to satisfy Schedule A of the Sydney market. Gas should commence to be supplied to Sydney later in 1976, so that Sydney gas supplies are assured to 2001 at the rates in Schedule B, and if another 0.8×10^{12} cu. ft. of gas is discovered before 1984, Sydney gas supplies are assured to the year 2006 at Schedule A rates.

6. The Government has negotiated with the Cooper Basin producers an agreement known as "The Exploration Indenture", which will ensure exploration at a rate considerably in excess of the requirements for the petroleum exploration licences in which the Cooper Basin lies. The exploration indenture will be signed soon, hopefully in August 1976, when the unit agreement is signed by all the Cooper Basin producers. It provides for at least \$15 000 000 to be spent in petroleum exploration licences for the five-year period to February 27, 1979. About \$3 300 000 will be spent in the Pedirka Basin, which has some geological similarities to the Cooper Basin and lies 400 km to the north-west, in an attempt to find if this relatively unexplored basin can produce gas, and the remainder will be spent

in the Cooper Basin. Some \$1 200 000 has already been spent on a seismic survey conducted in 1975. A seismic survey costing about \$1 800 000 is now in progress. Drilling of exploration wells under the indenture is expected to commence later this year. A further scheme whereby the Government would accelerate the exploration rate still further is being considered by the Government, but plans and negotiations are at a stage that is too early for any details to be given.

DIRECTOR OF TOURISM

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many applications were received for the position of Director of Tourism and how many of these applicants were interviewed?

2. Has an appointment been made and, if not, why not, and when will an appointment be made?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 23 applications was received for the position of Director of Tourism, and six applicants were interviewed.

2. An appointment has not been made, as none of the candidates was acceptable to the Government. The position is now occupied in an acting capacity. At this time it is not known when a permanent appointment will be made.

SUN ECLIPSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the General Manager, Railways Division, State Transport Authority, received a letter from R. J. Maerschell, dated May 18, 1976, making suggestions for a special train service to Mount Gambier in connection with the total eclipse of the sun on October 23, 1976, and if so:

(a) has any consideration been given to these suggestions and what decision, if any, has been made;

(b) has a reply been made to the letter and when; and

(c) what is it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:
 (a) Yes. A special train will depart Adelaide at 7 a.m. on Saturday, October 23, 1976, and return, departing Mount Gambier at 12.10 a.m. on October 24, 1976, arriving Adelaide at 8 a.m.

(b) Yes, on June 9, 1976.

(c) The letter was acknowledged and Mr. Maerschell notified that further information would be given after consideration of the costing and availability of rolling stock.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What special arrangements, if any, does the South Australian Railways propose to make to carry passengers to Mount Gambier to view the total eclipse of the sun on October 24, 1976?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A special train will depart from Adelaide at 7 a.m. on Saturday, October 23, 1976, and return, departing from Mount Gambier at 12.10 a.m. on Sunday, October 24, 1976, arriving in Adelaide at 8 a.m.

FIREMEN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the age of firemen, pursuant to the Fire Brigades Act, and why?

2. Is it proposed to introduce legislation to reduce this age and if so:

(a) to what age;

(b) why; and

(c) when will such legislation be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. As no retirement age is specified within the provisions of the Fire Brigades Act, 1936-1974, the retirement age for firemen and officers is the State standard of 65 years maximum.

2. No.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What payment, if any, was made to Mr. Ray Taylor in connection with his resignation as Chairman of the Monarto Commission, and why was this payment made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Payment of \$100 000 was made to Mr. Taylor to compensate him for the period between his resignation as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission and the date on which his appointment would have expired in the normal manner. The payment was made because delays in the commencement of construction at Monarto meant that the continued employment of both a full-time Chairman and General Manager was not justified. The General Manager has now also been made Chairman. All negotiations with R. C. Taylor were conducted by the Crown Solicitor.

BRUSH-TAILED POSSUMS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has any estimate been made of the population of brush-tailed possums in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and, if so, what is it?

2. Is it estimated that the population of brush-tailed possums is increasing and if so:

(a) at what rate; and

(b) what are believed to be the reasons for this increase?

3. Is the Government satisfied with present arrangements to keep down the population of these animals and what are those arrangements?

4. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to reduce the damage done by these animals and why?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. No formal surveys of brush-tailed possum populations have been carried out in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, but it is estimated that the population would be about 100 000 individuals or more.

2. The population of brush-tailed possums have probably reached equilibrium. In the brush-tailed possums most births occur in autumn, and a single young is suckled in the pouch for five months. If it should die prematurely, it is usually replaced by a dormant embryo. When the young leaves the mother's pouch, it rides on her back for a further two months suckling intermittently, and during this stage about 50 per cent of the females mate again to produce a second young in spring. Therefore, the average number of young a female a year is about 1.4. At this rate the adult population could potentially be replaced if each female bred for only two years. In fact, however, the females reach sexual maturity when one year old, and have a breeding life of at least five years. This means that brush-tailed possums have a reproductive capacity far greater than that needed to maintain the population stability and, in natural circumstances, their realised fertility is

severely reduced by adolescent mortality. If, however, extra mortality is imposed by either natural or artificial means, adolescent mortality is relaxed and more of their reproductive capacity is realised.

In this way they have proved themselves able to maintain maximum populations in the face of unlimited hunting elsewhere and there is no reason to suppose that the proclamation of an open season in Adelaide would be any more effective. In the Adelaide metropolitan area, as in all benign environments where brush-tailed possums occur, the population is maintained at saturation level. Overcrowding is prevented by behavioural mechanisms that ensure the death of excess adolescents and keep the adults dispersed. When young brush-tailed possums become independent at nine months they are driven out of the natal dens by increasing antagonism from their mothers. Once on their own they are immediately subordinate to all adults in the vicinity, so they tend to vacate their natal areas too. If the surrounding habitat is fully occupied, they must either die or migrate to a less favourable habitat elsewhere. Since this cycle occurs twice a year, it is obvious how brush-tailed possums removed from small areas under permit are so rapidly replaced. Adult brush-tailed possums of both sexes remain dispersed through their unequivocally solitary natures. They do not establish defended territories, but occupy overlapping home ranges where they practise mutual avoidance. They do, however, fearlessly defend their exclusive rights to their dens. This means that in an environment such as the Adelaide metropolitan area, in which sustenance is artificially assured and over-abundant at all times, the density of brush-tailed possums will depend not on seasonal fluctuations or the availability of food but on the number of suitable and independent den sites. If, therefore, in those districts where brush-tailed possums are a nuisance, each resident systematically blocks every possible den site on his or her property, the numbers of such animals will undoubtedly decrease.

3. The present arrangements for control are that people who are affected by brush-tailed possums may apply for a permit to take from the wild under section 53 (1) (c) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1974. Permits are freely given to persons suffering damage or from the nuisance caused by brush-tailed possums in roofs etc. Although permits are freely granted, many people release the animals in some other locality, such as near Belair Recreation Park rather than destroy them. Such relocation of the animals does nothing to overcome the problem, but merely allows for a temporary movement within the total population as demonstrated in 2 above. The relocation and release can give only temporary relief because, as soon as a breeding or living site is vacated by an animal being relocated, it would be filled by an animal from another area under overcrowding stress.

4. Primary responsibility for the control of such animals rests with the individuals in areas where they are a nuisance, particularly by blocking every possible den site on their property. No other action appears likely to offer any long term benefit. My department is producing a pamphlet for the information of the public on this problem.

THE LEVELS TRAFFIC

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has any consideration been given to installing traffic lights or any (and, if so, what) other traffic devices at the junction of Warrendi Road and the Main North Road at The Levels?

2. What decision, if any, has been reached?
3. What action, if any, is to be taken as a result and when?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. A left-turn lane from Warrendi Road into the Main North Road was constructed in 1975. The priority for traffic signals is low compared to other locations.
3. The priority for the installation of traffic signals is kept under review.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has been taken in the last 12 months to protect cyclists using Brighton Road?

2. What further action for this purpose is proposed and when and why?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. A Government study has recommended that King George Avenue, which parallels Brighton Road, be used as an alternative route. This recommendation will be considered in the light of traffic studies now being undertaken by the Brighton council.

2. Negotiations, which include the location of a second pedestrian-activated crossing of Brighton Road, are continuing with the Brighton council.

CYCLIST FACILITIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How much money has been spent by the Government in the City of Adelaide and metropolitan area in each of the last five financial years on facilities for cyclists?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Details are as follows:

1971-72, nil; 1972-73, nil; 1973-74, \$1 391·40; 1974-75, \$3 710·69; 1975-76, \$31 623·81.

BICYCLES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government concerning the encouragement of the bicycle as a means of transport?

2. What, if anything, has been done to put any such policy into effect?

3. What, if anything, is intended for the future to put such a policy into effect?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government's policy is to encourage the best mode of transport for a particular trip. If this should be by bicycle, the Government endeavours to provide safe facilities when sufficient demand for them occurs.

2. Several planning studies have been undertaken that have recommended the use of low-volume residential streets to reduce conflict with motorised traffic. The Government has financed two experimental tracks through the parklands, and has offered to subsidise the construction of bicycle tracks by the Adelaide council. To date, one has been constructed.

3. Methods of financing cycle-track construction are being examined with the intention of improving cyclists' facilities. In conjunction with councils, the Government is financing studies to determine low-cost alternatives for the safe movement of non-motorised travel, particularly for cyclists and pedestrians.

E. & W.S. ACCOUNTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Why does the Engineering and Water Supply Department forward separate quarterly accounts to multiple property owners instead of one account for all properties held?

2. What was the postage bill for the department for the financial year 1975-76?

3. What is the estimated postage bill for the financial year 1976-77?

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

1. Water and sewerage rates are billed on a cycle basis over 10 weeks each quarter. The whole of a local government area is billed at the one time. As some 30 per cent of ratepayers are not the owners of the property, accounts are rendered direct to the ratepayer. Where a single ratepayer is to receive four or more accounts in the one billing week, the accounts are placed in the one envelope and only one postage charge is incurred. About 94 000 accounts a quarter are forwarded by this method.

2. \$276 000.

3. \$241 000.

KING WILLIAM STREET BUILDINGS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

Has the Government acquired buildings in King William Street between Wright Street and the Local Courts building, and, if so—

(a) why;

(b) what is the age of these buildings;

(c) has the National Trust categorised any of these buildings;

(d) what does the Government plan to do with these buildings and when; and

(e) what is the estimated total cost of redevelopment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

WEST TORRENS AREA

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount of the new assessment made of the West Torrens council area by the Valuer-General?

2. What average percentage increase is this figure over the previous assessment?

3. What was the highest increase in valuation and in which suburb?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The total amount of the new general valuation of the West Torrens council area is:

Unimproved value \$277 181 790

Annual value \$31 815 620

2. The average percentage increase of this figure over the previous valuation made in 1971 is:

Unimproved value 243 per cent

Annual value 160 per cent

3. The highest increase, 850 per cent, in valuation was that of the unimproved value of an industrial land holding in Torrensville.

It should be noted that the average percentage increases have been based on the differences between the 1971 and 1976 total figures. These average percentages include increases in value due to land use zoning changes, subdivision and resubdivision of land, new buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings which have occurred over the five-year period as well as to the normal inflationary increases in land values.

TRANSPORT FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What investigations have been made into the need of public transport for the handicapped?

2. Has any survey been completed, what is the outcome of the report, and when will the recommendations be adopted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Investigations into public transport for the handicapped have been limited to specific investigations related to requests for variations to bus routes etc., to serve particular institutions. Nevertheless, the transport needs of the handicapped are continually being assessed as part of the total work programme of the Transport Department built in to specific studies of various aspects of public transport.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the method of selecting personnel for internally advertised positions at Royal Adelaide Hospital?

2. Who are the persons on the selecting panel, what are their qualifications, and when were they appointed?

3. Can appeals be made against appointments to internally advertised positions, and if not, why not?

4. Are any such advertised positions predetermined and, if so, why?

5. Is preference given to union members in lieu of qualifications and practical experience and, if so, why?

6. If a person leaves a position in private enterprise to take up a similar position at the Royal Adelaide Hospital why is it that practical experience and service are not considered when such applicant seeks a higher status at a later date?

7. Excepting nursing staff, how many persons are employed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and in what categories?

8. How many married females are employed and why are they employed?

9. How many school leavers were employed this year and how do these figures compare with each of the past three years?

10. What unions are accepted at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The selection of personnel for internally advertised positions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is conducted by a panel comprised of: the Senior Personnel Officer (or his nominee from the Personnel Department) as Chairman, the Services Superintendent and any other members decided upon jointly by those two officers. In general the other members will be the head or other senior officers of the service in which the vacancy exists. After the specified closing date, applications are perused by the panel and interviews of selected applicants subsequently conducted.

2. The members of the selection panel are: Chairman: Mr. G. R. Foubister—appointed Senior Personnel Officer, Royal Adelaide Hospital on November 13th, 1972. He holds the Personnel Studies Certificate of the South Australian Institute of Technology, and is an Associate Member of the Institute of Personnel Management Australia (South Australian Division). His nominees: Mr. R. J. Hassam—appointed Personnel Officer, Royal Adelaide Hospital on September 3, 1973. He holds the Personnel Administration Certificate of the South Australian Institute of Technology.

Mr. R. J. Lindsay—appointed Assistant Personnel Officer on November 4, 1974. He holds the Personnel Studies Certificate of the South Australian Institute of Technology. Members: Mr. H. M. Kelly—appointed Services Superintendent, Royal Adelaide Hospital on March 3, 1960. Other members as decided upon jointly by the Senior Personnel Officer and the Services Superintendent.

3. No. No appeals mechanism for promotional weekly-paid positions under the Hospitals Act exists.

4. No.

5. No.

6. In considering applicants for positions, aggregate relevant experience is considered, whether gained in the private or public sectors.

7. Services staff	1 278
Administrative services	325
Medical	482
Dental	117
Para medical	255

2 457

8. 967 married females are employed. As with all other staff members, married females are employed to carry out the duties of the positions to which they are appointed.

9. This year as in the past three years, all trainee or base grade positions falling vacant have been filled by school leavers where practicable. No accurate figure is available.

10. The union appropriate to the particular classification.

LEASEHOLD LAND

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government in relation to people who wish to convert leasehold land into freehold land?

2. What are the terms, conditions and costs associated with landholders who now hold land under miscellaneous leases and who wish to convert to perpetual leases?

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

1. Conversion of leasehold land to freehold land: Applications to freehold existing leases generally fall into three categories:

A. Broadacre—rural land: Each application is dealt with on its merits, having regard to existing land tenures, land use, soils, climatic conditions etc., prevailing in the area concerned.

B. Watershed and urban areas: The requirements of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the State Planning Authority and the viability and conditions of the lease as issued are taken into consideration in these two areas. If there are no valid objections from the authorities concerned, freeholding would generally be permitted.

C. Residential sites: Generally there is no objection to freeholding. In each case the freeholding price would be fixed by the Land Board.

2. Conversion of miscellaneous leases to perpetual leases: Miscellaneous leases are generally issued because permanent tenure either cannot or should not be offered at the time. It thus follows that in some instances for example, where the land is earmarked for future Government use, or where other restrictions on use are desirable, conversion to perpetual lease may never be permitted. Where there are no objections to conversion from miscellaneous to

perpetual lease, each case would attract certain terms, conditions and costs, but the following would be considered:

- (1) Amalgamation: If the miscellaneous lease is not viable in its own right, amalgamation with other perpetual leases could be required.
- (2) Rent: Depending on the date of issue of the miscellaneous lease and the land use proposed under the new lease, a change in rental would be considered.
- (3) Restrictions on use: Special requirements concerning transfers, subdivision, land use, clearing, drainage, etc., could be incorporated in the lease.
- (4) Fees:

	\$
Application fee	20
Surrender fee	20
Lease fee	19
	59

In addition to these fees, stamp duty on rental at the rate of \$1 each \$100 is added.

The foregoing information covers conversion of miscellaneous leases to perpetual leases on a general basis as it must be realised that miscellaneous leases are issued over land varying from broad acres to holiday home sites and the terms, conditions and costs would vary greatly with each application.

LAND TAX

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many persons paid land tax during 1975-76?
2. What amount was collected as land tax in that period and, of this amount, how much came from rural or primary producing landowners?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A total of 268 000.
2. An amount of \$19 840 000, of which \$1 228 000 was for rural land outside the Metropolitan Planning Area, and \$450 000 for rural land within that area. These figures may be subject to some minor alteration because final statistics of 1975-76 revenue are not available at this stage.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many primary producing landowners are there outside the proclaimed Metropolitan Planning Area and how many of these landowners paid land tax during 1975-76?
2. How many of these landowners did not pay land tax during 1975-76 under the \$40 000 exemption?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies relate to owners of rural land only. Relevant statistics are not available in relation to those who own both rural and other classes of land. The replies are as follows:

1. 28 500 of whom 3 800 were liable for payment of land tax for 1975-76.
2. 24 700.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. How many rural or primary producing landowners applied during 1975-76 for exemption from land tax on the grounds of hardship and, of these applicants, how many were granted exemption?
2. How many objections to valuations were received by the Valuation Department during 1975-76, and how many of these objections were upheld?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. In discussions with primary producer organisations I agreed to consider remissions of land tax and not

exemptions. Nineteen applications have been received. Eight have been considered to date and remissions allowed in respect of seven, one application being disallowed.

2. A total of 3 139 objections was received by the Valuation Department during 1975-76; 2 054 have been completed; 329 were upheld.

ASHBOURNE RESERVOIR

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Does the Government intend to build a reservoir near Ashbourne in the Adelaide Hills, and, if so, what is the expected date of commencement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): For the 12 months ended June 30, 1976, what was the amount of the loss incurred on operation of the Adelaide to Victor Harbor railway line and on this line during that period:

- (a) what tonnage of grain was carried;
- (b) what total tonnage of freight was carried; and
- (c) how many passengers were carried between Mount Barker and Victor Harbor?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows: The operating loss was about \$350 000.

- (a) 7 400 tonnes.
- (b) 10 500 tonnes.
- (c) 38 600.

PARA HILLS CROSSING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has any request been received that a pedestrian crossing be installed on Bridge Road, Para Hills, adjacent to "the Paddocks" and, if so, when was such request received and from whom?

2. Is it proposed to install such a crossing and, if so, when; if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Several requests have been received, the first one being from Mr. T. M. McRae, dated April 27, 1976.

2. It is intended to install a central pedestrian refuge in the vicinity of Williamson Road, to facilitate pedestrians crossing Bridge Road.

SCHOOL CANTEENS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who has undertaken the inquiry to ascertain how the Government may be able properly to assist school canteens with advice as to how they may continue their organisation, at the same time properly meeting the principle of paying full award wages and providing the service for which they were designed?

2. What were the full terms of reference for such inquiry?

3. When was this inquiry undertaken?

4. What recommendations have been received as a result of the inquiry?

5. Is any action to be taken to implement such recommendations and if so:

- (a) what action;
- (b) when; and
- (c) why?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:
1. A committee has been set up to examine the matter of management of school canteens. This committee comprises:

Mr. T. M. Barr, Assistant Director, Administration and Finance (Chairman).

Mr. F. Gow, Education Officer, Schools Directorate.

Mr. P. Corti, S.A.A.S.S.O.

Mr. I. S. Wilson, S.A.A.S.S.O.

The Secretary of the Committee will be Mr. P. J. McKeen, Administrative Officer, Education Department. An officer of the Public Service Board will be available as required on a consultant basis.

2. The terms of reference for the inquiry are:

(1) To inquire into and assess the conditions under which school canteens are currently being operated.

(2) To recommend to the Minister of Education appropriate management procedures for the operation of school canteens.

(3) To prepare a comprehensive set of guidelines for canteen management, for use by school councils and principals of schools.

3. Proceeding.

4. None as yet.

5. See 4.

WHYALLA RAIL SERVICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government received any representations that the Whyalla rail passenger services should be continued and if so:

(a) from whom;

(b) when; and

(c) what was the effect of such representations?

2. What action, if any, has been taken as a result of any representations and is any further action contemplated and if so:—

(a) what is it; and

(b) when will it be taken?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. A copy of the report on retention and upgrading of the Whyalla passenger train, March, 1976; prepared by the Save the Whyalla Train Committee was forwarded to the Government.

2. The Whyalla rail service is the prerogative of the Australian National Railways Commission, and requests for the restoration of the service should be directed to the A.N.R. or the Federal Minister, the Hon. P. J. Nixon, M.P.

SMOKING ON PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed permanently to prohibit smoking on all public transport?

2. If not, is it proposed to prohibit it permanently on some public transport and which?

3. What penalty is proposed for smoking on this transport despite the prohibition?

4. Has there been a period of trial for such prohibition and if so:

(a) on what public transport and during what period; and

(b) is such a trial considered to have been successful and if so, for what reasons?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Yes, metropolitan bus services operated by the State Transport Authority.

3. The bylaws provide for a penalty of \$20.

4. Yes.

(a) Metropolitan bus services operated by the State Transport Authority from March 1 to May 31, 1976.

(b) Yes. The majority of comments received were in favour of the ban continuing.

ADELAIDE SINGERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What representations, if any, have been made by the Government concerning the disbanding of the Adelaide Singers?

2. Has any reply to them been received and, if so, from whom and what is it?

3. Does the Government propose to take any further action in the matter and, if so, what action?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's support for the Adelaide Singers, and his commendable opposition to the extremely damaging Federal Government's cost cutting exercises, which are affecting the entire country in every area of endeavour, are appreciated.

I wrote to the then Acting and now Minister for Posts and Telecommunications on February 12, pointing out the contribution to music made by the Adelaide Singers, and urging in strongest terms that the Minister request the Australian Broadcasting Commission to reverse its decision to disband the Singers.

The Minister for Posts and Telecommunications replied on April 13, stating that "all he could do was pass on representations" and that the Acting Chairman of the Commission had advised that "owing to the stringent circumstances in which the Commission found itself, it had to relate its decisions to costs" and further that "The Commission had examined the options open to it against the aim of keeping staff requirements to a minimum". The Minister for Posts and Telecommunications was apparently unable to influence the A.B.C.'s decision to disband the Adelaide Singers.

The honourable member, in his opposition to the Federal Government's cost cutting exercises, has correctly identified the cause of this cultural vandalism. It is apparent that this ludicrous example of cost cutting, and reductions to the funds of the Australia Council, must in future place an increased burden on all State Governments who wish to support the Arts effectively. The cost of wholly supporting the Adelaide Singers would be considerable, but this Government continues to be hopeful and is investigating every possibility in the light of the extremely difficult and unwarranted impositions placed on State finances by the Federal Government's cut-backs.

OVERSEA TRIPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the total cost of trips overseas by the Premier, Ministers, Speakers, and Leaders of the Opposition, and their respective entourages, since June 1, 1970?

2. What is the detail of such cost?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The total cost, since 1970, of trips overseas by Ministers is shown in the Estimates of Revenue Expenditure

each year under the various portfolio headings. In the case of the Speaker and Leader of the Opposition the information is shown under the Legislature.

2. It is not feasible to extract details of costs of trips since 1970. After being audited accounts are filed away and in due course destroyed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the present policy of the Government concerning payment at public expense of trips overseas by the Premier, Ministers, the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition?

2. When was this policy adopted?

3. Is it proposed to review such policy and, if so, when and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Premier and Ministers may travel overseas whenever, in the opinion of Cabinet, it becomes necessary. The Leader of the Opposition may travel overseas once in each three years. The Speaker has no standing entitlement: each case is judged on its merits.

2. The Premier and Ministers have always been able to travel overseas at public expense, subject to Cabinet approval. In relation to Leaders of the Opposition the decision was made on June 24, 1974.

3. No.

CROYDON SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has been taken to improve amenities at the Croydon Junior Primary School since public complaints were made about them on December 11, 1975, and if so, at what cost?

2. If no action has been taken:

(a) why not; and

(b) is it proposed to take any action and, if so, what action, when, and at what estimated cost?

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

1. In order to provide upgraded facilities at the Croydon Junior Primary School, stage I of the overall redevelopment programme has now been deferred in favour of stage II. Stage II involves the upgrading of an existing solid construction building on the school site to provide flexible teaching spaces with associated wet areas and withdrawal facilities, toilet facilities, activity hall, resource centre and administration and staff facilities. It is expected that tenders will be called some time before October, 1976, with an expected completion date of September, 1977. The estimated cost of this project is \$450 000. Auxiliary accommodation, namely two transportables, will be erected at the school before stage II building programme begins. As an interim measure the following projects have been programmed:

(1) Upgrading of the existing toilet facilities will be included in the cyclic maintenance due for the whole school early in the forthcoming financial year. The complete cost of the maintenance is \$69 000.

(2) Water coolers are currently being installed for the use of the junior primary children at the school. A sum of \$2 200 has been spent on this project already with a further \$800 allocated for the completion of the work.

In addition the following action has been taken:

1. The Public Works Standing Committee has inspected the site for the stage II development.

2. Officers of the new Directorate of Educational Facilities have inspected the school and as a result of their inspection the following action will occur:

(1) Arrangements will be made for the secondary technical studies classes to quit the building in the south-east corner of the school site to make it available for primary and junior primary use, probably in term 3, 1976 and certainly for 1977.

(2) Action has been taken under the minor works programme for the section of yard to be resealed on the site of the building destroyed by fire.

2. See 1.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to reduce the number of fishing licences in South Australia?

2. As at June 30, 1976

(a) how many persons held class A fishing licences: and

(b) how many held class B fishing licences?

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

1. No; unless an infringement of policy occurs.

2. (a) 915.

(b) 663.

VEHICLE INSURANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Does the Government propose to introduce no-fault motor vehicle insurance and, if not, why not?

2. What action has the Government taken to speed up the settlement of claims of third party insurance?

3. Is the present system considered satisfactory and, if not, why not?

4. What is the current delay in present hearings?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows: 1, 2, and 3. The various aspects of third party insurance, including no-fault compensation, are being investigated and when the task is completed, the report will be submitted to Cabinet for its consideration. At that stage, an announcement of any changes proposed by the Government can be expected.

4. Local Court jurisdiction:

(a) The current delay in claims of or under the sum of \$500 is about five months. It is hoped that within the next few months the backlog of cases will be reduced and the delay will then be no longer than two months.

(b) In claims over \$500, the current delay is about three months.

Supreme Court jurisdiction:

(a) The delay between the setting down of an action and its first listing is at present between 12 to nine months. It is anticipated that as the matrimonial jurisdiction subsides the position should improve.

(b) It is not possible to give an estimate of the delay which occurs between the time when proceedings are instituted and the time when they are set down for hearing as this is a matter which depends upon the conduct of the action by the solicitors for the parties.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Will a waste disposal authority be established in South Australia and, if so, when and who will administer the authority?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A proposal to establish a waste disposal authority is now being considered by Cabinet. It is expected that an announcement will be made shortly on this matter.

TAPLEYS HILL ROAD

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will Tapleys Hill Road between Burbridge Road, West Beach and Anderson Avenue, Glenelg North, be upgraded to a four-lane highway, and if not, why not?

2. What plans and details has the Highways Department prepared to link Military Road with Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Commonwealth Government approval for the duplication of Tapleys Hill Road has been refused by the Federal Minister for Transport in his letter to me dated May 26, 1976. Mr. Nixon states he is not prepared to approve my request for permission to duplicate this road until the investigations of the advisory committee studying airport facilities has been completed. It appears that Mr. Nixon desires to retain the option for providing facilities at West Beach for the landing of Concorde supersonic aircraft, notwithstanding the fact that the State Government has repeatedly declared itself in favour of a policy that the airport facilities will not be permitted to be extended beyond the present boundaries of the airport property.

2. Until Federal Government approval for the duplication of Tapleys Hill Road between Burbridge Road and Anderson Avenue is given, it is not possible to provide the information sought regarding the linking of Military Road with Tapleys Hill Road.

CONCORDE AIRCRAFT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the State Government received any assurance from the Federal Minister for Transport that the Concorde aircraft will not use Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site?

2. What were the noise level readings obtained for the Environment Department during the last proving flights of the Concorde to and from Tullamarine Airport, Victoria?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. No. The Secretary, Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development, in a letter dated July 5, 1976, replying to the Government's submission on the draft environmental impact statement for Concorde, assured us that the proponents' final environmental impact statement will contain specific reference to the use of Adelaide Airport as an alternative to Melbourne Airport, and to predictions on the likely frequency that Adelaide Airport may be used by Concorde.

2. The following noise levels were recorded by the Commonwealth Department of Transport at Tullamarine on Concorde's recent visit when Concorde was operating under maximum weight conditions hence maximum noise generation. Noise levels are rated in effective perceived

noise levels, E.P.N. (dB) units on a selected grid having the following location references:

<i>Concorde take-off</i>						
Measurement sites	1	4	6			
Noise level E.P.N. (dB)	123.3	115.8	133.8			
<i>Concorde landing</i>						
Measurement						
Sites	11	12	13	14	15	16
Noise level						
E.P.N. (dB)	122.0	114.9	101.3	102.3	101.9	119.4

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Christies Beach-Noarlunga District Sewerage Scheme—Phase II (Southern and Onkaparinga Trunk Sewers), Flinders Medical Centre Development—Phase IV, LeFevre Co-educational High School Conversion (Stages II and III), Port Adelaide Birkenhead Wharves (Reconstructing G and H Berths).

Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: UNDERGROUND WATER

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Ever since it has been in office, the Government has been concerned for the welfare of market gardeners and other underground water users on the northern Adelaide Plains. Following establishment of market gardening activities in the area during the 1950's and 1960's, the Mines Department showed that the groundwater basin was being overpumped. In 1967, the area was defined under the Underground Waters Preservation Act and, following the advice of the Underground Waters Advisory Committee, the Government adopted an interim policy aimed at preventing further over-usage of the basin. Quotas were placed on all irrigation bores in the area, individual allocations being based on previous usage. The annual intake of the basin is of the order of 7 500 megalitres a year. At present the water extracted is 21 000 megalitres a year, or about three times the natural intake.

With this state of imbalance, the Mines Department estimated that localised salinity problems would occur within ten years and would be widespread in 30 years. The Government was therefore most concerned for the long-term viability of the market gardening industry in the northern Adelaide Plains and the consequent socio-economic problems that would face the hard working people of that area. The Government was also concerned at the inevitable loss of a valuable State water resource. A study of possible alternative water resources was carried out that demonstrated that effluent from the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works offered the most attractive and least uneconomical supplementary supply. This study was followed by a detailed investigation by the Agriculture Department into the suitability of Bolivar effluent for irrigation on the northern Adelaide Plains.

At the same time, sociological studies were initiated to examine the impact of the restrictions. The Agriculture Department study showed that the effluent could be used on free-draining soils and for salt tolerant crops, such as lucerne, potatoes, flood-irrigated tomatoes and cucumbers, onions and possibly cabbages, cauliflowers and wine grapes. Whilst preliminary studies had indicated that any proposal to reticulate Bolivar effluent throughout the market gardening area was not attractive economically, the Government's concern was such as to commission an in-depth report to consolidate all previous work on this matter; to evaluate the sociological, public health, agricultural and economic implications; and, in particular, to carry out the detailed engineering design and estimates for schemes to utilise Bolivar effluent as a supplementary water resource for the northern Adelaide Plains. This report has now been completed, and I seek leave to table it.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As members will see, it is a voluminous report and reflects the complexity of the subject. Very briefly, the report finds that there is sufficient effluent which could be used in conjunction with groundwater to maintain the major part of the agricultural industry and the aquifer. Because of its marginal quality, it is desirable (and for some crops, essential) that the effluent be blended with groundwater. Increased application rates would be required for leaching, and lower yields could be expected for some crops.

The effluent would also require disinfection for public health reasons. A preferred irrigation scheme provides for reticulating disinfected effluent to nearly all growers. The estimated capital cost is \$19 800 000, and total annual cost (including interest and depreciation) is \$2 800 000.

Unfortunately, the viability of market garden operations in the area is very sensitive to water price. The report suggests that a charge of 4c a kilolitre for effluent and a charge of 2c a kilolitre for groundwater would be the maximum possible; this would achieve a revenue of \$856 000. The Government's policy is not to make charges for the legitimate use of underground water and, while this could create some difficulties, no change in policy is proposed; this would reduce revenue to \$727 000 a year or a loss of over \$2 000 000 a year.

The scheme is therefore most unattractive economically, and could not be financed by the State, nor am I optimistic that the scheme would receive favourable consideration from the Commonwealth Government, particularly in the light of its present economic policies and the generally unhelpful attitude of that Government. There is a further important factor: the sociological studies carried out in this report (and previous reports) confirm that the provision of effluent will not in itself overcome the socio-economic problems facing the people of the area. Much of the activity is based on small market gardens that survive because of the industrious efforts of family groups.

Many of these properties could only be considered as uneconomic, and it is extremely doubtful whether future owners will be willing to accept the hard-earned return offered by these small enterprises. In fact, the report indicates that there is already a trend away from labour-intensive vegetable growing operations towards permanent crops, and a continuing trend in this direction will negate the Government's original objective of maintaining the existing activities in the area. The present proposal, which involves some internal capital outlay as well as higher running costs, could be expected to accelerate these and other changes in land use.

Before any approach can be made to the Commonwealth Government, it is necessary to obtain the reactions and, if possible, the support of the people of the area. It is also necessary to evaluate the proposals in terms of the most beneficial use of the total water resources of the State. There is one new development that reduces the urgency of this problem. As part of the Government's new water resources management policy, two highly qualified officers of the Mines Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department were sent overseas last year to study new techniques in the assessment, development, and management of underground water resources.

At the same time, data collection on the groundwater basin in the northern Adelaide Plains has continued. These initiatives have permitted a more rigorous and accurate analysis of the basin, and calculations to date indicate that, while salinity will increase over the next 30 years, the effects will tend to be relatively localised, and the rate of increase in the long term will be considerably less than previously predicted. This is due to the apparently limited areas by which the highly saline waters from the upper aquifers find their way into the deeper aquifers, and the fact that the saline water from these upper aquifers will be substantially drained out in about 30 years time. This means that irrigation will be disrupted in certain localised areas due to salinity problems.

The projected overall life of the basin however has been considerably extended. Whilst the continued "mining" of this valuable State water resource is of concern, the welfare of the people of the northern Adelaide Plains is the Government's paramount consideration. This latest development provides the time essential to resolve this difficult and complex problem. I have referred the consultants report and all other available information to the South Australian Water Resources Council and the Northern Adelaide Plains Water Resources Advisory Committee and have made arrangements for the public release and display of the report. I have written to all users of underground water in the area, informing them of the situation and inviting comment. In the light of that comment, the council will advise the Government of the best way to manage this complex situation. Of more immediate concern, I can announce that annual underground water allocations will be maintained at their present levels for at least the next five years.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POST SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: On February 3 this year, I announced to the House that the Government would be appointing a committee to inquire into post secondary education in this State. A rough and ready definition of what I mean by "post secondary education" was contained in that statement, and I refer members to *Hansard* if they wish to refresh their memory. Following the necessary Cabinet approval, I am now able to make public the terms of reference and membership of the committee. I will not delay the House now by reading in detail the terms of reference. I have made the terms of reference available to the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mallee (the spokesman for the Opposition on Education). The terms of reference will, of course, along with an explanatory statement, be released this afternoon to

the press and media. They are, however, available to any member of this House or the public who desires a copy.

The membership of the committee is as follows:

Chairman—Dr. D. S. Anderson, Professorial Fellow, Education Research Unit, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University.

The Government is delighted to have been able to attract an educationist of Dr. Anderson's calibre to head the inquiry. I have consulted on a confidential basis with persons associated with both South Australian universities, colleges of advanced education, and the Further Education Department, and the choice has been welcomed on all sides.

The two other members of the committee are Mr. S. Huddleston, General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, who recently resigned after serving for some years on the Board of Advanced Education and therefore has considerable knowledge of what is known as the college sector in tertiary education, and Mr. P. Fleming, Director of Staff Development Division of the Public Service Board and now a member of the Technical and Further Education Commission of the Commonwealth. In this latter capacity, Mr. Fleming has had a good opportunity to become familiar with problems in the further education sector.

I have also requested of the Chairman of the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research that Mr. D. Anders, Executive Director of the council, be permitted to act as a special consultant to the committee, and that Dr. Virginia Kenny, Academic Secretary of the S.A.C.E.P.R., be Secretary to the inquiry. In this way, all the resources of the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research will be available to the members of the inquiry. It is expected that the committee will call for submissions from interested parties between now and the end of this calendar year, but that most of the inquiry will take place during 1977. Members will note that one of the Government's instructions to the inquiry is that it should report no later than the end of 1977, but that it can make interim reports as necessary.

CENSURE MOTION: URANIUM

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

That in the opinion of this House,

- (1) the question of future uranium processing, enrichment and use in South Australia is a vital issue;
- (2) a detailed and informed public inquiry into the possible environmental, health, safety, moral and social effects of uranium processing and use in South Australia must be conducted before any such project is promoted by the Government, either in Australia or overseas; and
- (3) the Government has been gravely irresponsible and contemptuous of public concern in promoting proposals for uranium enrichment at Redcliff to overseas industrial concerns and the Federal Government without having first set up an independent public inquiry into the project, and is therefore to be censured.

This is a serious matter. If the Opposition were to move a motion of no confidence or censure every time the Government failed to take Parliament or the people of South Australia into its confidence, it would become a very commonplace occurrence. On this occasion, however, the matter is of such extreme and vital importance that such action is entirely necessary. The whole question of nuclear energy and the use of uranium is now under the closest scrutiny, not only here, but throughout the world. People in the community are concerned, and this is easily understood, because many of the world's leading figures and experts in the field of nuclear energy are concerned. South Australia is poised on the brink of the nuclear age, and no-one is quite sure whether it is safe to move on. If South Australia takes action to build a uranium enrichment plant, and thus enters the nuclear age, the community of this State, Australia, and indeed the whole world could be affected, and the community of this State is responsible enough to be vitally concerned about the issues involved and certainly quite capable of making a decision and expressing its point of view.

That is why, more than anything else, it should be a community decision, based on community involvement, and everyone should be given an opportunity to learn the facts, and be reassured about the final decision, whichever way that may go. Whatever the decision, everyone should be given the opportunity to know the facts. However, the Government did not see fit to take the people into its confidence. Even now, for some reason, the Government states that it will not hold any inquiry into the proposal, and the best the Minister for the Environment can say is that the Federal Government should hold an inquiry. The first news of this mammoth project came to light in a story published in a national magazine. It seems that details of the proposals were leaked to the *Bulletin* and that the Government had no intention of releasing them before that time, if one can judge by the Premier's reaction that day. Industrial secrecy is possibly justified, but community considerations are bigger than that. Perhaps it was for political secrecy, but that certainly is not justified either, because uranium enrichment is such a vital community issue.

The prospect of a multi-million dollar project of the magnitude of the proposed uranium enrichment plant is a very tempting one and, the uranium aspect ignored, would be most attractive to any Government. The Opposition agrees that it is the sort of development necessary in this State. In the past we have seen many pre-election promises such as Dartmouth, Monarto and Redcliff to name but a few. Today, more than ever before there is a great and urgent need for industrial development in South Australia.

The change from a predominantly rural economy to a largely industrial economy came about in the Playford era. The motor industry and the white goods industries were built up the hard way, almost in a pioneering way, but during the last few years we have seen how fragile is the structure of this Government's industrial policy. We have seen no major developments, other than those which were inevitable during the last two or three years. Because of militant actions by some trade union officials, South Australia has priced itself out of overseas competition. Factories have closed, and even the motor vehicle industry, the basis of our industrial prosperity, must now be considered shaky. The plain fact is, that South Australia no longer has the many advantages for industry it once enjoyed under a Liberal Government.

Industrial development is urgently needed, as witnessed by the Government's desperate attempts to find some projects before each election. Anything would be welcome,

but a major plan such as this would be very welcome. Leaving out the complications inherent in the use of uranium, and treating it as a straight-forward industrial development, it is very attractive to South Australia's economy. The Government's secrecy may demonstrate that it believes the plant could be very attractive electorally, and could be used as another of these pre-election promises. However, it may indicate more than a need to pre-empt the development in competition with other States, and indicate a realisation that there will be community concern because of the involvement of uranium.

The full details and advantages of the enrichment plant are set out in the committee's report, some of its headings being as follows:

It would be Australia's largest single industrial complex; it would be bigger in value than either of B.H.P.'s steel plants; it would be bigger than any car factory; it would be bigger than any oil refinery; the income generated would be over \$425 000 000 a year; site employment would be up to 800 during the eight years of building; factory employment would be provided for 1 550 people; it would support a town with a population of over 4 500 people; it would support a \$50 000 000 a year centrifuge industry in Adelaide, as well as technological developments and employment; and, above all it would make up for losses of industry and deficiencies in other fields.

This is just what is so desperately needed in South Australia.

What a good thing for the State and what a well-deserved feather in the Government's hat, if it can bring it off. Politically, it would make up for the Redcliff petro-chemical disaster. The Government will say, "We must not allow the question of community concern over uranium to stand in the way". However, this is the additional factor, the one fundamental difference that we cannot ignore. We are dealing with uranium. Perhaps it will be all right: if so, the project should go ahead. Perhaps it may not be all right: if so, the people of this State, and the rest of Australia, must know all details before the project is sold overseas.

There have been many debates, many learned dissertations and authoritative articles, and much publicity generally. There is thus a growing degree of public awareness that I think is inevitable, not just from organised groups, like Friends of the Earth, or the Australian Conservation Foundation, but now from the man in the street. All of these organisations and people are concerned and are uncertain about the project, mainly because only one side of the story has been told. They have heard about uranium and fallout, and the effects of nuclear waste; and whether or not their concern about this particular plant may be justified, concerned they are, and concerned they will remain, until they are reassured.

There is no doubt they need to be properly informed, just as every member of this House needs to be properly informed, both about the project, and about any possible complications that may arise from uranium enrichment, and the use of uranium elsewhere. We all recognise that the world is facing an energy crisis, and that there is a finite limit to the present reserves of fossil fuel. Nuclear energy is regarded by many people as a short-term energy source, bridging the gap between fossil fuel and fusion energy. The Australian Atomic Energy Commission report setting out the energy needs of Australia is quite conclusive. Ultimately, these will be met by fusion and by solar energy (including wind and tide

power), but there is much work still to be done in these fields. There are barriers to the effective utilisation and storage of those energies at this stage, and those barriers must be overcome before we can use effectively those means of energy generation.

In the meantime, it has been suggested that nuclear power should be used, but there are numerous difficulties and possible long-term risks. There is the danger of radio-activity. In the mining and milling of uranium, the chances of lung cancer are increased from the radiation effect of radon, which is exacerbated by smoking. This risk is not significant in open-cut mining. Leukemia and genetic effects certainly are known to result from radiation, but it is debatable whether there would be enough under the conditions likely to apply to make this a danger. On the positive side in nuclear fission, there has been a high safety record of reactor use up until now, because of high standards of control, but radio-active waste and its disposal remain a major problem and a potentially lethal one. We are back again to the radio-active problems.

I have no doubt it will be said from the other side of the House there will be no radio-active waste involved in the uranium enrichment plant, but we must consider the problems as they affect the use of nuclear energy generally and the use of uranium. We have that responsibility as a community and as a country, and we cannot back away from it. Many people are concerned about the potential use of uranium and its products in nuclear warfare. That also presents a most difficult problem, although it is said the development of other uranium sources will occur if we do not develop ours. We will have no control over theirs, but we may be able to control ours.

The enrichment process alone, it is clear, has few of these direct problems, but concern in the community is still there. This concern is governed by emotive factors associated with uranium and nuclear fission, and are governed by the appalling magnitude of a potential disaster. The actual and potential effects of atomic bombs, or of major disasters (as examined in the Rasmussen report) involve whole cities and complete communities. Of course everyone is concerned, and will want to be reassured; this can be done only by a careful public inquiry, which puts the pros and cons into a balanced perspective. Those pros and cons must be sorted out by an independent inquiry using the expertise that many of our university workers and other nuclear physicists now have.

It is in this vital area that I believe the present Government has betrayed the trust of the people of this State. It obviously knew of the possibility of action two years ago, or more, when Mr. Connor discussed the need for an enrichment plant somewhere in Australia. The first interim report of the Government's committee was taken overseas by the present Minister of Mines and Energy some time ago. Certainly there was a need then to get going and to prepare plans and ideas from the industrial development point of view, and in that area the Government has indeed shown initiative. It was better prepared for this than it was for the Redcliff petro-chemical project.

But it must surely have been apparent to the Government that a full-scale inquiry would have to be held and would be necessary, and indeed most people believed that the Labor Party had accepted the principle of requiring full-scale environmental impact studies before any project of this size would be considered. It has been said that the findings of the Fox Commission, after the current Ranger inquiry, will govern the decision to be made on the future

of the enrichment plant. This does not absolve the South Australian Government from its responsibility in this matter. The setting up of the Ranger inquiry was a fortuitous circumstance as far as this present project is concerned. Will its findings be directly applicable? Will they apply directly to a project at Redcliff in South Australia? I am sure this Government cannot defer its own independent inquiry until we know what the results of the Ranger inquiry are going to be. I maintain that it has no right whatever and that it has let down the people of South Australia in this regard.

The fact remains that, with at least two years notice and detailed investigation and research, no action was taken by the Government on a fundamental principle—the holding of a major environmental impact study. The Premier has said that a series of studies has been carried out. What were they and when were they carried out? Have they carried a full ecological cycle studied over a period of at least two years? Have the particular problems of uranium been considered as they relate to the project in South Australia? I strongly doubt it, but I shall be interested to hear from the Premier whether this is so. Dr. Ken King, of the University of Adelaide, is doing a post-graduate course in environmental sciences and has been studying the Government's report. In part, he says:

Although there are probably no insuperable difficulties concerning health, safety, and the environment, the problems are involved and require thorough exploration and planning. The report however, completely fails to come to grips with environmental matters and also makes no genuine attempt to explore the alternatives. For instance, the report itself admits that no sites were considered in any detail other than Redcliff. This site was chosen on economic criteria such as the availability of land, labour, services, transport, and raw materials. One factor of significance is that the site is already owned by the State Government, and this means that the plan can be implemented sooner.

I think, a very pertinent comment.

However, there were no environmental criteria used for siting the plant at Redcliff, and in fact there are many reasons for preferring a site nearer the mouth of the gulf.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Where? He does not say, does he?

Dr. TONKIN: I am not suggesting that he does say: I am simply quoting to the Premier, who is obviously embarrassed by the whole business, exactly what an expert in the field has had to say about the report that his Minister has been peddling overseas and showing to companies, hoping to interest them in coming to South Australia and setting up the project, regardless of the wishes and concern of the people of South Australia. Dr. King continues:

The committee whitewashes the choice by referring to the previous investigations of the Redcliff site for a petrochemical complex. However, they have been less than frank when they state that—

The suitability of Redcliff as a site for a major industry has previously been recognised and studied in considerable detail, and the findings of an environmental commission of inquiry as to the suitability of the site for development have been favourable.

In the first place, a petro-chemical complex is not an enrichment plant: there is scarce similarity in the "suitability" of the environmental factors governing the two. In the second place, the inquiry did not, and could not, establish anything definite. It was hastily convened and ran for a fortnight. It made no pretence of providing "an adequate substitute for an environmental impact statement". Many witnesses, and the commissioners themselves, complained that there had been inadequate time to appraise the petrochemical scheme. The inquiry added further that "in a project of this scale, economic studies and very costly design studies of a technological nature must proceed in parallel with environmental studies".

This is the basis of my concern. Environmental criteria must be used right from the outset in order that any serious impacts can be balanced properly against the alleged economic, social and political gains. The South Australian Department of the Environment is only now drawing up guidelines for an impact statement on the enrichment plant, nearly a year too late. A public inquiry will be needed to compensate for all the secrecy and to reassure the public about its concern for radiation hazards (a fear that is largely unjustified in the present context). Any final decision should also mesh with a national uranium policy, which itself should take note of the findings of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry.

Dr. King has summed up the situation very well. He has made quite clear that there have been insufficient environmental studies. He has made quite clear, too, that he believes that the fears of many people will be proved groundless when we hear the results of the various inquiries into this project. He says, quite categorically (and I totally agree with him) that, because of the secrecy with which this programme has been conducted, many people in South Australia will require that an independent South Australian inquiry be held into the matter before they will be reassured. Certainly the Government cannot say it was not aware of any community disquiet. Members of its own Party have frequently made that clear, and I am confident of their support in this matter. A matter as vital as this is above Party politics, and gets down to basic principles and personal convictions. As recently as the last State A.L.P. Convention, I understand that these matters were ventilated by members, and it seems that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy were less than frank on that occasion. If, because of time, a detailed independent and public inquiry was not possible as a preliminary step, it should have been undertaken concurrently. Instead, we find that the second report, which is attractively presented, certainly, with glossy photographs, which is full of details, and which sets out strong reasons for coming to South Australia, has now been given wide circulation overseas, as we read in the press reports today the following:

Hudson back. Europe wants uranium.

It will do little good for the Minister to say, as he does at the end of his press statement (obviously having had second thoughts), that he has not really sold the project at all, and that it will be totally subject to the findings of an independent inquiry. The question is: what independent inquiry, and when will it be set up? More particularly, why was it not set up two years ago?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Fancy coming back to listen to this garbage—and I had a pair for this week! A man must be stark, staring, raving nuts!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister apparently treats this subject very lightly and without any consideration for the concern of the community, and I have no doubt that his attitude will be noticed and noted by the whole community. I should like him to go down, as the Premier did recently, to a Politics I lecture and face the barrage of questions and concern exhibited there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I was terribly put—

Dr. TONKIN: The Premier did not make much of an impression down there either. Surely the Government must realise that this must tend very strongly to pre-empt the decision, and it is foolish of the Government to say that it does not. I, for one, hope that the findings of the Ranger inquiry and those of our own independent and public inquiry in South Australia (which I hope will be set up soon, even though it will be two years late) will put all our minds at rest regarding uranium enrichment and that the project can proceed. If the enrichment plant passes all the

tests one can apply to it, and if we can attract sufficient support from overseas and from the Commonwealth Government, it will be of immense significance and benefit to South Australia. We need the project to maintain South Australia's industrial position. However, even if the inquiry gives the project a clean bill of health in every way, the delay in instituting it may already have ruined our chances of gaining the development.

It is difficult enough for this Government to persuade any oversea interest to come to South Australia in the face of its policies on worker participation and workmen's compensation, and because of union activity. We can certainly do without the additional handicap of lost time caused by Government negligence in fulfilling its fundamental obligations and keeping its promises to the people of South Australia. It has bungled yet again. The Government has a responsibility to inform and, as far as possible, reassure the people of this State, and it has been grossly negligent and irresponsible in its planning and promotion of the Redcliff uranium enrichment plant proposals. It well deserves the censure of this Parliament and of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader at some stage in the extraordinary pastiche he has given to us this afternoon talked of energy from wind power. His speech had plenty of wind, but neither power nor energy. I listened with care to the Leader to see what it was he was saying the Government had been negligent about and what it was that we had been lacking in doing for South Australia. He said that we had a report from an inquiry and that the report is well presented, full of facts, well documented, that it is the second interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, and that we are now having environmental studies into the proposals contained in that report; but, somehow or other, despite the fact that we need industrial development in South Australia, that the report has been well presented and that South Australia is well ahead of any other area of Australia in preparing proposals, we have lost time in doing studies. I do not know where it can be said that we have lost time. I notice that Dr. King, whom I have not met, who did not check with any Government department about his statements, and who is a great authority, apparently, as a post-graduate student at Adelaide University, has said that the South Australian Environment Department is only now drawing up guidelines for an impact statement on the enrichment plant, nearly a year too late. What is too late about it?

No decision has been made. We are well ahead of every other State in the preparation of studies, but no decision can be made until the necessary environmental studies have been completed. They are to be proceeded with, and no other State is in this position at present. What is too late about it? Apparently the Leader is not aware that it will be at least two years before it can even be decided that it would be economic for any country to proceed with a centrifuge enrichment plant.

Mr. Mathwin: We saw all this with Redcliff.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It seems to be suggested that somehow we could have done this yesterday. The pilot projects in centrifuge enrichment (which is the process recommended in the report, and we are recommended against being involved in any other kind of process) have not been completed as to the economics, so how is it too late at this stage of proceedings to proceed with environmental studies regarding the propriety of proceeding with a centrifuge enrichment plant about

which, given all the factors we would have to consider, no decision could be made for another two years? The Leader says that we are losing it through delay. What delay? We are ahead of every other State, and that position has been stated by the Deputy Prime Minister of the Government of which the Leader is such an assiduous defender. Whenever that Government attacks South Australia or the States, and Ministers in other States in Liberal Governments protest about the way in which the States are dealt with, the Leader gets up and defends the Commonwealth Government. He does not worry about South Australia, but is always defending the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Anthony, who welcomed the studies made by South Australia, said that the decision would finally be made by the Commonwealth Government and, as South Australia had said, only after a whole series of public criteria had been established.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He didn't say that we were too late.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he said he was glad that we were first in the field. Apparently the Leader does not agree with the Deputy Prime Minister in this matter. The Leader said that, somehow or other, we had been gravely deficient, and then got himself off on to the subject of losses in industry in South Australia. Of the three major industrial States, this State has had, in the past 10 years, and continues to have a better rate of industrial growth than has either of the other two. The figures are clear: in the past 10 years we have had a 12 per cent increase in industrial jobs, compared to a 3 per cent increase in Victoria and a 2 per cent loss in New South Wales.

Mr. Dean Brown: Queensland and Western Australia are well ahead of us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, they are not. They are marginally ahead, but they are not as industrialised as we are by far.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about lost man hours?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are a long way ahead. We have 10.4 per cent of the work force (an increase from 9.2 per cent) and we have only 3.4 per cent of the time lost in industrial disputes—the best record in Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have another go!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am always glad of his help. I waited to see what was the Leader's grave area of concern to South Australia about our even considering a report of the committee. No decision has been made by Government about this. We received the committee's report. It was leaked to the press after I had directed that the Environment Department was to specify the environmental studies to be done in relation to it. Because it had been leaked to the press, I released it to everyone. No decision had been made. The Leader has said that, because of the report the Government has had, there is a grave community concern about the dangers of radio-activity in the mining and milling of uranium. I do not know what grave public concern there is. Apparently the Leader has not studied the history of uranium in South Australia, which was a major producer of uranium. In the past we had the State-run mine at Radium Hill and a treatment works at Port Pirie. A former South Australian Minister of Labour and Industry was a miner at Radium Hill, and the propotent of the whole programme was Sir Thomas Playford. Radium Hill was an extremely successful State

project, for which we gave Sir Thomas great credit. Where was the great difficulty about the danger of radio-activity in the mining and milling of uranium then, and what case can the Leader cite of lack of care or medical problems that arose out of that mining and treatment project?

The Leader has not cited a case; he cannot do so. That was the only thing the Leader said that was actively a problem for South Australia. He could not cite evidence in support of there being a problem of this nature. He admits that, from the report put forward, it is clear that there are no real hazards to South Australia in the establishment of a centrifuge enrichment plant. Environmentally, such a plant would cause less trouble than the Imperial Chemical Industries plant at Port Adelaide causes. The Leader cannot point, nor can Dr. King in his grand statement that he made to the press, point to anything that would cause environmental difficulty or damage to South Australia. No atomic wastes are involved, there are no problems about effluent, no escaping gases, and no possibility of the escape of radio-activity. In fact, a hexafluoride plant or a full uranium enrichment plant on the centrifuge process presents South Australia, as the report states, with fewer problems than the average petro-chemical plant already existing in this country.

The Leader then turned to the oversea problems of dealing with uranium by customer countries. That is a matter of great concern to the South Australian Government. We made it clear as soon as the report was released that a decision would not be made in relation to the mining of uranium or its enrichment in South Australia unless it was established publicly that it was safe to provide a customer country with any form of uranium.

Mr. Millhouse: You'll never establish that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know that we will not establish that, but, if we do not do so, the Government will not proceed.

Mr. Millhouse: Good!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have made that clear from the outset: it is clearly Australian Labor Party policy and it was discussed at the Labor Party conference held in South Australia. The motion on this matter, which affirmed that policy and which was seconded by me, was passed without opposition at that conference. I do not know where the Leader hears these rumors about there being great problems at the State Labor conference, because there were no problems. The Leader also suggests that the South Australian Government should now establish an inquiry into the provision of uranium to customer countries.

We do not believe at this stage that it is necessary to proceed with such an inquiry, given the terms of reference of the Ranger inquiry, which specifically covers this topic. I will read out those terms of reference. New directions were given, when Mr. Berinson was the Minister for the Environment, to the commission. It was to inquire into all the environmental aspects of the formulation of proposals, the carrying out of works and other projects, the negotiation, operation and enforcement of agreements and arrangements, the making of or the participation in the making of decisions and recommendations, the incurring of expenditure by or on behalf of the Australian Government, and other matters.

The arrangements to be made with customer countries are the subject of the Ranger inquiry. With all the lengthy proceedings that that inquiry has gone through and with the wide range of evidence at the Commonwealth

level that has been provided, why in the world should South Australia now provide a public inquiry to cover the same matters? The Government has said that it will not proceed with an inquiry because it does not believe that it is necessary to hold such an inquiry at this stage. We will determine what future action will be taken by the Government after the Ranger commission has reported. We will then know what are the areas requiring further studies and what inquiries need to be undertaken. When that situation becomes clear, the South Australian Government will take whatever action needs to be taken. South Australia is certainly ahead of anyone else in seeing to it that South Australia is in a position to take advantage of any properly established decision in Australia to proceed to uranium enrichment if it is safe to do so.

The Leader then asked how the Fox inquiry was applicable to Redcliff. It is applicable in relation to the provision of uranium to customer countries and in relation to the mining of uranium in Australia. In generalities, it will also cover the question of enrichment, which is vital to the question of a proposal for a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. The Leader said that the South Australian Government should have made an environmental impact statement to start with—that it should have gone into the environmental aspects of a uranium enrichment proposal before the interim report was released.

I suggest to the Leader (and I appreciate that he has not had any experience in Administration) that, if he sets out on an environmental study in a situation where he does not have a specific proposal, he will never get to the end of the environmental study. Such studies need to be made in relation to specific proposals. The specific proposal has been prepared but has not been decided on by the Government. However, in order to further the process so that the Government can make a decision in future, environmental studies will be made in relation to the specific proposal.

It is suggested that what one must do is look only at the environmental questions in deciding the site. Apparently the questions of cost, the social factors involved in the provision of a work force, the provision of infrastructure and shipping facilities, and the spread of costs are not to be taken into account regarding the siting of works. That is a ridiculous proposition; it is juvenile.

Dr. King has suggested that a site nearer the mouth of the gulf might have been better, but he does not suggest an alternative site. Where would it be? Would it be at Port Lincoln, Port Rickaby or Port Victoria? How would we then provide the houses, the infrastructure, and the schools? Obviously, if we are to decide on a site within the gulf, it must be near the possibility of effective port facilities, and all the studies done on Spencer Gulf previously, dating back to the old Public Works Committee study on Port Paterson, were that the site at Redcliff was the ideal one for the use of deep sea port facilities within the gulf. Where else could it be established effectively?

What is more, from the point of view of provision of the work force, we must have towns with a reasonable growth factor if we are to provide a generator of employment of this kind. If not, enormous costs will be encountered in an isolated community, which will have a whole series of social disabilities. Quite obviously, the decision as to siting related to the northern area of Spencer Gulf. The proposals were considered in relation to Port Pirie and Whyalla and sites near Port Augusta, but the recommendation of the committee quite clearly was that such a plant should be at some little distance from housing, just as the proposal in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical plant was that,

given the amount of noise and light that it provided, it should be some little distance from housing. The Redcliff site was an obvious one for the committee to choose, because it has all the necessary advantages, but that does not mean that the Government has decided on the matter; it has not. No decision has been pre-empted. This is a recommendation of the committee that must now be studied.

Mr. Millhouse: When do you expect to be able to make a decision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would think it would take at least two years.

Mr. Millhouse: From now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It would not be possible to obtain a decision: the decision will not be ours alone, but a decision of the Federal Government and probably of the Australian Industry Development Corporation. I am aware that the directors of A.I.D.C. are still proposing to the Federal Government that the way in which a uranium enrichment plant should be established (if one is to be established) is by A.I.D.C. borrowing the money from the customer countries, and A.I.D.C. putting the money in so that, in effect, it is in control of the plant on behalf of the Australian Government. It will be at least that time before decisions can be made by the relevant organisations, given the economics of uranium enrichment on the centrifuge system. We could not consider a gas diffusion system of uranium enrichment in South Australia, and that is not proposed by the committee. Such a system would mean an enormous input of power, far beyond what we could reasonably provide, whereas a centrifuge system is entirely within our proposed power capacity in South Australia without putting any extra strain on us at all.

The gas diffusion system requires large quantities of water which we could not provide, whereas the centrifuge system requires almost none. The honourable member then said that the Minister had gone overseas peddling a uranium enrichment plant. That is not true. Certainly, the Minister had with him a copy of the study, but it was not so much that he set out to discuss the uranium enrichment plant with people he saw in the mining and mining development areas of Europe as that everywhere he went the first thing anyone said to him was, "What about the provision of uranium from Australia?" Any Minister of Mines who has gone overseas knows that the position is that several countries are committed, as is Japan, to the provision of power from uranium in the interim period between the likely ending of fossil fuel availability and the provision of alternative sources of power.

Naturally, they are interested, and I am sure the Minister will tell the House what they had to say on this subject. Finally, the Leader referred to some kind of delay in this industry. There has been no delay. We set up this study, and the Environment Department in South Australia was fully informed about it from the outset. I sat with officers of the department at the time the study was set up. They have been kept informed, and when the study was presented to the Government we sent a minute to the department for the specifying of the necessary further studies to complete the information to the South Australian Government on environmental aspects. How has there been any delay at all? The Leader suggested we should set up some alternative to the Fox inquiry, going into the same area, to reassure South Australian people about qualms in this matter, qualms about which he gave no specifics whatever.

He has not given us a single basis to show that the Government in South Australia has proceeded in any undue or unsafe way in preparing these studies. Obviously, the Leader came to the beginning of this recommencement of the Parliamentary session and thought, "What can I make a bit of a splash about today?" He looked around and saw this piece from a post-graduate student at the university and said, "We will have a go about that. That will stir somehow. We have not got much to go on, and that is something that will get us a headline." That is all he did. In the newspaper printed on Saturday morning there is the comment that Mr. Dunstan could not be contacted at home the previous night. That is strange, because a reporter from the *Advertiser* rang me in Kingscote. I was in the district of the member for Alexandra sharing the wonderful celebrations.

Mr. Chapman: You were going to open the show but you sat down and forgot to do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not. The honourable member was not listening.

Mr. Chapman: I was, and so were 500 others, and we are still waiting. You wasted 15 minutes on an address, and forgot to open it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid the honourable member did not listen to my last words, but that is not unusual. I said "launch", not "open", and that was in my last sentence. I thought it was appropriately nautical. The honourable member will have to listen to a few more of my words from time to time. I was available for comment, but no-one telephoned me. Dr. King did not ring me or anyone else in the Ministry, as far as I can discover. I was Acting Minister at the time, but he did not check what he had to say and he should have, because, if he puts himself forward as a post-graduate student in environmental sciences, he should do his homework, but apparently he has not done so any more than has the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Premier usually starts his rebuttal in debates such as this by referring to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition as being some sort of a pastiche. It is time he sought to regale us with a little more convincing vocabulary than that he is wont to use on every occasion. I do not think anyone would say that his rebuttal was Churchillian: he attempted to make the whole speech low key, and to treat the question of uranium as a matter of no great importance. It is a matter of great importance—probably the most fundamental issue confronting mankind in our lifetime. He says there has been no delay. Of course there has been no delay, because there has been no inquiry. The Premier said that the Minister of Mines and Energy was overseas on matters unspecified and just in passing one morning over a cup of tea someone asked, "By the way, have you any uranium for sale in South Australia?" That hardly lines up with what the Premier has been saying publicly in the Minister's absence about the purpose of the trip. Recently an Adelaide newspaper published an article, under the heading "Globe-trot Hudson seeks cash for uranium", as follows:

Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff, Mr. Hudson, will be looking for financial backing overseas for the development of the uranium enrichment plant. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said this today. The uranium enrichment plant is estimated to cost \$1 400 000 000. "Originally, we had looked at a scheme of obtaining finance from overseas, and then paying back this oversea investment with uranium products," Mr. Dunstan said. "That scheme is still being looked at, along with other finance schemes."

So much for the impression the Premier sought to make this afternoon in his attempted rebuttal of the Leader's speech. He also says that the project is indefinite at the moment. What is the good of having an environmental impact study if the project is indefinite? The Government has already chosen the site of Redcliff, because it says no other site in South Australia would be suitable, and the type of project. It has said that it is to be a uranium enrichment plant using a centrifuge type of operation, yet we are told today that the project is indefinite. However, the Premier has his officers going ahead with a detailed planning. That does not sound to me to be indefinite. It is much more definite than other promotions the Premier has tried to foist on the public.

The Premier then asks where is the public concern. He is trying to suggest that the Leader's speech was based on one newspaper article, which quoted Dr. King. I did not read that newspaper article, and the Opposition has certainly not based its case for the public of South Australia on that one newspaper article. The Premier is getting around this State with his eyes and ears shut. He is out of touch if he does not believe that this is a matter of grave concern to the people of South Australia. My Party has received many representations from members of the public about it: the Leader has a file of correspondence from the public on this question. Almost daily the newspapers publish letters on it. I believe the *Sunday Mail* ran one or two articles recently on this subject. If the Premier is trying to say there is no public concern, he is less credible than he would have us believe.

I was interested in a newspaper report that quoted extensively the remarks made by the Attorney-General about uranium. The Premier pushed ahead with this investigation into the project and involved his officers in a great deal of work in putting out a report, which has obviously been expensive, and he has not even got his own Party behind him. An article in the *Advertiser* on June 28 states:

The Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) is taking a hard line on the issue. When the Australian Railways Union went on strike, he sent a telegram to the union's State and Federal headquarters. It read, "Congratulations on your absolute stand against the mining and handling of uranium. I have contacted the Australian Council of Trade Unions to urge them to adopt a similar unbending position."

I do not think the Premier picked that up.

Mr. Mathwin: He didn't quote it, did he?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier did not quote it, but I will. The article continues:

Mr. Duncan says his firm personal opposition to the development of uranium resources is based on scientific evidence as well as moral and humanitarian grounds. "The very existence of plutonium as a necessary by-product of the standard nuclear process is enough to warrant leaving uranium in the ground," he says. "Plutonium is the most toxic substance known to man. Even with the most sophisticated security, accidents and leakages from reactors can occur. And there is already evidence in the United States of an illicit nuclear black market with plutonium being secreted from reactor plants."

The Attorney-General has been looking most uncomfortable during the course of this debate. He was equally outspoken in an article published in the university newspaper *On Dit*, in which he speaks out on uranium. Let him get up and speak in this debate. Let us hear his point of view in this debate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Let's hear yours. What's your attitude?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Our attitude is that, before the Government proceeds with an expensive investigation and a detailed analysis of the feasibility of the plant, it ought

to get its priorities right and see whether there is any chance of getting a project working by having an environmental impact statement made. It is supposed to be Labor Party policy that environmental impact statements are prepared before such projects are proceeded with. The Premier is keeping the Minister for the Environment informed, but the Minister has not been in on the ground floor in the Government's discussions. The Premier's concession to the environmentalists is to say that he has handed a copy of the report to his Minister. I would like to hear the Minister's views on this. I think his stance would not be much different from that taken by the Attorney-General, if he had the courage to make it public. It seems to me to be a tremendous waste of the State's resources to go ahead with a detailed study when the Premier does not even know whether he can bring the rest of his Cabinet into line. Some of his colleagues are obviously totally opposed to the project, yet he is still prepared to spend large sums of taxpayers' money to investigate the project. I suppose he will be saving Commonwealth money, because the Commonwealth would not say, "Do not do it." Someone has to do it. I know from conversations with Government back-benchers that they share the Attorney-General's view, but I do not wish to mention their names.

Mr. Jennings: You cannot.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I could, but I do not intend to talk in this House about private conversations.

Mr. Jennings: Have you spoken to anyone privately on this side of the House? They would not speak to you privately anyway.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Not many people engage in coherent conversation with the member who has just interjected, anyway, and he would not know what is our contact with his colleagues. I know that that opinion is held by some of the back-bench members of the Labor Party. The Premier made much of the fact that we have got such tremendous industrial growth in this State that we do not really need this project, because we are growing so quickly. He mentioned that the growth rate from September, 1966, to September, 1975, was 12.5 per cent, but he failed completely to mention that in Western Australia it was 26.5 per cent. He said there was an industrial growth in the other States slightly in excess of that in South Australia. By my calculations, that slight increase over South Australia is of about 120 per cent.

The Premier also said that Sir Thomas Playford was instrumental in developing uranium mining in South Australia. That, of course, is perfectly true, and considerable profit was derived from those operations. Also, an atomic bomb was exploded at Maralinga, but far more is known now about the hazards of radiation than was known at that time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not by you.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was known by me at that stage. Long before I became involved in politics, I engaged in a debate about the dangers of exploding atomic bombs at Maralinga. The Premier gives precious little credit to Sir Thomas Playford for the other far more remarkable achievements he managed to bring into fruition in South Australia. I refer to the development of power and water supplies. The Premier seized on the fact that we had a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia many years ago, long before the real hazards and dangers of its uses were known. The dangers of mining and processing uranium are well documented, and I do not intend to delay the House by quoting the figures. The Attorney-General may wish to do that for us. The dangers are well known. One very significant fact referring to the

long term danger to man's health and to the environment is that nuclear waste remains active for long periods. Because of the half life period of plutonium, strontium 90, and some of the more dangerous by-products, they must be stored safely for 500 000 years. No-one can brush aside that fact lightly.

Maybe we can be convinced that these products can be stored safely, but the point of this motion is that the Government has done nothing to reassure the public of South Australia. The Premier's answer is summed up in the point he tried to make that members of the public are not worried. Of course, that is absolute nonsense. As the Leader has pointed out, the Premier has sought to be in the forefront of development. He has sought to indicate to the public in this State that he is the "up-and-at-'em" Premier, that we are in the forefront of all these developments. But, as the Leader has pointed out, most developments of any significance have come to nothing.

When we talk of this project at Redcliff, we have only to think of the former proposal for the petro-chemical plant to realise that another of the Premier's grandiose schemes will come to nothing. Probably the greatest comfort to the public of South Australia lies in the fact that, if they examine Labor's track record and the projects which have been trumpeted in the press and at what has become of these projects, they will see that they have not much to fear in this case, because all major projects, in immediate memory, have come to nothing.

The petro-chemical plant has come to nothing. Monarto has come to nothing, and it is likely to come to nothing. The Government is still prepared to spend \$1 000 000 a year on the Monarto Commission, but it has achieved nothing but plant some trees and lease back the land. They have been pretty expensive trees! Unless something more tangible than the Government has produced so far is put forward, it is likely to come to nothing. This could well be an exercise in futility that ranks with those I have mentioned. The public in South Australia is gravely alarmed, and it ill behoves the Premier to try shrugging this off and proceeding with his detailed planning without first educating and reassuring the public. The only way he can do this is to summon scientific fact and evidence by inquiry.

The second fact that makes this exercise quite ludicrous is that the Premier has not even carried his own Party with him. The attitude of the unions to the enrichment and mining of uranium is well known. That applies particularly to the left wing unions, which are to an increasing extent calling the tune in Australia. The Premier talks of this information being leaked to the press. The sort of statement the Premier was making, such as "I am again in the forefront; I have beaten the other Premiers to the draw", hardly seems to indicate a leak to the press. It seems he got his army of press people and caretakers on the job to make something of it for him: "Here I am again, out in the forefront." However, he has not even carried the rank and file of his Party, let alone his back bench and Cabinet, which is obviously divided on this matter. Again we are to be subjected to this "I am the greatest" type of press coverage, to which we are subjected continuously in this State, when the Premier has not altered his priorities at all. The union attitude is well known, as is shown by the following newspaper article that appeared on June 29:

Unions reject uranium plea. A special conference on unions in Sydney yesterday rejected a Government request to allow Mary Kathleen uranium to export a limited amount of uranium oxide to fulfil a commitment to a U.S. company. The unions warned there would be immediate industrial action if export licences were issued.

An article in the *Australian* on July 13 stated:

M.P.'s amazed at Japan's stand on nuclear power. Four A.L.P. M.P.'s on a study visit to Japan have been surprised by the differences in attitudes to nuclear power development compared to Australia. The group, headed by the former Labor Treasurer, Mr. Bill Hayden, spoke to representatives of the socialist, communist and komel parties and the two major Labour confederations.

We also have the very recent statements of the Attorney-General on this matter. Who is the Premier trying to kid? The only explanation I can conceive of the Premier's behaviour in this matter is that he is trying to head off the unions, the left wing militants and other dissidents by getting so far along the track that they cannot head him off. What other explanation is there for this strange behaviour? I am not particularly interested in the internal fighting within the Labor Party, but I am interested in the welfare of the people.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What fighting? I thought there was more trouble in your Party.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know the Premier will always have trouble with a Party such as the Labor Party, and he will have increasing trouble as the left wing gains more and more dominance of the Party. What I am saying is that this makes the exercise unrealistic. The point I make is that the people of South Australia are entitled to have a Premier who is aware of their fears. Obviously the Premier is not aware of their fears, or says that he is not aware of them. They are entitled to have a Government which is sensitive to their fears and which comes clean. The Premier tried to suggest that this was all secret, but that there was an unfortunate leak to the press. The South Australian public is entitled to have open government and, moreover, it should be entitled to a reassurance that any major public undertaking of the significance of that envisaged in the uranium enrichment treatment plant would not cause any environmental damage to accrue to them or, indeed, to future generations. I support the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for making a speech that was at least better than that made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The speech we have just had to suffer is on a par with the quote in today's *Australian* of a statement made by the Queensland Premier. There is about as much logic in the Deputy Leader's speech as in what Mr. Bjelke-Petersen had to say on the subject of uranium. Page 7 of today's *Australian* contains the following report of the Queensland Premier's statement:

We won't be able to sit on uranium, firstly because it would not be right and secondly because it would be wrong as far as we are concerned.

That is about on a par with what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said. To come back from overseas and to have to listen to and contend with that kind of garbage, from either the Deputy Leader or the Queensland Premier, is a bit rough. Obviously, he could not make a good speech, because that would put the Leader in a bad light indeed. I will deal first with the story, which has appeared in the press several times, that somehow or other I went to Europe peddling our plans for a uranium enrichment plant. I will go back in time a little, because a report

appeared in the *Australian* on June 2, before I went overseas, wherein various statements were made by Eric Cummins about my attitude. This is a matter of some importance, because I think it illustrates the journalistic standards now applying within the *Australian*, and I am afraid that they are of the lowest. Eric Cummins stated:

The South Australian Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, held a series of talks with the former Federal Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Connor, to press the claims of his own State. The selection of a site in South Australia is particularly important to the State Government . . . The South Australian Government is pressing the Federal Government for an enrichment plant at Lake Phillipson, 480 kilometres north of Adelaide . . . The South Australian representations are believed to be linked to a consortium of British, German and Dutch interests negotiating with the Federal Government on terms and the estimated cost is \$2 000 000 000.

Although I tried to correct that statement because of the number of inaccuracies it contained, three days elapsed before I was able to get a correction. The only way in which I finally got a correction was to ring the Editor of the *Australian* and accuse him and his paper of filthy tactics. Finally, on June 5, three days later, the following appeared:

The South Australian Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, yesterday denied a report in the *Australian* that the South Australian Government is pressing for a uranium enrichment plant at Lake Phillipson. "The South Australian Government's position on uranium enrichment is that we are not prepared to move in this area until an independent inquiry establishes that uranium projects can be undertaken without any risk to people or the environment. There is no change in that position," Mr. Hudson said. He said the State Government did not consider an enrichment plant could be built at Lake Phillipson. He had met the former Federal Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr. Connor, only once before the 1975 election and the subject of uranium did not arise in their talks. "There is no link known to me with any overseas consortium interested in such a venture."

That was on June 5, 10 days before I went overseas. In the original article produced by that paragon of accuracy, Mr. Samuel, appeared the first statement that I was peddling the uranium enrichment around overseas. His report in the *Bulletin* states:

The Government men won and the uranium auction remains open. Mines Minister Hudson went abroad immediately after the convention to try to interest large industrial concerns in the Government's plans for a uranium industry . . . He took with him copies of a 75 page Government-produced report proposing an enormous new industry based on uranium enrichment.

I had one copy of the report with me. The Deputy Director of Mines, who was with me for certain parts of the trip, had two copies. So, the two or three people who were really interested and who asked for a copy of the report were able to get a copy. They were the only copies we had available.

Mr. Dean Brown: Obviously the Premier was ill-informed, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Let us come to that. I wish that the member for Davenport would take more care sometimes, because he might be able to persuade the Deputy Leader, who was not performing very well, of the need to achieve greater accuracy. The Deputy Leader quoted from an article in the *News* of July 1. He quoted the headline, which is a notoriously inaccurate source of information.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I quoted more than that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. A report in the *Advertiser* of the same day states:

Mr. Dunstan denied that the Minister of Development (Mr. Hudson) was overseas for the specific purpose of promoting the uranium enrichment concept.

The Premier has denied that several times, but it does not suit the overall pattern of the story originally started in the *Australian*, taken up by Mr. Samuel in the *Bulletin*, and repeated in the *Australian* of July 1. On July 1, the same day, it is also stated by Eric Cummins, that absolute paragon of accurate reporting—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is he a friend of yours?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. He never discusses or checks with me. I am always getting quoted, but I am never effectively contacted by him. Mr. Cummins's report states:

The State Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, left Adelaide on June 15 with a brief which included trying to interest overseas investors in the plant at Redcliff, near Port Augusta.

On that day, I was contacted by a News Limited London representative when I was at the Australian Embassy, in Berne, Switzerland, and asked about this matter. This took place in front of the First Secretary of the Australian Embassy (Mr. Fraser), so there is a witness—to his eternal embarrassment, no doubt. I stated first that it was not true that I was peddling a report around Europe and trying to interest overseas consortia in a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. Secondly, I stated to that reporter, representing News Limited in London, that no uranium project could develop in Australia through the South Australian Government until an independent inquiry produced results that demonstrated the safety of the project from the viewpoint of the environment and the people. Thirdly, I stated to that reporter, in the presence of Mr. Fraser, that no uranium enrichment project could proceed in South Australia without the full support and co-operation of the Australian Government. Because of the Australian Government's control over exports, any uranium, whether yellow cake or enriched, could only be developed with the support of that Government. Those statements were made to the News Limited representative in London, but were not printed anywhere in Australia. They were not printed in the *Australian* or the *News*, because they demonstrated that the *Australian* reporters, in particular Mr. Cummins and Mr. Samuel, were peddling untruths.

This afternoon we had the great spectacle of the Leader and the Deputy Leader making exactly the same allegations, but what they have said is simply not the case. Certainly, the State Government at this stage is not able to formulate a final proposal on uranium enrichment: first, because we do not have the results of the Ranger inquiry and, secondly, because we must have the full backing and support of the Federal Government. We have had full co-operation from Mr. Anthony and the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no great brook with Mr. Anthony, but he is at least willing to co-operate in a sensible way, and not come out with the kind of garbage we have had to listen to from the Opposition in this House. In a press statement, not a newspaper report, Mr. Anthony has stated:

The study being undertaken by the South Australian Government of the feasibility of a uranium enrichment industry being established in the State is quite consistent with the Commonwealth view that the feasibility of uranium enrichment should be fully explored. The South Australian Government has sought and received technical advice from the Atomic Energy Commission. This contact should continue so that the Commonwealth can remain fully informed of progress of the State Government's study.

In my first Ministerial contact with Mr. Anthony, I presented him with a copy of the first interim report on uranium enrichment that had been prepared by the Uranium Enrichment Committee in this state, and he expressed

then the same kind of attitude that he has expressed in the press statement from which I have just read. In any contact I had with people overseas I made clear that the South Australian Government was interested in the safety aspects of establishing a uranium enrichment plant. However, there was more interest in the question of buying Australia's uranium, and also much interest in the Ranger inquiry, because many countries in Europe are already fully committed to nuclear power. Switzerland already gets 23 per cent of its electrical energy from nuclear power. Italy gets a small fraction but is planning to get one-third of its electrical power from nuclear energy by 1985.

Mr. Millhouse: How long will world supplies last if they are all developed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In terms of known reserves, at least until the end of this century. Of course, the extent of uranium exploration is not great and reserves would therefore probably last much longer. What is clear, however, concerning western Europe (and I have no doubt that the same situation applies in North America), is that, if Australia's uranium is not made available, those countries will have no alternative but to use breeder reactors.

Mr. Mathwin: Where is the Swiss reactor located?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Just outside Berne; there is another near Geneva, and I am not sure where the third reactor is located. That those countries will turn to breeder reactors was made clear to me several times. It was emphasised again at the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna that if Australia's uranium supplies were withheld (and I understand that these supplies are important in a world context, at least the Europeans' concern over the supply of uranium seems to indicate that they consider them important), a greater use of uranium waste products that come from the use of ordinary nuclear reactors would occur, and breeder reactor technology would have to be developed. By using that technology, the existing supplies of uranium, already under established contracts, could be made to last for a long time. Members should be aware that the breeder reactor technology produces large quantities of plutonium as a by-product. I am told (I presume it is reliable information, and it does not come from the kind of inaccurate press account that we tend to get in Australia) that it is not that plutonium is a particularly dangerous substance compared to other radio-active waste products. Many other radio-active waste products have longer half-lives than plutonium.

The danger with plutonium is that it increases the possibility that some mischief will occur if it gets into the wrong hands, because only relatively small amounts of plutonium are necessary to produce a nuclear device. Certainly, the general opinion in Europe is that if breeder reactor technology can be avoided, it should be avoided. That technology only increases the complexities and difficulties associated with nuclear power. Europeans believe that such technology could be avoided only if Australia's uranium resources are readily available.

Mr. Millhouse: Morally, that argument does not stand up too well.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham and the Leader wish to say that, but I believe that the Europeans have already demonstrated that they are willing to accept the risk of nuclear power rather than reduce the standard of living of their people. That attitude applies not only in conservative dominated countries and countries dominated by the left, but also in Soviet Russia, the United

Kingdom, France, West Germany, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Japan, and even in Italy. In fact, soon after the Italian election when I was in Italy (a country with the greatest division of opinion among all the political Parties on almost any subject), there was complete unanimity among the communists, socialists, Christian Democrats and other right wing groups on one issue—nuclear power. I did not come across any evidence to suggest there is significant opposition in Europe to the further development of nuclear power. I emphasise that there are already operating about 50 nuclear power plants in North America, with at least 100 more under construction or planned. I could not give the exact number already operating in Europe, although three are operating in Switzerland, but the number planned or under construction will treble the number already in existence. Europe, Japan, and North America are already committed to nuclear energy, and the debate we are having now is the kind of debate that occurred in Europe 10 years ago. That is the basic score in this situation.

I would like to believe that some ideal solution to the energy problem exists other than returning to the caveman state. Some have suggested we should supply coal to Japan so that that country would not need more and more nuclear energy, but environmental problems arise from using coal to generate electric power; there is pollution from the sulphides in the coal, pollution from the emission of CO₂, and so on. It is argued that, in the Japanese situation, the degree of air pollution is already so intense that further coal-fired stations in that country are not possible, quite apart from the simple problem of getting into Japan all the coal that would be necessary, with the accompanying shipping problems and the detailed administrative and other arrangements necessary. Certainly, the Japanese do not see their future in terms of using coal rather than nuclear energy. I know of no source of energy that is environmentally clean.

Mr. Vandeeper: For the moment you think we should go ahead and mine our uranium?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I want to see the full results of the Ranger inquiry.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! You have committed yourself already: every word you have uttered commits you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a pity to have to put up with the idiocy of such members as the member for Mitcham, straight after having discussions with reasonably intelligent people for some weeks. I was giving views expressed to me over the past few weeks, information about the Japanese attitude, from what I have heard, and views about the European attitude. That does not necessarily imply that I hold exactly the same attitude, but I am sick to death of the trashy and stupid arguments peddled in this place by such people as the member for Mitcham and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: Abuse is no argument.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham never bothers to argue at all. He has ceased to be an effective argument for anything. The situation is quite clear, so far as I can judge, that the rest of the world, communist and non-communist, has committed itself to nuclear energy. In terms of present knowledge, the requirements for solar energy to produce electric power would involve many acres of country to enable mirrors to collect and focus the sun's rays. No doubt there could be environmental arguments on that. I heard the view expressed in Europe that seeking to take advantage of tidal energy would have environmental consequences on the speed of rotation of the earth. Some have argued

significantly, and others not so significantly: the speed of rotation of the earth would be affected by the attempt to harness tidal energy. I do not know whether that is so.

I have heard over the past few weeks environmental arguments against any form of providing energy. It is argued that, even if we use up our existing fossil fuel reserves, we are running serious environmental dangers through the excess emission of carbon dioxide, which may or may not increase the temperature of the earth. Of course, I believe it can be demonstrated that if the temperature of the earth rises by as much as one degree or two degrees, the ice caps will start to melt and cities such as Adelaide will turn out to be inappropriately located. It is important, in this energy debate, to recognise that we cannot discuss one form of energy in isolation. Every form of energy creation has advantages and disadvantages, and a balance must be struck.

The fundamental proposition put forward by the Leader this afternoon is patently ridiculous. The Leader said we should have gone ahead already with an environmental impact study on this question before having the general results of the Ranger inquiry. An environmental impact study costs much more than the basic studies the Government has undertaken. The environmental impact studies in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical proposition carried out by the consortium and the State Government cost more than \$1 000 000, possibly more than \$2 000 000; I am not sure of the figure. It is absolute nonsense for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to suggest we should have an environmental impact study before carrying out the expensive studies already undertaken. The Leader has got his argument the wrong way round. Furthermore, one would not carry out environmental impact studies unless studies have been undertaken to give some reasonable idea as to whether or not a project is feasible economically and whether or not a feasible location is available. Such an assessment having been made, which is all we have done so far, it would be possible to undertake an environmental impact study. Surely it is necessary to have a location in order to undertake a proper environmental impact study. Is the Leader telling us that we could have an environmental impact statement completely in isolation of any location? Would he care to answer that question?

Dr. Tonkin: Concurrently.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: So, concurrently with establishing the location, we will have an environmental impact study! We may have a dozen possible locations; is the Leader suggesting that we have a dozen possible environmental impact statements? The Leader has spoken rubbish this afternoon: it was a better speech than that of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I will grant him that. Nevertheless, it was absolute rubbish. The motion starts off quite lamely with these words:

The question of future uranium processing, enrichment and use in South Australia is a vital issue.

That is tautologous. It continues:

. . . a detailed and informed public inquiry into the possible environmental, health, safety . . . must be conducted.

The Ranger inquiry is proceeding, and the Government is willing to accept on general questions the results of that inquiry, because it has extended its activities to South Australia and to the length and breadth of the country, as well as to oversea countries. Then the final jewel states:

The Government has been gravely irresponsible and contemptuous of public concern in promoting proposals for uranium enrichment at Redcliff to oversea industrial concerns.

That is simply not true.

Mr. Arnold: Why keep it secret from the public?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have not promoted these proposals to oversea industrial concerns.

Mr. Arnold: The public knew nothing about it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If someone was interested in it, it was shown but, as I said earlier, I took one copy of the report with me. To suggest that therefore it was a promotional trip is a load of hogwash, and indicates that the Leader of the Opposition has nothing to say. I also explained how the original falsehoods appeared in the press and how the press has refused (particularly the *Australian*) to correct these falsehoods. I want to make it absolutely clear that the Leader of the Opposition's case this afternoon is based on a phoney version of the facts, on a misunderstanding of the situation, and a wrong appreciation of the overall situation, and I hope that honourable members will reject the proposition with the speed it deserves.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I knew that members of the Liberal Party were planning some special debate this afternoon. It was obvious they would be most attracted to do so as this is the first day after some weeks when we have not been sitting. Like the Minister of Mines and Energy (but this is the only way during this debate in which I am like him) I congratulate them in one respect, and that is on the subject they have chosen. They have chosen a good subject to debate in this House because the whole question of uranium mining is topical, and there is growing unease about it, with very good reason indeed. The question of the mining of uranium is but one aspect of the whole debate on ecology and the future of the world.

One cannot avoid this aspect, when one considers all the problems that mankind is facing because of our high standard of living, the low standard of living of two-thirds of the world, and the fact of the population explosion. We just cannot go on as we have been doing for the last few decades, if not hundreds of years. I often think of the situation arising after the eruption of Krakatoa in 1887, when the island was left absolutely barren: then ants appeared on it and they multiplied rapidly, because they had none of their natural predators to keep them down, so that the island was absolutely overrun with ants. I cannot (and people may laugh at this and say it is quaint) get that same idea out of my mind concerning the whole world.

That is the sort of thing that is likely to happen if we go on doubling the population of the world every 35 years. The question of uranium is merely one aspect of the whole debate on the future of mankind and ecology, and it is a question that well may split the community in the future and cut right across our traditional political allegiances. One has only to look, as I can in this House, at the difficulties within both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party at present on this matter. The Government is undoubtedly in a cleft stick: it has gone ahead with this proposal, and has accepted a report for an enrichment plant at Redcliff. That does not mean to say it is going to build it, but it undoubtedly commissioned the report and has welcomed its receipt.

That would not have been done if there were no intention of proceeding with this matter, and yet on the other hand we heard the Premier this afternoon, in answer to my question, treading very carefully indeed on the question of the safety and the prudence, or otherwise, of it. It is all very well for the Premier to say, as he did in this House, that all was love and light at the Australian Labor Party

conference on this matter: he sounded, as he usually does when he cannot be contradicted, very plausible, but I have a copy of the *Bulletin* article, which gives a different account of what went on at the convention. I will read one paragraph, and then members opposite can say whether I am right, the *Bulletin* is right, or whether the Premier is right. The article stated:

When left-wingers and conservationists combined at the recent State convention of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia in an attempt to get bans on uranium development written into Party policy, their fiercest opponents were Premier Don Dunstan and Mines Minister Hugh Hudson.

Having heard the Minister this afternoon, one would not be surprised at that. The Attorney-General who seems to want to say something, is referred to in the next phrase, and I invite him to put us right and say where he stands personally on this issue, because I think he and I are probably closer together on this issue than on most. The article continues:

The Government men won and the uranium options remain open. Mines Minister Hudson went abroad immediately after the convention to try to interest large industrial concerns in the Government's plans for a uranium industry.

Of course the Minister has denied this, but the *Bulletin* went on to say:

He took with him copies of a 75-page Government-produced report proposing an enormous new industry based on uranium enrichment.

If he did not take them with him, there were certainly copies available. The Government is in a cleft stick on this matter, as is the Labor Party. That is no disgrace. The only thing I criticise is their denial of the fact that they are in this situation. Of course my friends in the Liberal Party are in the same position. They came along today with this motion, but it has been widely reported in the press that the Leader has approved in principle of this enrichment plant. An article in the *Advertiser* on July 2 stated:

The State Opposition announced its support in principle for the Redcliff proposal. Dr. Tonkin stated, however, that a public inquiry was first needed into safety and environmental considerations.

The Liberals have already announced their support in principle for the idea: what else could they do as a State Party because of the obvious attitudes of their Federal colleagues? They do not give a damn about it. Mr. Anthony, who is a Country Party man and the Deputy Prime Minister in the coalition Government, is already doing his best to sell Australian uranium wherever he can. The Liberal Party is committed to this whether its members like to admit it or not. Both the Parties are in difficulties. I have congratulated the Liberal Party for raising this topic today—

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —but I regret to disappoint the member for Rocky River, because my congratulations stop there, as neither the terms of the motion nor the Leader's speech make any commitment at all one way or the other. They are trying to have it both ways; they are condemning the Government for doing what it has done with the Redcliff site now that the petro-chemical proposal is finished as we know it is, and yet they themselves want to keep their options open. It is right, of course, for the Liberal Party to criticise the Government for committing itself to the extent that it has to Redcliff as the site for this project, because there should be (and this is the fallacy of the argument we have heard this afternoon from the Minister of Mines and Energy) an environmental impact statement for every site, for a

plant of any description. It is no good saying, and it is only part of the answer to say, that the Ranger inquiry is going into the arguments, pro and con, of mining. So it is, but the Minister of Mines and Energy may or may not know that the Ranger inquiry has proceeded at three levels: international, national and local. One cannot have an environmental impact study without getting to the local level, because it has to be sited in a particular spot. Let me quote the Federal Act, the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act, which sets out what an environmental impact study has to do and what it is for. Section 5 of that Act provides:

5. (1) The object of this Act is to ensure, to the greatest extent that is practicable, that matters affecting the environment to a significant extent are fully examined and taken into account in and in relation to—

- (a) the formulation of proposals;
- (b) the carrying out of works and other projects;
- (c) the negotiation, operation and enforcement of agreement and arrangements (including agreements and arrangements with, and with authorities of, the States);
- (d) the making of, or the participation in the making of, decisions and recommendations; and
- (e) the incurring of expenditure,

by, or on behalf of, the Australian Government.

An environmental impact study must relate to a place. One cannot say, as the Minister tried to do just now, that the Ranger uranium inquiry is giving all the answers, because that is relating to another place. The environment in the Northern Territory is quite different from the environment at Redcliff, so that is no answer whatever. Having said something about both the other Parties, that brings me to my own position. I am opposed to the mining of uranium as I am at present advised. The member for Goyder will remember that before the last State election I was persuaded, with some difficulty, not to put such opposition in my policy speech. I had put it in the draft, and my then colleagues persuaded me to take it out. Perhaps they were wise to do that.

I am opposed to the mining of uranium. There are several reasons why I am opposed to it, and I am not afraid to say that I am opposed to it. I do say that, unlike any other member who has spoken in this House so far. The most cogent of those reasons is that, so far as I can discover, there is no answer whatever to the question of the disposal of waste products. The member for Kavel touched on this, and I will amplify what he said. Waste products remain active for long periods. In the case of plutonium, that means something like 34 000 years, which means in turn that the waste products must be stored safely for 500 000 years. That is, in my view, an utter impossibility. It is impossible for us to do that for mankind, or for man, shall I say. It can be retorted, of course, that Australia has not got a monopoly on uranium and therefore our withholding of our uranium resources will not affect the mining of uranium by others in other parts of the world. That may be so, but surely to goodness we have a moral obligation not to add to the amount of this material available and therefore add to the risks of its use. The Minister of Mines and Energy dealt with that point too, and as I understood him when he was discussing Switzerland, what he said was that, if other countries could not get uranium, they would have to do something worse—they would have to develop breeder reactor technology. In other words, if they cannot get something that is bad they will do something that is worse. To me, that is no answer at all. On the question of waste, I will quote two short paragraphs from the *Current Affairs Bulletin* of May, 1976, which canvasses

the whole question of the use of uranium. This is what it says on page 10:

There is now complete agreement among all nuclear power workers that the high-level wastes must be totally and permanently segregated from the biosphere. However, in spite of continuous effort for over 25 years this problem has not yet been solved and may in fact be insoluble. It is the realisation of this fact that is behind the growing opposition to plans for large-scale nuclear power generation even by those who were former believers in it. The high-level wastes contain at least 100 curies of radioactivity per litre, are frequently highly acid and in addition to intense beta and gamma radiation emit sufficient heat in the first years of their existence to boil spontaneously. As a result they have for many years to be contained in stainless-steel tanks, buried to provide radiation shielding and fitted with cooling coils and condensers to prevent the release of radioactive spray and steam.

Another paragraph on page 14 states:

Various other schemes have been advanced such as sealing the waste in drums and dropping them in the Antarctic ice where they would melt their way to bedrock thousands of feet below. All such schemes involve abandoning future control over the movements of wastes, and the possibility of catastrophic geological changes leading to their release to the biosphere over the next 500 000 years may not be negligible, even if records of their whereabouts still exist. So far, no political system has persisted unchanged even for 1 000 years.

I emphasise the last sentence of that quotation. How can we possibly take the risk of being able to look after waste products for the periods of time that are required? It may, even now, be far too late to save the world from this danger, but I do not believe that, because of that thought of despair, we should add to the danger by having our uranium available for these purposes. As I have already said, the Premier was right, in one way, to point to the Ranger inquiry. He referred to the terms of reference, and some of the matters which the Leader of the Opposition has raised today are covered by the Ranger inquiry. I can tell the Leader and other members of his Party, if they are interested, that about 12 000 pages of evidence have been taken, and I am presently engaged in looking at that evidence. I shall be happy for the help of any member who would like to assist me in going through it.

The final addresses to the Commission will take place in a fortnight, and, undoubtedly, in part they will cover the matters I have raised this afternoon and the general matters that the Opposition has raised. I knew that the Liberals would be left lamenting on this matter when I interjected during the speech of the member for Kavel and he affected not to hear me, and therefore not to give me any answer on this, because there is no answer from their point of view in this debate. It would be, of course, useless to go over that ground again. Of course, as I have said, an environmental impact statement would be related to the site of Redcliff, and that is where the weakness in the Government's position comes. That is all I have to say about this matter. The terms of the motion are not particularly satisfactory if one wants to analyse them, but it is not worth doing so. I am prepared to support the motion, because it points to the problem. It goes some little way towards my personal position, and I emphasise that I am speaking for myself. I am not necessarily speaking for my Party, although I think that many of its members would have a position about the same as mine (others would not). As I have said, the motion goes a little way towards my own position, which is against, as I have emphasised, uranium mining. However, the motion does not go nearly as far as I would like to go. With those qualifications, I support it.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Government stands condemned by the motion, not because of its involvement in uranium mining and enrichment but because of the secrecy surrounding the whole project: that is what concerns the people of South Australia. They have a democratic right to be totally involved in a subject that concerns them to the degree that uranium mining and enrichment do. The Premier tried to belittle Dr. King, but at least Dr. King set out in plain terms the questions that the public wanted answered, but the Premier was not willing in any way when replying to the Leader of the Opposition to try to put at ease the concern of the public of this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He said it was of no concern to them.

Mr. ARNOLD: That is not quite the case, and I think that the Attorney-General will agree that that is not the case when I refer shortly to some of the questions put to him by *On Dit* and the replies he gave. First, we should look at some of the unanswered questions which Dr. King has posed and which the public wants answered. First, he asked whether South Australia was the best place in Australia for a uranium enrichment plant. That is a simple question, and one which has not been answered hitherto. Secondly, he questioned what the alternative sites were and how they compared environmentally with Redcliff, the site recommended in the report. Obviously, the site recommended in the report was the site already owned by the Government and, once again, it has a major influence on the argument. The fact that other sites have not been considered is of immense concern to South Australians.

Dr. King also suggested that it might be to the advantage of such a project that it be situated near the mouth of the gulf, where there is a considerable movement of water. The Redcliff site is little different, as you would well know, Mr. Speaker, from the site of the Port Augusta power station, where the movement of water is limited and where there is not a change of water; the water ebbs and flows, but it is the same water. A pollution problem is possible in that area because of the limited movement back and forth of the same water; consequently, there is not the same turn-round as there is on the open coast. This is a problem with inland waters and estuaries and with waters such as those in Spencer and St. Vincent Gulfs. We must consider the problem that emerged in Japan. The Minister said that he had discussed this matter overseas and had been assured that there were no problems. He was assured in Japan that there were no problems, but the Japanese have been known to make mistakes. I refer, for example, to the Minimata Bay episode, which involved mercury poisoning and contamination of the fish in the bay, and to the number of Japanese who died as a result. Insufficient research and environmental impact studies resulted in the death of many Japanese.

We have a situation in Australia similar to that in Japan; I refer to the Derwent River in Tasmania, which would be one of the most polluted rivers I have ever seen. When I visited there recently, the state of the river certainly convinced me of the absolute need for environmental impact studies to be undertaken with every new project that is contemplated. The damage that has been done in Minimata Bay and the Derwent will take a long time to repair. Even if the pollution is stopped now, it will be many years before the ecology of the area returns to its original state, if it ever does. The public has been kept completely in the dark. We hear much from the Premier and his Ministers about open government, but this is one of the best examples of just the opposite: the people of

South Australia were totally unaware of this matter, and the Premier said that it was as a result of the report having been stolen from his department that the report appeared in the *Bulletin*. I would say that that is the best thing that could have happened.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He didn't say that.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, he did.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He said the document was leaked, not stolen.

Mr. ARNOLD: I thought he said that the document had been stolen from his department. Does he mean that members of his staff deliberately leaked the information to the *Bulletin*? Is that what the Attorney-General is saying?

The Hon. Peter Duncan: No. He said that the document was leaked by someone who had possession of it, not necessarily someone on his staff or on anyone else's staff.

Mr. ARNOLD: The fact is that the public was denied any knowledge of this project. There should have been a press statement when the Government was first considering entering into this type of project. The Government stands condemned, but not for being involved in uranium mining or enrichment. If it can be shown by the appropriate independent studies that there is no risk to the environment in South Australia or to the people of South Australia, we then have a proposition that we can present to the public of South Australia for their consideration about whether or not we should proceed. Heaven only knows, we need new industrial projects in South Australia.

I will refer now to certain comments made by the Attorney-General when he answered questions put to him by *On Dit*, and this will indicate the wide variation of opinion that exists within the Labor Party over this issue. The following question was put to him:

Are you an isolated member of the Labor Party against uranium?

The Attorney-General replied:

No, not by any means. The Labor Party's policy is clear on these matters. The Party believes in the use of uranium but with certain safeguards which are crucial. We believed federally in setting up a commission which would not only have responsibility for supervising mining of uranium but would also have to take environmental and ecological factors into account.

The Attorney-General has clearly stated the position, as he sees it, of the Labor Party. The next question was as follows:

Do you see that the commission that the Labor Government was setting up would have decided to leave the uranium in the ground?

In reply, the Attorney stated:

I am confident that that would have been the result.

The Attorney is confident that that would have been the result of the commission that was to have been set up by the Labor Party, yet the State Labor Government is proceeding, without any knowledge of what the public believes, to establish this plant. That is completely contrary to what the Attorney has said. That clearly indicates the division of thinking that exists in the Labor Party on this important issue. Fundamentally, it comes back not to whether or not the Labor Party or the State Government should be involved in this subject but to whether the public at large through an open inquiry should have the opportunity to express an opinion. The questions the public would like answered were set out clearly in the *Advertiser* of July 24 by Dr. King. It would do the Government much good to cease its operations at their present stage, reassess the situation, and involve the public in this matter in the future. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): An advantage of being on this side and following the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy, and the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy is that there is little left for me to do to demolish the Opposition's case. The Leader has a strangely ambivalent attitude towards Redcliff and, indeed, to industrial development of any kind. He is on record as supporting Redcliff as a site for development. There are many socio-economic, industrial, and geographical arguments that favour its use. Today the Leader has also criticised quite strongly what he calls lack of development during the past two or three years. His attitude in favour of Redcliff and his criticism of what he calls a lack of development on the part of the Government contrast rather strangely with the attack he has today tried to mount on the possibility of establishing a uranium enrichment plant, possibly at Redcliff.

The Leader has given figures showing that a development of this size will be a major industrial development on the site (wherever it may be) and bring about a spin-off to industry in other areas. I believe he went so far as to say that, if the Premier could pull off this project, he would be willing to forgive the Premier for all the alleged deficiencies in development that have occurred in this State.

Dr. Tonkin: Don't go too far!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Leader was so wrapped up in the importance of this project that he thought its acquisition to South Australia would more than compensate for the deficiencies he alleged had occurred in this Government's record, alleged deficiencies that I believe the Premier has answered adequately. I cannot determine whether the Leader is really so scared that in this respect, as in others, he will be so definitely upstaged by the Premier that he is trying to make this attack now. The policy of the Government and of the Labor Party, which was clearly spelt out by the Premier, is that proceeding with such a project will depend on the outcome of the Ranger inquiry. There are three logical possibilities in relation to the Ranger inquiry. The first is that the Ranger inquiry will come out strongly against the mining and development of uranium and that the present Commonwealth Government will accept that recommendation.

The Hon. Doug Anthony (Deputy Leader of the Commonwealth Government) has stated that that Government will accept the recommendations of the inquiry. Frankly, bearing in mind its track record to date on such matters as Medibank, indexation and so on, to say nothing of the Concorde (the first two of which were election promises on which the present Commonwealth Government falsely gained office last December), I shall be pleased if the Commonwealth Government honours the Deputy Leader's commitment that that Government will accept the findings of the Ranger inquiry. However, I will believe that when I see it. It is at least a theoretical possibility, however.

If the Ranger inquiry comes out against the mining and export of uranium, and the Commonwealth Government honours its word and accepts the recommendation, this debate will be a waste of time, because there will be no uranium enrichment plant proceeded with in South Australia, as it would be contrary to Labor Party policy as adopted at its Convention last year, a policy that was seconded by the Premier. It is also contrary to the policy of this Government. In that case, the huffing and puffing by the Opposition will have been done for nothing. The second possibility (and it is much more real than that which I have just postulated) is that the Ranger inquiry will come out against uranium and the Commonwealth Government will refuse to accept the recommendation. That is a real

possibility and, should it happen, I ask what would be the position of this Government. If, despite the recommendations of that inquiry, the Commonwealth Government goes ahead, it is obvious that all claims for the plant must be considered.

The third possibility is that the Ranger inquiry will recommend that such a project be proceeded with, either with or without conditions. The Commonwealth Government will accept such a recommendation because it fits in with its obvious philosophy. In those circumstances, what would the Opposition want this State Government to do? We have said that we will not go ahead with such a plant until there has been a full public inquiry. The Ranger inquiry has been conducted throughout the length and breadth of this land. That inquiry existed when this policy was adopted, so it was only proper that the State Government should take into account that an inquiry which covered the whole of Australia was being undertaken and that the Federal Government would have to decide whether or not to allow the export of uranium (and that is a salient factor in determining the feasibility and practicability of such a plant) so it was reasonable enough to wait until that inquiry had finished. There is a possibility that the Ranger inquiry will permit such a development and that the Australian Government will decide to go ahead with it. What would be the howl of rage from the Opposition if the State Government was not in a position to get in the race for such an industry? We would be hearing once more the cries that we are too late on the job, that we have not done our homework, and so on. Opposition members are getting a bit more capital in trying to stir up a controversy on making preliminary investigations into the possibility of such a plant being established in South Australia.

Mr. Arnold: Why was it necessary to keep the public in the dark?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: There has been no attempt to keep the public in the dark. The public will be informed in accordance with procedures laid down and generally accepted in relation to environmental impact statements.

Mr. Coumbe: Is this what you call open government?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: For the benefit of members opposite, perhaps I should give some idea of what is involved in the procedure for an environmental impact statement. Members will be hearing more of this later in this session, when the Government will introduce a Bill on the matter, but so that they can make more informed contributions to such debates, I shall put forward a few elementary principles on which such legislation is based. It is necessary, first, for the environmental impact statement to be prepared by the proponent, the one putting forward the proposal. Only the person who intends to carry out a development knows what is involved and it would be nonsense to say that anyone else could do the job. The Environment Department will lay down the guidelines to be followed by the proponent in putting forward, for consideration by the public, a proper environmental impact statement. This exercise has been carried out completely in respect of two projects: the Morphettville bus depot—

Mr. Mathwin: Made up by one department and assessed by another!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: —and the further power station for the Electricity Trust. If honourable members opposite take the trouble to read those reports, they will find spelt out in great detail the requirements of the

department that the proponent must meet in order to provide the public with a proper basis on which to properly assess what will happen in the development. One of the main things to be considered in preparing an environmental impact statement is the suitability of the site. It cannot be said that a certain site is the best one unless alternative sites are considered. If the member for Glenelg would take the trouble to read the environmental impact statement assessment in relation to the Morphettville bus depot, he would find that 12 separate sites were examined. In the event, the final choice came down to two, and the relative merits of those two sites were canvassed at length.

That is an essential part of the preparation of environmental impact statements. It is ridiculous to talk in terms of preparing such a statement without knowing which part of the country is to be impacted by the development. While it is necessary for the proponent to put forward a proposal in respect of the site, it is also necessary, in the public interest, to determine whether such a site is the correct one, for the proponent to give the reasons why he selected that site instead of all other alternative sites. If he has not properly considered the alternative sites he has not properly prepared the environmental impact statement, and the thing can be rejected on those grounds. Having prepared an environmental impact statement for a certain proposal, the matter is then put out for public discussion. That happened quite fully in relation to the Morphettville bus depot, and would have happened in respect of any proposals put forward for a uranium enrichment plant.

The third step is that a final decision will be made, bearing in mind the environmental factors as well as the social, educational, economic, industrial, and political factors involved in that decision. It is ridiculous to suggest that any meaningful decision can be made by a Government if it does not consider all these factors as well as the environmental factor. It is the function of my department, and a function it will carry out under the legislation that, with the co-operation of members opposite, will be passed through this House, to ensure that a full assessment has been made of the environmental factors and that they are properly considered, along with all other relevant factors, in making a final decision. There appears to be an impression among some members of the public that it is necessary to find only one environmental factor against a project, and that project will be killed. That is nonsense. Just as there may be social, political, or economic disadvantages in a project, there may be environmental difficulty. In my district a new complex has been established. I was not able to attend the opening of that establishment, for very good reasons, and I refer to the Torrens College of Advanced Education. Few members opposite would say that that project was unnecessary.

Nevertheless, it is true that there was some adverse reaction from the people on Holbrooks Road, where the complex is situated. The amount of traffic has increased enormously, but that is not a good reason for saying we cannot have a college of advanced education in the area. A proper decision made by a responsible Government (and that is the sort of decision that will be made by this Government) considers environmental factors as well as economic, industrial, social, political, geographical, and all other factors.

That little essay on the basic principles of environmental impact statements will, I hope, have some impact on Opposition members, because that is the only basis on which this matter can proceed. It makes nonsense of the

whole Opposition case that the public has not been consulted. At this stage, the progress of a uranium enrichment plant depends, first, on the outcome of the Ranger inquiry. That inquiry is still proceeding, and it would be ridiculous on our part to run a mini Ranger inquiry when the results of that inquiry could be vitiated completely by the Commonwealth Government if the Ranger inquiry recommended against uranium export and the Commonwealth Government accepted that recommendation. There would be no point in going ahead with such an inquiry if, in fact, the Commonwealth Government states that uranium may not be exported. We are depending on the result of the Ranger inquiry. Also, we depend on the support of the Australian Government. Other States will also make claims for this project, if it is permitted to go ahead, particularly if it is as valuable as the Leader of the Opposition has suggested when he spoke in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars from such a plant. Other States will also stake a claim in this race, and therefore it will depend on the Australian Government supporting this project before we can go ahead with it. Large sums are involved in this project, and we will have to be sure that the finance is available. The Minister of Mines and Energy has dealt with that aspect adequately.

We will also have to be sure that the technology is available to enable a plant of this nature to be constructed. The Premier said the diffusion process is beyond our capacity, because it requires inputs of water and power that we do not have, and therefore it is not a practical possibility for South Australia. On the other hand the centrifuge process is a possibility, but the Premier has said today that it will be two years or so before the technical problems associated with this will be properly evaluated. Again, there will be at least two years before the only possible type of uranium enrichment plant that can be constructed in South Australia will be known to be technically feasible. Why is the Opposition saying that the public is being rushed into a decision without being given an opportunity to state its point of view?

Social problems relating to the work force would have to be properly evaluated before we could reasonably decide that the project is feasible. We are referring today to economic grounds, not to environmental issues. When all that is done, we have the design of the plant to be decided upon, because I cannot see how the public can properly assess the environmental impact of a plant until it knows what is involved in the plant, what sort of effluent, and what sort of noise and traffic problems would be created by that plant. We have to wait until after all these other operations are proceeded with in the feasibility study and for the design of the plant to be prepared. At that stage the proponent is able to put forward something that is meaningful to the public, and can take the form of an environmental impact statement, as was done in relation to the Morphettville bus depot. There will be ample opportunity for members of the public to object to the project.

Mr. Mathwin: You will take no notice of it.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: They will be given proper consideration in the assessment by my department and by the Government before it makes the final decision. Members of the Opposition have a cavalier attitude to environmental impact studies. I think they ought to show some responsibility. The Minister of Mines and Energy has already spoken about the cost of the environmental studies for the petro-chemical project. For the information of the member for Glenelg, I can state the cost involved

in the environmental impact study that was carried out in relation to the Morphettville bus depot.

Mr. Mathwin: I know about that.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It was a very considerable amount, indeed. Apart from the fee to the consultants who prepared the original environmental impact statement on behalf of the proponents, the M.T.T.—

Mr. Mathwin: Assessed by your department.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: That was only a very small part of the cost.

Mr. Mathwin: You had a public relations firm to featherbed the public.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The cost of calling of public meetings, and so forth, so that the public could have the matters explained to them in person and express their points of view, is a relatively small part of the total cost. Largely because of inordinate delays in Canberra following the election last December (which shows how little the Federal Government regards this particular matter) and because of the delay with the department's assessment of that project (a delay which far exceeded the time laid down in the Act under which it was supposed to operate) the progress of the Morphettville bus depot was delayed for many months.

The result was that, in a time of rapidly escalating costs the cost of the project increased by a figure many more times greater than the estimated cost of the original environmental impact statement. Obviously, when dealing with a project of this magnitude, the environmental studies that have to be carried out are going to be extraordinarily expensive, as they have to be detailed. There will be a tremendous interest by the public in the statement, and the effect will cause a considerable delay in the compilation of the final environmental impact statement.

Mr. Mathwin: That is balderdash, and you know it.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Although the Government is keen to see environmental impact statements are produced wherever necessary (and in fact, under new legislation they will be so called for when necessary), nevertheless it is not an operation that should be entered into in the cavalier manner suggested by the speakers for the Opposition. It will be an extremely expensive operation. It will almost certainly, in a case like this, run into seven figures, and to say we should go ahead with such an inquiry at this stage, when there are so many reasons why the project will not go ahead, would be absolutely irresponsible. The Leader said:

Much of the public concern was governed by emotive factors,

That is quite true, and I suggest that the Leader has sought to exploit to the utmost, for purely political purposes and quite irresponsibly, those emotive factors. I draw his attention to the wellknown saying quoted by Stanley Baldwin. I do not think it was original for him, as it is hard to imagine a conservative having such profundity, but I believe he said, "Power without responsibility was ever the prerogative of the harlot." In this case the only source of satisfaction is that the Leader has so little power that he will not be able to have much ill effect.

I said earlier that the Leader has a very ambivalent attitude to this particular matter. That is shared by his Deputy, who said something like this:

Very great sums of money have already been spent on this particular project.

Yet, he wants us to spend more money before the possibility that such an undertaking would be considered

by the Australian Government has been established, and before South Australia has any chance to get the industry, even if allowed to go ahead by the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that the whole censure motion put forward by the Opposition is not fair dinkum. The Opposition never puts up a case; all it is trying to do is exploit the concern that members of the public have, rightfully, about the use of uranium.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you finally admit they are concerned?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: There has never been any doubt that members of the public are concerned about the use of uranium as a future fuel source.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you admitting that concern?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I share that concern, and I would be irresponsible, as would members opposite, if they were not concerned about the effect of the widespread use of atomic power. This does not mean that the concern of the public should not be properly catered for by a full and open consideration of all the factors relating to the use of uranium as a fuel. I suggest that the Opposition is not fair dinkum in this particular matter, as it would be desperately keen to get such an industry. Also, I suggest it would not be too scrupulous about the environmental effect, if it were in Government, just as in the same way the Commonwealth Government formed by their brethren is not in the least concerned about environmental factors, as instanced by its attitude towards the Concorde and the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway. Therefore, I reject the argument put forward by the Opposition, and I reject the motion they have put forward today.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): This is a serious question for members of the Opposition. We have not raised this matter as a capricious censure motion. I think only one other speaker has referred to the question of morals, and whether we like it or not this is more than just a question of local morals: it is a question of world morals. I believe, ultimately, this question will not be resolved by South Australians. It is a question of whether people are willing to sacrifice a considerable amount of security in their need for power: I do not mean political power, I mean the energy source. This afternoon numerous newspaper reports have been quoted, many of which have been ridiculed by the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy, and others.

In ridiculing the Liberal-based press, perhaps they should have paid more attention to the Labor-based press, because this month's edition of *Scope*, a very reliable Labor newspaper, contains much comment about nuclear energy. Admittedly, South Australia may not be in a tremendous amount of danger if a nuclear enrichment plant were to be established, but that material has to be sent somewhere in the world and the moral question, and also what the unions will think about this, has not been aired much this afternoon.

The unions are very clear on the issue. They took to task the previous Whitlam Government, and went on strike to prevent Whitlam contracts from being fulfilled. They say that they will not only look at the important actions that have already been taken in the campaign against the mining and exporting of uranium, but also they will look overseas towards the nations to which the uranium is to be exported. How do they intend to do this? Mr. Bill Hartley, the union leader, says they will develop closer ties between Australian trade unions and the Labor-orientated political Parties, and with their counterparts in Japan. He said that Mr. Fraser went to Japan to cement

a treaty with Mr. Meiko, the Japanese Prime Minister, and that the fulfilment of the Australian contracts to Japan for the supply of uranium oxide was one of the promises Mr. Fraser made.

Mr. Hartley says that this statement constitutes a challenge to the Australian trade union movement and to the Japanese people. He quotes that 49 per cent of the Japanese people are in favour of going ahead with uranium plants for power, and 43 per cent are against: the remainder are undecided. I suggest that many people, not only in Japan, but throughout the world would be undecided, because the type of environmental impact statement that has yet to be made in South Australia has not yet been made elsewhere overseas. It is the fact that this whole scheme was propounded in relative secrecy that has made the Opposition so incensed. Perhaps it will prove to be safe for South Australia to extract and enrich uranium, but we want to know about it before anything goes ahead.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you mean that it can be safe?

Mr. ALLISON: I do not know, and that is one of the things I am fearful about. Far more is to be discovered yet. I hope that South Australian or Australian uranium might be exported overseas, where a tremendous amount of technological research is being done at some risk. Perhaps our uranium may make this research more safe. Two authorities might be quoted, one of whom is none other than the Governor of South Australia (Sir Mark Oliphant), who, only a few days after I brought up a similar theory in Mount Gambier, said it was possible that the fusion system of providing nuclear energy might be the one that would ultimately be accepted the world over. Fusion is far more safe than nuclear fission.

As the Minister referred to this matter earlier, he is obviously aware that we are getting our comments from the same source, namely, the Atomic Energy Research Establishment in Britain, which does considerable research in this field. That is where I got my first information about three or four months ago. Perhaps we can hope that the extraction and supply of Australian uranium will make this type of fusion energy far safer and more reliable. If that will salve my conscience, it will make me justified in saying "yes" to some kind of extraction scheme in South Australia, in the hope that ultimately it will get us over the 30-year or 40-year energy crisis, and provide safe energy thereafter. However, I do not know that that will be the case, because I have not seen enough work done on it.

Mr. Millhouse: That's really self-justification.

Mr. ALLISON: There is no doubt about that. In the absence of anything more concrete than that, I am the meat in the sandwich and the man in the street, and I do not know. The unions are in no doubt, because they are saying that they will build opposition in Japan, whose people are already very nuclear-leakage conscious. The article in *Scope* states:

They have been subjected to nuclear leakages in Japan. That nation's only nuclear-powered vessel has been out of service as a result of accidents. Japanese fishermen have in the past suffered radiation sickness due to other nations' nuclear tests. There is also the fact that Japan is the only nation to have sustained nuclear attacks . . . That is by the way, because the whole question of the disposal of nuclear waste troubles me, because where on the face of the earth could mankind find a spot sufficiently safe to store these deadly nuclear wastes, whether it be in lead or concrete containers? Most of the world's centres that depend on a tremendous amount

of energy (including nuclear energy, in the next 30 years) are on the earth's earthquake belt, which stretches from North and South America, across Europe, right through the Alps into Central Asia, through the Himalayas, through into China, the Philippines and Japan. Those centres contain vast numbers of the world's population that will be demanding nuclear energy and, if they use it, they will be faced with the problem of waste disposal. Once again, I return to *Scope* for references to leakages that have already occurred. The article states:

So far, a proper method for disposing of even highly dangerous high-level nuclear wastes, such as plutonium, cesium, strontium, and uranium isotopes, has not yet been devised. These substances have been stored in underground steel tanks at the federal government's 600 square mile nuclear waste facility at Hanford, Washington, since 1945, and more recently at Savannah River, in Georgia. Since 1958, however there have been 20 publicly acknowledged major leaks, involving 420 000 gallons of high-level radioactive wastes at the Hanford facility. The most recent of these occurrences took place last June, when 165 000 gallons from two separate tanks were "lost".

This report lists about 10 or 12 examples, including one where a trailer truck carrying low-level radio-active waste collided with another vehicle and spilled the waste on the highway. The article in *Scope* also states:

In Florida, the *Miami Herald* reported in mid-March, that large quantities of radioactive liquid produced by a Florida Power and Light nuclear power plant have been seeping into Miami's Biscayne Bay for the last two years. The leak, traced to waste storage pits, is currently put at 90 gallons an hour, but is considered not a threat by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) despite its acknowledgement that the leaks have not been sealed because radio-activity in the pits is too intense to make repairs.

Many other examples are available. I would assume that, since the Liberal Party press has been pilloried this afternoon as being untrue, we would have to accept that the Australian Labor Party press was telling the truth. I am worried. I think the censure motion, whatever the implied intention is, had to come. This matter should have been brought before the public, not now but long ago. The Government should have stated its intention of considering nuclear power. I believe that this matter has been in camera for some time, because a witness at the recent Electoral Boundaries Commission hearing put forward a hypothetical suggestion that perhaps the South-East of South Australia might be the site for a nuclear power plant, and that would change the whole housing and population situation. As that is on record in the commission's transcript, perhaps it is not quite so new as we may think. It has been banded about at least at high level in this State, even though at the hypothetic level.

A second interim report is also available and, if that were leaked out, the potential leakage of nuclear waste is far more dangerous than this. It should have been aired before the public before now. I support the motion with great concern. I have a conscience. I am certainly conscious of the moral issue, not only for South Australia but for the rest of the world. I am also conscious that the rest of the world needs power, and that probably in the long run many consciences may be salved, because it is better to have power, food, work, and clothing and temporary insecurity from nuclear waste in the hope that we will be able to obtain a far more secure and reliable source of power. I am hanging my hat, flimsy though it may be, on the fusion method propounded by the Atomic Energy Research Establishment in Great Britain and now being taken up by experts in Australia.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It's a long way off yet.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have been most grateful and not at all surprised by the responsible attitude taken to the subject at least by Opposition members, but the attitude taken by Government Ministers does them little credit. Some Ministers sought refuge in a little levity, some in personal abuse and personalities some in shuffling around the subject so solidly that it took 28 minutes to admit that people in the community were and are concerned, and there was a general backing-off from the whole issue. If there were any other justification for moving the censure motion today, that would provide it, because Government members are not able to justify what is being done.

They have deliberately ignored and not referred to the fundamental issue that the Government has a moral responsibility to take the people of this State into its confidence before it proceeds with the detailed planning for a uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff. The Government has acted irresponsibly and in contempt of the concern of the people of this State in proceeding to the present stage with its preparations and investigations without having initiated a full public inquiry into all the matters which have been ventilated this afternoon and which are causing concern. I am disappointed that we have not heard from the Attorney-General in this debate, because I thought he might have had the courage of his convictions. I am more disappointed to have heard the Minister for the Environment, however, trying to defend the Government's activity. His performance was not at all impressive.

He spoke predominantly about economic conditions when, by virtue of his portfolio, one would have expected him to defend the environmental and other issues involved. One wonders whether as he has been so ineffective in the House on this matter, he has been as ineffective in Cabinet. Perhaps we need a Minister for the Environment who will stand up in Cabinet for the environment, stick to his guns and not be over-ridden by the attitudes of the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy. One also wonders just how much influence the Attorney carries. The Minister for the Environment said that this issue was not really his responsibility and tried to push the issue back on to the Federal Government. He said whether the project will proceed will depend entirely on the Federal Government. He quoted the Deputy Prime Minister's approval in principle of the scheme.

He then blamed his own department, but the responsibility is really Cabinet's and his. Basically, it is the Government of this State that must take responsibility. The Minister has said that the Opposition has a cavalier attitude towards environmental impact studies. He even suggests that those studies may be too expensive to conduct. What has happened to the high-minded principles the Labor Party has thrust down the throats of South Australian electors all these years? Where have they gone?

Mr. Gunn: They never had any principles.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister dodged and shuffled around the issue and took no apparent stand. Finally, he said that the Opposition would not be too scrupulous. Obviously, he is judging the Opposition by the Government's standards. The Premier referred to the Opposition's raising an issue that would make the biggest splash, saying that that was the reason we had moved it. The Premier is right. This is one of the most important issues that has come before this Parliament. Many other issues could be raised, not the least of which is the current drought and the crisis threatening the rural community, such issues will be ventilated in

this House soon. In my view this is one of the most important issues to have come before the House in my time here.

The Premier's response shows an almost total lack of social conscience on these matters. He has tried to say that South Australia has two more years up its sleeve, because it will be two years before a further agreement is entered into on this matter. He ignores totally that the issue has been going on for two years. He said the Government would not make a decision on the matter, and that when the Minister of Mines and Energy took the interim report away with him on his oversea trip no Government decision had been made. If the Minister did not take the report away with him on behalf of the Government, on whose responsibility did he take it? For him to say that he did not show the report to anyone unless they raised the subject is just so much humbug. The Premier has failed totally to reassure the House. If he cannot reassure the House, how can he hope to reassure the community?

The Premier said that the project would depend on the outcome of the Ranger inquiry and that we should wait until its recommendations were handed down. The investigation has been proceeding for two years, whereas the public hearings before the Ranger inquiry began only on September 9 last year. It just does not make sense. It is a straw that the Government is clutching at.

Mr. Millhouse: It makes some sense.

Dr. TONKIN: Not in the context of using it as an excuse for not setting up a State inquiry. The financial costings of siting houses for employees and the infrastructure for towns are, according to the Premier, matters that must be considered. From his and the Minister of Mines and Energy's point of view, these matters will be of predominant interest. The Australian Labor Party's policy on environmental impact studies is wearing thin. What the A.L.P. really means is that it will take environmental impact studies into account unless financial and political advantages come first. That attitude clearly came through. I do not believe it is the attitude of all members of the A.L.P. but it is obvious that the Premier and, judging from the silence of all the other Ministers, the Government has no sense of social responsibility towards the people of South Australia.

The widely publicised concern for the environment that has been attributed to the Labor Party will, after today, be worth nothing. The speeches made in this debate have exploded that. I repeat that the Government of this State has acted most irresponsibly and in contempt of the concerns of the people of this State. The Government should have instituted an inquiry to run concurrently with its planning. It has not done so, and it deserves the censure of this House on behalf of the people of South Australia.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandeppeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Dean Brown. No—Mr. Keneally.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I join with His Excellency in expressing condolences to the families of Mr. Jim Ferguson, Mr. Horace Hogben, and Mr. William MacGillivray. I knew personally only Mr. Jim Ferguson, and I consider that he was the personification of a good politician. He was kindly and fair, and he endeavoured at all times to carry out the wishes of the people whom he represented and who sent him to this Chamber. At the same time, however, he always had the capacity to respect another person's viewpoint. The people of South Australia suffered a grave loss when Jim died. His Excellency told us that his Address to the Parliament would be his last because of his projected retirement. This Parliament and the State owe a debt of gratitude to His Excellency for the manner in which he has carried out his duties as Governor. Through his actions, we will see set a pattern that will be hard to emulate. I wish His Excellency and his Lady a comfortable and happy retirement.

His Excellency's successor will no doubt be an admirable Governor. Sir Douglas Nicholls is a truly great Australian, and credit is due to the Government and those responsible for his appointment: without doubt he will be a kindly and considerate Governor, concerned at all times with the welfare of the people. I, for one, look forward to meeting Sir Douglas and making his acquaintance, knowing that I will be impressed by him as a Governor. I think all members in this place will be similarly impressed by his actions and the manner in which he performs the duties he will be called on to carry out.

The Parliament was told by His Excellency that a heavy schedule of legislation was to be presented during the present session, and we may be sure that the enactment of that legislation will be of great value to South Australia, keeping this State in the forefront of Australian politics and also, in relation to some measures, setting a pace for the Western world. The Government has done a remarkable job in leading South Australia to a position that has earned the admiration and the envy of every other Australian State, including those States led by Liberal or coalition Governments.

Since His Excellency opened Parliament, South Australia has suffered and is still in the throes of a serious drought. That is most unfortunate. Expected seasonal rains did not eventuate, with resultant great hardship to our rural producers. I can say with great certainty that the plight of those people has troubled the Government, which, of course, always has been concerned with the economic viability of such an important section of our community. I am certain that the people involved must be greatly heartened and gain much satisfaction from the prompt and generous relief afforded them by the Government of South Australia. They surely should not gain any comfort from Mr. Ian Sinclair, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, who addressed the annual conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated recently. Judging by press reports of that conference, it is certain that Mr. Sinclair offered our rural producers nothing but a bleak outlook regarding their future activities. However, the State Government is aware of the plight of our rural producers and, as I have said, it always expresses concern and it has done something concrete to alleviate the situation caused by the present drought.

All sections of the community will applaud the efforts of the Community Welfare Department to implement the recommendations of the Community Welfare Advisory

Committee, which deal largely with the serious maltreatment of children. The capable Minister and his dedicated staff are to be commended on the action they are taking to see that the maltreatment of children ceases and that all offenders are punished severely. Further, the very capable and able Minister of Labour and Industry, who in my opinion is the best Minister to have held that portfolio for decades, has indicated his intention to seek to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to give effect to the undertaking in the policy speech to provide that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes but should be resolved in tribunals specifically provided for the purpose. This should please all sections of the community interested in industrial justice.

The passage of this legislation will mean that yet another fetter will be dragged from the ankles of the workers of this State. Of course, this legislation, just and fair as it will be, will not meet with the approbation of members of the Opposition, because they delight in seeing workers in a situation where they can be suppressed and dictated to and have their standards of living adjudged and regulated by tribunals that are not specifically set up for that purpose.

Mr. Becker: That's rot.

Mr. WELLS: Laws such as the law of torts have been devised purely and simply to permit the employer class to dictate to and suppress the workers in any particular industry.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's a nice slur on industry.

Mr. WELLS: I stand by what I have said. Specific tribunals have been established to hear industrial matters and make determinations on them, and these are the tribunals that should hear matters of this kind. Such matters should not be dragged into civil courts. I am sure that, although Opposition members do not agree with that statement vocally, if they examine their consciences they will realise that, if justice is to be done, this legislation must receive a unanimous passage through Parliament.

Mr. Venning: What did you tell the farmers at Mount Barker?

Mr. WELLS: I will come to that. The Bill to which I have referred will also provide for the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions. Such a provision is long overdue and will be welcomed by the workers in this State. Who could argue about a Bill of this kind?

Mr. Goldsworthy: I could.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member may, and other members of the Opposition will argue strenuously, but we must ask ourselves why this legislation will be opposed. It will be opposed because the Opposition considers that, if it can have such a Bill rejected, that may produce a divisive force in the trade union movement and among the workers of South Australia. Of course, such a situation will not eventuate, because the Bill will provide that members of trade unions will receive absolute preference in employment, and nothing could be fairer or more just. As I have stated in this Chamber previously and as other people have repeated, if men work in an industry alongside members of a trade union, the members of which are paying dues to that union for its administration, including the payment to officers and the payment of the costs of award applications and of protection against intimidation and such actions by the employers, those men, who are so eager and so willing to take the benefits derived from the activities of the trade union, such as

in take-home pay, wages, sick leave, long service leave, annual leave, and other fringe benefits obtained by the union, should subscribe to the cost now borne by the rank and file members of the union to obtain those benefits.

Who could, in fairness, say that, if a man working on the shop floor is willing to accept and, in fact, to demand the benefits, derived through the efforts of a trade union, at the expense of the rank and file members, that man should not pay part of the cost involved? If that situation is analysed closely, it is seen that there can be no doubt that those men who are not members of the union but who are working with unionists should contribute towards the cost of obtaining the benefits that they enjoy. I do not think that anyone could argue successfully about this matter. However, Opposition members doubtless will try to raise some objection and to substantiate any objections that some people may have to subscribing to a union, and I expect that they will raise an old bogey that some workers are not willing to contribute.

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

Mr. WELLS: Before the dinner adjournment, I spoke of my esteem for the Government, His Excellency the Governor, and also his successor. I referred also to the extremely valuable legislation that will be introduced by the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Labour and Industry, and of compulsory unionism, or in fact the absolute preference in employment to be given to trade unionists. Undoubtedly, we will hear in later Opposition contributions to the debate the old chestnut pulled out of the fire that some trade unionists do not want to pay an affiliation fee or their dues to the Australian Labor Party or, indeed, to assist its campaign funds. I want to lay this matter to rest once and for all by telling Opposition members, because they do not know (it is not necessary to tell Government members) that no trade union in South Australia affiliates to the A.L.P. for its full effective membership. Therefore, people who object to an affiliation fee being paid or a donation made to the A.L.P. are numbered among the people who are not affiliated. The full effective strength of a union is not affiliated to the A.L.P.

Mr. Whitten: And never has been.

Mr. WELLS: That is so. This chestnut is always dragged up but, if any union member goes to the office of a union which is going to make a contribution to the A.L.P., he has a right to say, "I do not want an affiliation fee paid to the A.L.P."

Mr. Gunn: And he loses his job!

Mr. WELLS: That is not so, because trade unions operate democratically. Let me tell the House of a personal experience. I was for many years Secretary of the powerful and militant Waterside Workers Federation. It was always known and publicised that, if any member of the federation did not want a levy, fee, or contribution to go to the A.L.P., he could come and tell me accordingly.

Mr. Gunn: They would pay it to the Communist Party.

Mr. WELLS: That is wrong. Not one red cent, at any stage of my experience as Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation, went to the Communist Party. However, if a member had come to me and said that he was a member of the Liberal Party, or that he supported the Liberal Movement or some other Party, and did not want a contribution made to the Australian Labor Party, it was known that I would have said, "That is quite all right. I

will put your request to the next stop-work meeting, and I am sure the meeting will give permission for your 50c to go to the Liberal Party." But it is a strange thing that not one man, in my experience, said, "Give my 50c to the Liberal Party."

So, one can see that those concerned had complete faith in the management of their organisation, of which I was the chief administrative officer, and they were willing to accept the situation as it existed without protest. So that puts the myth to rest.

Dr. Eastick: What other unions practise that same democracy?

Mr. WELLS: That is democracy. A man has a choice whether or not he puts in his \$1, but no wharfie came and told me that he wanted his \$1 to go to the Liberal Party. The membership would have been pleased to hear about it and let the \$1 go to the Liberal Party.

The number of wage-fixing tribunals has been a source of concern in South Australia for some time, and accordingly the Minister will seek to repeal the Public Service Arbitration Act, and vest in the Industrial Commission the jurisdiction to make awards in respect of public servants in the same way as it does for any other workers, and this in itself is a welcome and desired piece of industrial legislation. Of course, we will probably hear objections from the Opposition regarding this matter. Rating disputes have been the cause of some mild objections in the past and recently, and land acquisition is also receiving some attention. Accordingly, the appropriate Minister has in his usual conscientious and fair-minded manner appointed a committee to investigate alternative means of dealing with the matters referred to, and the report of the committee will be received with great interest. This was never suggested while Liberal Party members occupied the Treasury benches. The Minister, in his fair-minded manner, has set up this committee, which will give people the chance to say what they want to say. Of course, when the report has been completed, I have no doubt that it will be implemented, at least to some degree, by the Government.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about Monarto.

Mr. WELLS: I want to speak about something else that is close to my heart at present.

Mr. Coumbe: The pie cart.

Mr. WELLS: No, I have given that away. The Government is vitally concerned with the subdivision, and consequent removal from production, of some of the best agricultural land in the State and the establishment of what have come to be termed "hobby farms". The Government, in its long-demonstrated concern for the welfare of our rural communities and the economics involved, is actively considering ways in which the extremely undesirable aspects of this form of development may be effectively controlled in the interests of legitimate rural producers.

This subject has given rise to much heat and anger. Of course, there are two sides to every question. In some areas of the State choice rural productive land has been sold and developed or formed into small hobby farms. All members know that land tax is based on recent sales in a certain area, as well as on certain other factors. These hobby farms have been bought at shockingly high prices and, as a consequence, the legitimate rural producer is suffering to the extent that his land tax is based on recent sales, and this involves the hobby farms.

The Government is vitally concerned about the matter and has determined that it will do everything in its power to alleviate the position in which the rural producer finds

himself. As I have said, there are two sides to every question. If landowners decide that they will exercise their rights under section 12c of the Act, they are rated as rural producing units. If subsequently the land is sold at an inflated price, as it is being sold at present, they are required to pay back taxes on that property in relation to the sale. The people to whom I have spoken have been reluctant to do this. They want to be taxed as rural producing units, which is perhaps fair enough. On the other hand, they still want to maintain the potential value of their land as it is related to hobby farm sales. They want it both ways. Something has to be done to correct the situation, and the Government has the matter in hand.

I have been asked to relate this personal experience. I was asked to go to Mount Barker, to represent the Minister, and to listen to people at a public meeting in the Mount Barker institute. I went along in good faith to the well-attended warm meeting, at which I received a warm welcome. Speaker after speaker did nothing but castigate the Minister, although they did not know what they were talking about. They wanted me to represent them on a deputation to the Premier to support their case, but I properly refused to represent them in that way. They then had the temerity to howl down a city man (a university professor) who owned one of the farmlets. He had gone to the meeting to talk about the conservation aspect, but after three minutes he had to resume his seat. When it was my turn, the louder they yelled the louder I laughed. They did not disturb me at all. At this hostile meeting I had only one friend, the Government driver who drove me to Mount Barker. He was on side, but he did not dare say anything. I enjoyed the meeting: the rougher the better.

Subsequently, I received a letter, which I do not have with me, from a gentleman who was concerned with a rural property and who was an officer of the Apple and Pear Board. This gentleman was apologetic for the rough treatment that the guests had received at that public meeting. I thought that the professor got a rough deal, but I enjoyed it. The gentleman who wrote the letter said, "Please do not judge the residents of Mount Barker, Nairne, and Littlehampton by the noisy, rude minority at the meeting". I have addressed a few meetings of wharfies and trade unions. Perhaps the people at the Mount Barker meeting were rude, but I do not think it was a particularly violent meeting. At any rate, not much satisfaction was gained from it.

What amused me most was that these people said, "We will tell you what we will do. We will put our tractors and ploughs on the freeway, and no vehicles will be able to travel between Adelaide and Melbourne." I said, "At least you show some guts." However, they did not carry out their threat. Afterwards, I said to them, "You had better be sure that your tractors are registered before you take them on to the road. Otherwise, you may get into trouble." I have not heard that the freeway was blocked. They are very nice people, but they went cold. They did nothing, except talk. As a matter of fact, last weekend I visited some friends at Littlehampton, Murray Bridge, and Taillem Bend, and I was surprised at the different attitude toward me and toward the tax. Incidentally, the deputation elected at that Mount Barker meeting eventually saw the Premier, who explained the situation. The members of the deputation went away happy that the Labor Party was protecting their interests, and they had no worries.

Widespread improvements in education are proposed by the Minister of Education; this shows the importance of adult education for our adult Aboriginal citizens. The Further Education Department is undertaking a project to develop Wardang Island as a self-supporting tourist venture

completely under Aboriginal control. This is of great credit to the Government, as it is obvious that the Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government in Canberra has completely abdicated its responsibility in Aboriginal welfare. This is a disgrace to the Federal Government, headed by Mr. Fraser.

In public transport, the Government has determined, despite drastic federal cutting back of funds, to continue with its forward-looking transport policies. To that end, \$92 000 000 will be dispersed by the Highways Department; this will make possible the completion of the sealing of the Eyre Highway this year, a task that was studiously avoided by anti-Labor Governments previously in power in South Australia. However, the Labor Party faced up to its responsibility, and this project will be brought to finality.

Mr. Gunn: How much federal money is involved?

Mr. WELLS: The Federal Government has decimated the value of funds for transport, but this will not deter the South Australian Government, which will press ahead with a forward-looking policy.

Mr. Venning: You will not be here for long.

Mr. WELLS: There is much conjecture as to when the next State election will be held, and there is a lot of huffing and puffing. Only the Premier knows when the next election will be held, and when he says "Go", we will be ready. Many Opposition members will be trembling in their shoes when the next election comes, because the Labor Party will rip some seats off the Opposition, because of the sterling qualities and achievements of this Government.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about the election.

Mr. WELLS: I do not know when it will be, but if I did know I would not tell the honourable member. I have read conjecture in the press from the Leader, from other prominent Opposition members, and from the Leader of the Liberal Movement and his cohorts, telling us when we will have an election. No wonder the Premier sits back and chuckles, because he, and no-one else, will decide. He is far too cagey a gentleman to give any clue as to what he intends to do. The member for Glenelg ought to watch out.

Mr. Mathwin: No worries.

Mr. WELLS: It is the intention of the Government to complete the Little Para dam and ancillary works, to provide adequate supplies of water to the Elizabeth-Salisbury areas, and to devise a method to improve the distribution system in the northern suburbs. This move is being applauded by wide sections of our community. I can assure members that this is so, because part of the area is in my electoral district.

I am quite sure that my friends in the Mount Barker and Littlehampton area will be delighted to learn that new pumping stations, pumps, and distribution mains are to be installed within their townships. This action again demonstrates the anxiety and concern the Labor Government in South Australia has for the welfare of our rural citizens, and it further cements the traditional bonds between the A.L.P. and country dwellers.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Hon. Mr. Casey?

Mr. WELLS: I do not know about the Hon. Mr. Casey, but I can tell members opposite about Mr. Fraser. Already in a short time the Fraser Government in Canberra has demonstrated its complete contempt for the average Australian citizen by the vicious slashing of expenditure, especially in education, health, social welfare, transport, housing and local government. This action has sickened our community, and the attempted activities of

the Commonwealth Government have been submerged by calculated, premeditated attacks upon the trade union movement in our country.

However, I can assure all members that these vicious slanderous attacks upon the democratically elected trade union leaders of this State will not in any circumstances or in any manner alienate the rank and file members of the trade unions from their democratically elected leadership, despite the fact that attempts are being made from all quarters to do that. If honourable members opposite could hear the contemptuous remarks made in reference to these activities by the rank and file members of trade unions, they would cease their stupid opportunism.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: Regarding union leaders, there is much screaming and yelling by the Liberal Party and its supporters, especially by talk-back joeys who must line up the night before to get on the radio, to try to denigrate the Australian Labor Party.

Dr. Tonkin: They get on by saying they are friends of Charlie Wells.

Mr. WELLS: If they are friends of mine members opposite can bet they can trust them. Nevertheless, all these people attempt to denigrate trade union leaders. However, trade union leaders without exception are elected by secret ballot by rank and file unionists, and I challenge any honourable member opposite to deny that or to prove that I am telling an untruth. Every trade union elects its officers by secret ballot. I refer to the situation applying on Australia's waterfront (my old stamping ground), and give a brief outline of the electoral procedures held on the waterfront by the Waterside Workers Federation, the finest industrial body in Australia. In such an election the following position applies: nominations for all positions are declared open once every three years. Nominations are open for a month, a returning officer is appointed and, when nominations close, they are published. On an appointed day the election is held from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m. and throughout Australia the ballot takes place.

How does the ballot take place? I refer honourable members opposite to the situation applying at Port Adelaide. The Australian Electoral Office provides voting booths, as we know them for any State or Commonwealth election, including lighting, a table, and a pencil. Returning officers and assistants are involved. Indeed, before he can vote, a man must prove his identity and his name is ruled off the register as in a Commonwealth or State election. A voter is given his ballot-papers and he places them in the boxes provided by the Electoral Department. At the close of the day the boxes are sealed, and at the completion of the count—

Mr. Harrison: Are they locked?

Mr. WELLS: Of course they are locked. At the completion of the count the ballot boxes are taken to the Commonwealth Bank and placed in a bank vault and sealed therein by the bank manager, who remains on the premises even after normal banking hours to receive all the ballot boxes. Next morning the ballot boxes are taken by the returning officer, and in the presence of scrutineers the vote is counted, the return is made, and the result is published. Nothing could be fairer, and I do not believe the position is any better elsewhere in relation to elections for other organisations. There is a completely secret ballot.

Mr. Mathwin: What is the percentage vote?

Mr. WELLS: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. The only people excused from voting in such

elections are those who present a medical certificate. Moreover, a \$10 fine is imposed if a union member does not vote in such an election. Honourable members opposite should not forget that fact. It is not merely a matter of saying that one owes \$10 to the union: if the applicable fine is not paid within seven days one does not come to work on the waterfront on the eighth day. A member is then unfinancial and he cannot work. They are the registered rules.

Members opposite include in their number farmers, schoolteachers, and men of other varying vocations, but they are certainly not industrialists. Honourable members opposite would not know what that was all about, especially in regard to trade unions, and that applies also to their shadow Minister. I am sorry that he is not here, because I would like to have a word with him. Slanderous attacks made on trade union leaders are, unfortunately, supported and escalated by a vicious anti-Labor media. I make the point clear that, without exception, the media will come out in an anti-worker voice or attitude. The facts are these: journalists make reports, but they are not the reports we see published in the newspapers. Often such reports are slanted in an anti-worker and anti-Labor manner by editors. True, I believe that newspaper management has the right to produce policy, but it should be contained in the editorial column. Certainly, it should not be expressed through the journalistic efforts of media employees that are slanted.

These attacks upon the workers of this country are duplicated or even formulated in Canberra by the vicious Fraser Government, the Government that already is discredited in the eyes of the voters of this country. If honourable members opposite could have heard some of the country people I spoke to at the weekend, they would know that there is disenchantment throughout the State in relation to the Fraser Government. The Fraser Government is comprised of squibs, they ratted on their own members, and that Government has never been any good and it never will be. Certainly, any man who believes words emanating from Mr. Fraser's mouth is either crazy or is easily duped. Mr. Fraser cannot lie straight in bed.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WELLS: I know that honourable members opposite do not like to hear this tirade, but I have the floor and I still have some time to go, so members opposite must swallow it and, unless they leave the room, I intend to ram this information down their necks. Certainly, members opposite can please themselves as to whether they stay. I will make my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate and I will not, in any circumstances, spare the feelings of honourable members opposite. I almost said that members opposite are 100 per cent anti-worker. They are not quite, but they are not far off. They are anti-unionist; union bashers from A to Z. A member opposite referred to *Scope*. I did not know he could read, but at least he reads *Scope*.

Mr. Allison: The columns are about 48 millimetres wide.

Mr. WELLS: I suppose the honourable member can manage to read in some circumstances. He should look at the *News* to see the good news that Fraser has given to workers—\$9·90 a week for coverage if you are sick. He says this is a fair, democratic and just Medibank system. I have been to Sweden and have associates who have spent many years there (and speak fluent Swedish), so I am fully informed about the Swedish system and am willing to discuss it at any time. The present position concerning Medibank is another abdication from a promise made by

Fraser, who said, "We won't touch Medibank; we'll improve it." He has improved it so that people now pay about \$10 a week.

Dr. Eastick: Read it properly.

Mr. WELLS: It will cost a man and his family \$10 a week. It is an absolute disgrace! Why? It is part of Fraser's cringing effort to drive people back into private funds to assist and swell the pockets of the monopolistic health funds and certain sections of the medical fraternity. They are the people who support the Fraser Government. Everyone knows what the private funds did in their attempt to wreck Medibank. I predict that, soon, because of what we read in the newspaper tonight and because of other events to come, there will be the greatest industrial upheaval that has even been experienced in Australia.

Mr. Rodda: Is that a threat?

Mr. WELLS: It is a promise. Workers will not accept this intimidation, this vicious treatment that lowers their living standards.

Dr. Eastick: I read "Medibank—\$4·57 a week".

Mr. WELLS: Well, you have the wrong bloody paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! That was unparliamentary. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. WELLS: I apologise, and withdraw the word "bloody". The honourable member must have a different paper from mine; it must be an earlier edition.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you pay anything if you are a pensioner?

Mr. WELLS: No, but you pay tax on your pension, which is worse.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The member for Florey has the floor.

Mr. WELLS: They are rather inane interjections, too. To the relief of the Opposition I shall conclude my contribution by congratulating the New South Wales Labor Party on its magnificent victory at the recent election in that State, where we swept the Liberal Party from power. I am sure it was the result of people's disenchantment with and the disgust they hold towards the Fraser Government, together with the realisation and acknowledgment that they were conned and lied to by Fraser and his cohorts in the past. Indeed, we will see Liberal Governments swept from power soon in other States, because people will demand a democratic Labor Party State Government such as we have in South Australia with the Dunstan Labor Party Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You should look at the Gallup polls.

Mr. WELLS: They are about 54 per cent A.L.P. and 40 per cent Liberal Party. At least they are the latest figures I have seen unless you have doctored a few more. Another disgraceful act on the part of the Fraser Government is its attempt to wreck wage indexation. Fraser said, "We will not interfere with wage indexation." But what did he do? At the first opportunity, his Government intervened in a court action and tried to bludgeon the court into accepting the Government's proposition to pay 50 per cent of the actual indexed wage rate that should have been paid. This week we have the Federal Government in court again attempting to bludgeon the court into making a decision that is contrary to other wage indexation decisions. Such action will never bring industrial peace to Australia. The sooner Fraser and his crowd wake up to this the better. I hope that we will soon get back to an even keel and to a situation we experienced previously and will experience again in the future, namely, a Labor Government in Canberra.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): It is an honour to be afforded this opportunity to second the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It is always a pleasure to follow the member for Florey. I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that he is to be congratulated on his contribution. It is also a pleasure, Sir, to welcome you back from your overseas trips and to observe your healthy physical condition, which no doubt is a result of those trips. I am sure that the experience you have gained from your overseas conferences will be of benefit to this House. In a more serious vein, I express my sympathy to the relatives of several former members of Parliament who have passed away in the past year.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, during your absence overseas and, indeed, since your return, the Federal Government has deliberately put South Australia in a grave economic position with forced cuts in Government spending, increased sales tax, a reduction in the purchasing power of people's incomes, in addition to the problem of unemployment. It is not surprising that many Liberal supporters are coming into my office and complaining bitterly about the way in which Federal Government measures are affecting their enterprises. Their businesses and their way of life are being jeopardised by the present attitude in Canberra. That attitude is making it more difficult for people to secure houses. It is therefore not surprising that some of these people have said that the way the present Liberal Government is performing is starting to make the previous Whitlam Government look good. More people are becoming painfully aware of the harsh policies emanating from Canberra.

Mr. Whitten: They'll get harsher in August.

Mr. OLSON: They certainly will. It is plain that the overriding objective of Federal Government policy is to strengthen and preserve capitalism and free enterprise in the interests of people with property, mining interests, the commercial interests, their corporate friends on the stock exchanges, and those people in professions who help to sustain their wealth and property. Profit-making and profit-taking are the essence of the exercise, while welfare and full employment objectives are considered only if they are compatible with and subservient to the profit objective. The worldwide recession and its Australian counterpart have provided a political climate to grant concessions and incentives to the owners and manipulators of capital. Free enterprise is talked of so widely, free enterprise in which one can trust one's arm to get one's profit and benefit therefrom, provided one is protected by Government subsidy, bounties, and every assistance under the sun.

When are we going to get that into perspective? If members opposite want to talk of free enterprise and private enterprise, it should be defined. Members opposite spend most of their time protecting private enterprise at the cost of the ordinary low and middle income earners. Members opposite should start making up their minds about public expenditure and private expenditure, because much of their talk is hollow. Much of that private expenditure will not go on unless there is massive Government support. Those members who visited the opening of the new office area of the Education Building in Flinders Street recently were able to see a perfect example of how the Government is working in co-operation with private consultants. Expenditure on consultative services during 1973-74 totalled \$2 290 000, while for 1974-75 it totalled \$4 220 000. The Minister and his department are to be congratulated on their policy of letting a proportion of their works programme to private consultants and builders.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not refer to and support a statement recently made by the Deputy Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) when he said, "The Liberal Government in Canberra has deliberately set out to cut back on services provided for the people of South Australia." This applies particularly to my electorate, where many of my constituents are in receipt of age pensions. As members may be well aware, the Commonwealth Government has recently taken many essential drugs and medicines off the free list of pharmaceutical benefits. In doing that, the Government has in one hit forced pensioners and many others to pay large amounts of money for essential medicines that they previously received at no cost. This has decreased the value of their pension and is causing extreme hardship to many people. It hits the person who must have regular and often numerous prescriptions, the person who may have three to six prescriptions a month.

There are many such persons in the community; some of them cannot afford the additional funds. If a person goes to a chemist regularly, it means a substantial reduction in his standard of living, whilst the amount of money saved by the Federal Government is insignificant. It is not unusual to hear of people who are forgoing their evening meal to offset sufficient money to put aside for their burial and, if it was not for the Meals on Wheels service, which is producing a substantial mid-day meal for these people, we would find that many of them would not be able to survive.

It is time someone considered what purpose is being served by taking away pensioner and pharmaceutical benefits, which include hearing aids for pensioners, and by deferring pensions and going through all the pinpricking exercises that have been gone through during the past few months to save some \$300 000 to \$400 000 in a \$4 000 000 000 deficit, particularly when there does not appear to be any difficulty in finding \$500 000 to \$750 000 to put out a pamphlet indicating, as the Government will now be obliged to do, the benefits of Medibank; and, further to this, providing some \$12 000 000 000 for defence expenditure. We have a situation where the member for Glenelg gets up in this Chamber and says it is necessary to maintain the school cadets so that they can have a wash. That was the argument that he contributed in this Chamber.

Mr. Jennings: That would be one of his best.

Mr. OLSON: Of course it would be, definitely. Members will probably find that, with the attitude that the Fraser Government is taking towards the unions at present, the \$12 000 000 000 will be used to shoot the workers down if they do not comply with the requirements of the changes to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Members opposite can say that this will not happen, but we know, from the situation of this person who maintains his divine right to govern and who has broken so many promises at this stage, that not one thing that he mentioned in the election speech is being maintained. It is a complete fallacy for people to get up in this Chamber and maintain that they are doing the best for the Australian workers.

Mr. Mathwin: How would you get rid of a deficit of \$5 000 000 000?

Mr. OLSON: Money does not mean a thing compared with keeping the standards of people from conditions of starvation. One of the cutbacks announced in the Federal Treasurer's speech is in respect of metropolitan public transport, which has received a body blow. The South Australian Government sought \$20 000 000 from Canberra, and it will get only \$1 300 000. Anticipating a reasonable amount of funds from the Fraser Government, this Government placed orders for 370 new buses for Adelaide, at a

cost well in excess of \$20 000 000. Because of the Federal Government's action, that will have to be funded from this State's resources. Even in my electorate, we have a situation where the people are unable to catch a bus from Friday evening until Monday morning.

Dr. Eastick: It is the Whitlam Government.

Mr. OLSON: It was not the Whitlam Government. It has no bearing on it whatsoever. Services have been provided by the capabilities of the Municipal Tramways Trust. With the development of areas well outside what should be regarded as an area where one can travel freely, people have had to go miles out to get suitable building blocks at a price that they can afford. The Commonwealth Government appears to have no conception of the problems faced in the provision of serviced land, sewerage, and decent public transport. The problems faced by people living in our major cities in obtaining access to a reasonable level of facilities have been enormous. For two decades we have witnessed Liberal and Country Party Governments destroying the inner cities and the cities of Australia. By their action and inaction they have encouraged the over-centralism of urban development, with never a thought for the problems of the people in those cities.

For more than 20 years we have fought the Liberal Government coalition for allowing the rape of our cities by foreign investment. By its action in allowing foreign investors and major insurance companies to acquire control of freehold land in the centre of those cities, it has brought about this sorry state. It has allowed the insurance companies to use the savings of the people to destroy their way of life, and members opposite cannot get away from that. In the decade from 1960 to 1970, the investment by insurance companies in the major cities of this country increased from \$112 000 000 to about \$12 000 000 000.

The Federal Liberal Government engaged in asset stripping on a monumental scale when it forced the State Governments to run down the public transport systems of our major cities. It forced the people to live in unserved outer suburbs without schools and hospitals, and a wide variety of services and facilities which we are continually told are a standard for our society. It was not until 1972, after the return of a Federal Labor Government, that things began to change, when millions of dollars was provided to catch up on the backlog regarding sewerage and public transport and funding was made available to local government to provide good local services.

The Liberal Party wants to put South Australia into severe financial difficulties by deluding the people into accepting that \$1 spent on essential public service is inflationary or somehow immoral, whereas \$1 spent by the private individual is not. This is a fallacy and a myth which must be exploded quickly. The Liberal Party talks about incentives for private industry and the need for business confidence. Where is the endorsement for a growth centre programme when the Liberal Party wants less money to provide hospitals, schools, roads, public transport services, and the whole range of community assistance schemes that South Australians expect their Government to provide?

Dr. Tonkin: That is not true.

Mr. OLSON: It is 100 per cent true. Liberal members should be honest. If they propose cutbacks in urban programmes they should tell the people of South Australia that the cuts will be in Government services, which will mean fewer teachers, fewer doctors, the curtailment of dental clinics for schoolchildren, less road building, and deteriorating public transport services. Turning now to unemployment and inflation, we were told that under a Liberal and

National Country Party Government there would be jobs for all who wanted to work. That was contained in a report of Fraser's election policy speech on November 28, 1975, yet a report in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, June 5, 1976, does not support that claim, although the Government, after being in office for eight months, has had an opportunity to do something about it. The growth rate predicted has not eventuated, and one reads in the press that the half-yearly reports of manufacturing industries showed substantial increases in profits during the last six months of 1975, the period when the Labor Government was blamed for letting inflation run wild.

I refer, first, to the *B.H.P. News Review*, particularly in relation to claims made by the Opposition members that the worker is not exactly pulling his weight; in other words, we must show increased productivity before we are able to expect improved living conditions. This will give some indication of the exploitation involved or the excuses made in this regard. The *B.H.P. News Review* of 1976, dealing with production results, revealed that it had not been a bad year. High levels of output of raw steel in the last quarter of 1975-76 had resulted in an annual output figure only 209 000 tonnes below the previous year, even though two blast furnaces were out for 12 months and one for four months. Raw steel output for May, at 733 000 tonnes, was close to the monthly record of 751 000 tonnes set in December, 1974.

To use the words of the Prime Minister, that was the worst period of prolonged inflation in the nation's history, and yet we can look at some of the profits made, for instance, by the oil companies. Recently Shell and Mobil, both foreign owned, announced that they had doubled their profits in 1975. Shell lifted its profits from \$15 500 000 to \$34 400 000 while Mobil, controlled by the Rockefeller family, boosted its earnings from \$9 700 000 to \$15 500 000. Ampol announced a 56.9 per cent increase in half-yearly profits from \$2 400 000 to \$3 800 000, admitting that increased petrol prices were a major contribution to increased profits in the last six months. Meanwhile, British controlled Unilever Australia, a major foodstuffs and household products manufacturer, announced a 21.7 per cent increase in its profits from \$3 900 000 to \$4 800 000. The Unilever brands include Rosella, Omo, Drive, Lux, Lifebuoy, Handy Andy, Street's ice cream, Vesta and Continental, as well as the margarines Flora, Stork, Astra and Fairy. Turning to last Friday's paper, we find that the results of General Motors-Holden's are up but unsatisfactory. This is what it states:

Australia's biggest car maker, General Motors-Holden's Limited, announced a profit \$17 800 000 for 1975 and the company has paid \$7 000 000 of this to oversea dividends. In other words, the company can pay \$7 000 000 of its profits in oversea dividends, which is more than the amount that the Chifley Labor Government provided to set this company up in the first place. The report goes on to give this deplorable set of circumstances:

At the same time, G.M.H. indicated that it would soon be asking the Prices Justification Tribunal for approval to lift car prices to cover increased costs of production.

Anyone who saw a *This Day Tonight* programme recently would have seen that a person had paid almost \$8 000 for one of the company's products, only to find that the vehicle was an absolute write-off before it had covered 8 000 kilometres because it had an oil leak. That shows the reduction in quality of its profits. If the Holden company put some quality into the product, the company might not have to go to the Prices Justification Tribunal for a review.

Members interjecting:

Mr. OLSON: If the worker was given more time to work on the product the vehicle would be of a better quality than it is at present. Opposition members ought to inspect the factories, where the people have not even time to go to the toilet or to straighten their backs. When we consider this matter, we see that it is none other than crap. Over the years, we have been told that we must consider the high inflationary rates that have been brought about as a result of the worker getting increases in salary.

However, let us reflect back to 1950, 1951 and 1952. This is an excellent illustration, because in the first three years of the Menzies Administration, after the defeat of the Labor Government in 1949, the inflation rate collectively was 46 per cent. It was 11.1 per cent in 1950, 25.1 per cent in 1951, and 9.8 per cent in 1952. In 1973, 1974 and 1975, the period in respect of which we are blamed for bringing about all this reaction on the worker and for having to pay all these inflationary prices, the figures were 13.2 per cent in 1973, 16.25 per cent in 1974 (the highest in that period), and back to 12.55 per cent in 1975. The total over those three years was only 42 per cent, compared to 46 per cent in 1951-53, under Menzies. The Fraser Government wants to say that it is the fault of the jobless themselves. The Prime Minister has also stated:

At the root of the economic crisis is a steadily increasing tax burden required to finance, at the expense of the private sector, an ever-growing public sector.

What utter rubbish! In the latest document published in relation to taxation and the gross domestic product, of all the 21 countries that make up the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, of which Australia is a member, where does Australia come in relation to direct and indirect taxation?

Mr. Dean Brown: There are 22 countries in the O.E.C.D.

Mr. OLSON: Perhaps the honourable member will tell me where Australia stands. He probably cannot do that, but Australia comes 20th out of the 21 countries. The figures range from 31.48 per cent for the Netherlands down to Australia, for which taxation as a proportion of gross domestic product is 12.99 per cent, yet members opposite, who are part of this sordid and sorry deal, now try to convince the Australian people that our taxation in respect of our gross domestic product is out of relationship and that, in fact, that is what is creating the economic difficulties in our country.

South Australia collects far less in terms of total tax receipts per capita than the Liberal-governed State of Victoria or the State of New South Wales, which was a Liberal-governed State until recently. These figures cannot be misconstrued and it cannot be said that they are inaccurate. They were supplied to me only today. New South Wales collects at the rate of \$233 a person, Victoria at the rate of \$227 a person, and South Australia at the rate of \$198 a person. In specific cases such as land tax, pay-roll tax, succession duties, or stamp duty, our per capita collections again are much lower than those in New South Wales and in the Liberal-governed State of Victoria.

To claim, as the Leader of the Opposition has done recently, that industries are moving out of South Australia is utter humbug, and it is blackmail by those firms that threaten to do so. In his determined bid to knock South Australia the Leader has overlooked that in the past year new industries worth \$146 000 000 have been established in South Australia, to provide both security and diversity of employment here. Because of the excellent leadership of Premier Dunstan, seasonally adjusted figures for May, 1976,

show that South Australia has the lowest percentage of unemployment, with 22 000, or only 3.64 per cent of its work force, unemployed.

Members opposite should realise that business confidence will not be restored in the State if the States are forced to scrap public works. A cut of \$2 600 000 000 from Government expenditure can only have a severe impact. A serious cut in Government expenditure will reduce general spending and thus cut production and employment. To show this, I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of June 26, 1976, headed "Retail Sales Down." The report states:

Hopes of an upswing in consumer spending have been dampened by retail sale statistics issued in Canberra yesterday. The figures from the Bureau of Census show the value of retail sales in Australia fell by .5 per cent in April. In March, retail sales were valued at \$1 617 000 000, which was a March record. The unusually high March figure prompted speculation that a consumer-led economic recovery was under way, but Government officials now believe the speculation may have been over-optimistic.

The Fraser Government is ably assisted by members opposite, who long before today in this Chamber have claimed (and the member for Alexandra has repeatedly claimed this) that the only way in which to get the maximum out of the worker is to starve him. It is surprising to learn that these people, who consider that wage demands are the prime cause of Australia's high inflation rate, believe that, to maintain the unemployment pool at its present level of 4.2 per cent, or about 260 000 people, is the most effective means of curbing wage demands. However, after eight months of a Liberal and National Country Party Government in Canberra, inflation is still running at 12 per cent.

I now refer to the promise made by the Prime Minister of jobs for all. He said that only under a Liberal and National Country Party Government would there be jobs for all who wanted to work. The promise to curb inflation was a hollow one, because the adoption of an anti-inflation strategy at the expense of the unemployed will merely create further unemployment. The Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research has predicted that the jobless rate early next year will be more than 6 per cent. This means that 420 000 people will be out of work in Australia. How can business confidence be restored and industry stimulated to increase production in those circumstances?

This is what we are arguing all along the line. Opposition members say that, before inflation can be defeated, production must be increased. But how can we increase production when 420 000 people who want to work cannot get work? These are not bludgers on society as we are led to believe, or people who are told that, if they do not want a job, they should line up for the dole and it will be all right for them to receive the benefits. Members opposite do not say how humiliating it is if one applies for a job, only to be told that if one has given up that job over the past six weeks one cannot get unemployment benefits. The Commonwealth Government is maintaining that one should not have the freedom of choice in a job. If one does not want to work in the job one has, it is too bad: one does not line up for unemployment benefits. The Commonwealth Government is trying to say that, with 420 000 people out of a job, business confidence will be restored and that industry will be stimulated with increased production.

We on this side realise that the Fraser Government is systematically dismantling the gains that have been made by workers during the years of the Whitlam Administration, not to mention the years of workers' struggles during

which, because of gerrymandered electorates, the Labor Party, having always received the greatest percentage of votes (in some cases over 50 per cent) has been unable to form a Government. The people of Australia have been required to put up with the humiliation of having on the Government benches a Party that wants to lower their standards even further.

To illustrate this, I should like to quote the views of an economist who would be regarded as one of the most foremost economists in this country. I refer to none other than Alan Wood, the economist on the *Sydney Morning Herald*. As recently as May 24, he said:

The only real method Fraser has of holding down wage rises, and thus inflation, is to ensure that the economy runs with a fair degree of slack; that is, with plenty of unemployment. The Liberals have additional motivation for cutting down Government expenditure: they want to destroy all of Labor's social reforms and thus help their free enterprise friends. They want such things as private housing and land speculation instead of Government public enterprise. The Liberals not only know who their friends are, they also know whom they wish to hit first: the weak and the needy.

Members opposite have not the slightest consideration for improved standards of living. How can they, when the Federal Government sees 7 per cent of its work force jobless?

Mr. Becker: Who wrote this guff for you?

Mr. OLSON: I do not need anyone to write it for me. I am capable of writing it myself. If members opposite had the same concept of what is going on in Australia, the honourable member would not ask such a stupid, ridiculous question. At present, their representatives, claiming to be Liberals, are none other than Tory conservatives, arch enemies of the worker, considered fit to rule by their own right (I can say their "divine" right) and to kick society as hard as is necessary to maintain the highest profit margins. Their only aim at present is to conduct a personal vendetta against Gough Whitlam because he is capable of leaving Fraser for dead at any time he wants to meet him. They want to conduct a personal vendetta against Bob Hawke, because he is capable of running the trade unions to the greatest advantage of their membership. Further, they want to conduct a vendetta against the workers of this country, when all they are doing is simply biting the hand that feeds them. The more they keep down the worker, the less is the chance of a recovery of this country's economy. When the Commonwealth Government has the guts to face up to this situation, the better Australia will be.

At present, the workers of this country can expect no relief from capitalism, which for the past 200 years has worked on the same basis. They have gone from gluts to famines, and from famines to wars. The present system is based on one thing only: to exploit the worker and destroy mankind. Their only motive is profit, irrespective of the individual. They will use every low contrivance, so long as they can keep the worker down.

When the Federal Government reduced pharmaceutical benefits for pensioners, some pensioners decided to have only one decent meal a day so that they could provide money for their burial. It is high time the Federal Government realised that there are human beings in the community besides themselves. The President of the South Australian branch of the Pharmacy Guild of Australia (Mr. Erickson) said that vitamins, laxatives, long-acting antihistamines, and drugs for stomach acidity were the most commonly used drugs withdrawn from the list. He believed that some patients had suffered hardship as a result of the withdrawal

of the drugs. I have received the following letter from Mrs. Staple, Secretary of the Largs North branch of the Pensioners League:

I have had a notice as regards medicines and drugs being taken off the medical list for pensioners. Quite a number of my members have been affected and have had to pay for their medication. It makes it very hard for some of them. I rang a number given, and was told to write to a member of Parliament. So we are hoping you can enlighten me on this subject, so as I can help my members.

I replied that I, as a member on this side, could not do very much, but at least I could say that it was paramount that their plight be drawn to the attention of the Minister of Health (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) in the hope that he could urge the Federal Minister for Health (Hon. R. J. Hunt) to eliminate the charges at present imposed on pensioners. I know just how far we are going to get in connection with consideration for pensioners!

In his Speech, His Excellency referred to the Government's pledge to introduce legislation to control noise pollution. As a result of approaches from my constituents and as a result of conversations with other members, I am aware that this problem has been worrying many people for a long time. Some people are far more sensitive to noise than are others. The *New Scientist* reports that research has shown that between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of the total British population is especially noise sensitive. A slightly higher percentage has very few worries about noise, and the rest of the community is in between these two extremes. A sizable minority suffers considerably in our increasingly noisy world, whilst alongside them many neighbours wonder what they will do about it.

What worries one person can be calmly accepted by others; this is part of the explanation of why control measures in this State have gone along in fits and starts. It also explains why it has proved exceptionally difficult to regulate this area. The community is in two minds. The time has now come when those who complain that their ears are suffering from unfair assaults from a wide variety of causes should be able to claim protection through the Government. At this stage, I am not aware of the precise form of the legislation but, from inquiries I have made, I know that much thought has been given to the matter and that technical experts in at least four departments have been fully consulted.

Mr. Mathwin: They all came up with different answers.

Mr. OLSON: Legislation in other States has resulted in some difficulties, and we are well placed to learn from the experience of those States. The legislation of some countries has gone to what noise tolerant people would regard as extremes. For example, in Switzerland it is a punishable offence to slam a car door. I wonder how the sensitive Swiss would fare here. In Australia, when people leave noisy parties late in the evening, we often hear the slamming of doors. Further, there is an unnecessary "good-bye" toot on the car horn, followed by the screech of tyres as the revellers rocket away from the kerbside. In some parts of Greece, hours of public quiet are designated, during which public noise must cease. This is a peculiarly civilised convention, but one for which this community is not ready at present. In South Australia, we now know which noises have proved most upsetting to the sensitive section of the population.

Mr. Mathwin: Mr. Whitlam was one of them.

Mr. OLSON: He was not nearly as bad as Mr. Fraser. What Mr. Whitlam did was make some progress, but all Mr. Fraser can do is make a lot of noise. In South Australia, we know which noises have proved most upsetting to the sensitive section of the population.

Mr. Evans: Kookaburras?

Mr. OLSON: It is more like galahs! The Public Health Department has analysed noises that have been investigated, following complaints. My figures may not be entirely up to date, but I doubt whether the figures change very much from one year to the next. The prime cause of trouble is in the domestic sphere. The domestic wall-mounted air-conditioning unit is the number one target. It is unfortunate that so many of these units have been installed and that such units are not more frequently installed in ceilings so that the noise cannot be heard by neighbours.

Often a reduction in noise levels can be achieved if neighbours make the right approach, get together, and suggest ways to reduce noise levels, but not all neighbours are on good terms, and therefore it is time for legislation in relation to this matter to be introduced. Of the 195 complaints received by the Public Health Department in 1973, 36 complaints concerned wall-mounted air-conditioning units. Twenty-six complaints concerned industrial compressor units.

Industrial noise is a separate problem and I understand that action has been taken to produce equipment that produces a lower level of noise. There were 19 complaints about exhaust units in shops, in factories, and some in homes. Another 14 complaints concerned amplified music by groups playing or practising in homes, and I suspect that such noise has increased since 1973.

Many people say that objection to loud and super-loud pop music is to be expected from the older generation, and that it is part, and an unfair part, of the so-called generation gap. That could be the case, because many young people have been conditioned to take their pop music loud, but this sound could be a shock to many older people. However, most people have the same auditory response. I doubt whether a 14-year old person is, by virtue of his or her youth, immune from physical damage from blasting loudspeakers.

Nevertheless, such noise is loud, there is much of it from backyards, discos, and hotels and, whether one cares for the classics, the pops, folk music, or whatever, the noise is usually deafening, distracting, or annoying. We must consider the civil rights of people in the community who do not wish to be bombarded with noise, as this problem is sixth on the list of the most often encountered complaints in Adelaide. Members may be surprised to hear how severely some people can suffer in these circumstances.

I refer to the tragic case of a Sydney musician, who was about to be appointed as a lecturer at a conservatorium. He was looking forward to giving a series of concerts. One evening a noisy party was held in his neighbourhood, and the musician suffered it until about midnight. At about 3 a.m. he took a strong sleeping draught in a desperate attempt to block out the racket and get some sleep, but he took too much, and he was found dead by his wife the next morning. True, this is an extreme example, but many people take noise pollution much to heart, and noise forced upon them against their will drives them to distraction. For years such people have felt frustrated and powerless but, unfortunately, they have not been able to do anything about it. A Sydney judge made the following statement:

It is preposterous that an ordinary householder in a residential area can prevent his neighbour playing an electric guitar at high volume, or carrying on haphazard panel-beating in his backyard, only by commencing an action for an injunction in one of the State Supreme Courts at great expense.

A Bill, soon to be introduced by the Minister for the Environment, will, I hope, provide a far less expensive remedy. People must have the right to enjoy their home as they please, and no-one but a member of the Worker's Party would believe that this gives anyone the absolute right to do anything at all, especially if it is annoying to neighbours who must also have their right to privacy. I know of several militant unions who have taken direct, positive and constructive interest in the problems of noise, including the Amalgamated Metalworkers Union, which the member for Price knows all about. He knows all about the high incidence of deafness in this industry; indeed, the honourable member suffers to a degree from boilermaker's deafness. The A.M.W.U. is campaigning strongly regarding noise pollution. The Minister for the Environment can be assured that, when his Bill is introduced, he will receive my full support in seeking its passage—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): In supporting the motion I refer, too, as I think the mover of the motion did, to the untimely deaths of Jim Ferguson, Mr. Hogben, and William MacGillivray. These former members have been referred to in this House before, but it is appropriate that we should once again recognise the contribution they made to this State, and to extend our condolences to their families. Before proceeding further in this debate, I must sincerely congratulate the member for Semaphore on his speech. Obviously, either he or his ghost writer is one of the finest exponents of class warfare the nineteenth century has even seen.

I was appalled to sit in this House and listen to such outdated claptrap, because that is all it was. Not only am I appalled but I am also distressed to know that such attitudes can still be held by apparently responsible members of Parliament, from whichever side of the House they speak. It is a sick situation that, in the 20th century, such statements can be made. I can only make one excuse for the honourable member: obviously, he did not write his speech. I suggest in future that the honourable member would do himself and his Party a great service if he did not mouth such class warfare reactionary statements in which he has indulged this evening. I say that sincerely and, I hope, kindly.

It is part of the ceremonial tradition of Westminster that each session of Parliament begins with a speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor in another place. I am sure that all honourable members present in another place for the opening of this session heard, with some regret, the Governor deliver that speech. As we all know, his Excellency's term of office expires in a few months and, although there may be an opportunity, and I hope that there will be, for us to express our feelings at that time, I place on record now my appreciation of his fine services to South Australia. The Governor has discharged his duties in an exemplary way and, as a South Australian, has shown dignity, humour, wisdom, and concern. He and Lady Oliphant have endeared themselves to all South Australians, and will be long remembered in this State.

Mr. Whitten: It was a wise choice by a wise Government.

Dr. TONKIN: It was a wise choice by a Government that was to be rather surprised by the reaction that came from a distinguished gentleman, a man who has given great service to this State. It was somewhat of a disappointment to me and other people that the speech

provided for His Excellency by the Government was such a pedestrian affair. As usual, the Government opened the speech with comments about rural conditions and affairs. It is significant that this is almost the only time it ever really gives any indication that it is aware of rural problems and difficulties. On this occasion the Government referred to the low rainfall and the potential difficulties that could apply to certain areas of the State. However, it could not have anticipated the serious condition that has since developed.

There is a serious drought in this State, parts of which are reaching the point of no return. Crops that have been sown will not germinate and will wither and die for want of water if they should germinate, and the rural economy will come under even greater pressure than it has been under until now, if that situation should occur. To add insult to injury, the best the Government has done is to offer subsidies to help with the agistment of breeding stock and for the purchase of fodder and hay. The comment being made generally throughout country areas is simply, "Of what value are these subsidies when agistment is not obtainable within reasonable distances, and hay and fodder are not available at any price?" I repeat the call I made some days ago for the Government to take the drought situation far more seriously than it is taking it now. It must take positive and active measures to relieve the lot of the man on the land. Perhaps the Victorian system of a guaranteed payment for each head of stock for on-property disposal should be introduced. I do not know. Whatever the solution, it must be arrived at soon and action must be taken soon, too.

Mr. Whitten: How much a head for sheep and cattle do you suggest?

Dr. TONKIN: The Victorian system is offering \$10 a head for steers.

Mr. Whitten: How much for sheep?

Dr. TONKIN: I am not sure, but I think it is \$5. His Excellency's Speech then outlined a relatively short list of Bills, most of which will amend existing legislation. From memory I believe there were about 50 such Bills. How the list was inflated to about 100 Bills as was reported in the press this morning, I do not know. I am certain that that figure must have been given to the press by the Government. Obviously, the statement made last year by the Premier, when he was challenged about the Government's expressed intention not to sit early this year because it had come to the end of its legislative programme, was true. The number of sitting days so far this year reflects the Government's sorry lack of incentives. These, too, have been few.

Parliament sat for nine days in February, arranged only because of pressure from the Opposition, which mobilised public disquiet that the Government had intended to have a recess of more than six months. The three sitting days in June were essential only because of Appropriation measures. The Government has deliberately kept Parliament from sitting, not only because it is running out of ideas but also because it fears defeat or embarrassment in the House with its majority of one, and also wishes to avoid giving the Opposition the chance to question and probe its activities and exposing its shortcomings to the people of South Australia.

The activities of the Government are daily becoming more secretive and more devious. There is an obsession with secrecy, as evidenced by the television surveillance cameras installed outside the Premier's Department, and the difficulties faced by journalists in obtaining access to

the Premier, Ministers, and members of their staff. Criticism of the Government now brings forth a ready response from the front bench by way of personal attack on those who criticise. Members of the Opposition are vilified and called knockers. We had another example of that parroted this evening.

Mr. Olson: If you continue in this fashion, you'll get a lot more, too.

Dr. TONKIN: If we are called knockers, it is because we knock the performance of this Government.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are knockers of South Australia.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: We are doing it because of what the Government is doing to the people of South Australia. What it is doing to this wonderful country of ours is exactly what the Whitlam Government tried to do to Australia. I will knock the Dunstan Government over and over again, and I will be proud to do it, because I will do it in the interests of South Australia.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Keep knocking the State, I don't mind.

Dr. TONKIN: That remark emphasises the immediate reaction that comes from members opposite, because any criticism at all of their Government's performance is immediately twisted into criticism of the State.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Especially when it is unfounded criticism.

Dr. TONKIN: A Government that believes that it is the only Government that can govern, that it is the State and does not have to listen to the people, is in serious trouble. The Attorney-General knows full well that that was seen this afternoon.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're doing us the world of good. I hope you never stop.

Dr. TONKIN: Journalists come in for their fair share, too. The extent of press bashing that goes on by the Government is appalling, under-handed, and miserable. Journalists are subjected to tirades of abuse and criticism in this House, and are threatened with a ban or at least a condition that all material should be checked with the Premier for his approval. I understand that even on television some lists of questions have to be checked with the Premier to ensure that no-one asks the wrong question. The Premier of the State cannot possibly be embarrassed in front of the public: that would never do!

These instances of press bashing occurred when the Government attacked two journalists from the *News*, Mr. Rex Jory and Mr. Greg Reid. They were not attacked by name, but certainly by implication. Mr. Ian Steele of the *Advertiser* also came in for a sustained attack by the Premier, and it was then Mr. Eric Franklin's turn under the the Minister of Labour and Industry's name for him, Arnold Franklin.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You're sure to get a headline out of this tomorrow.

Dr. TONKIN: Jealousy will get the Attorney nowhere. The Premier also attacked the media generally during his *This Day Tonight* appearance recently, and has attacked specific interviewers because their questions, quite fairly, probed criticisms of him. Even today the Minister of Mines and Energy has castigated Mr. Eric Cummins of the *Australian*. No-one in the media is free from these vicious attacks by members of the Government who cannot stand criticism. The Government has shown by these and other

activities that it cannot take criticism and, given any sort of chance, will not tolerate criticism. What a good job that the Privacy Bill did not pass this Parliament.

If the media cannot probe and inquire freely, what chance has the public of finding out what is happening? The public certainly cannot depend on the Government's media section or station 5DD, and there are often listener comments on talk-back programmes that the comments are being monitored by the Government's media monitoring service. All this adds up to a most insecure and unhealthy Government, a Government which, although espousing open Government, is publicly moving closer to becoming the most secretive Government this State and country has ever known. It is moving closer to the big brother control of 1984 than we ever dreamed possible several years ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: If my remarks are embarrassing the Attorney-General—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Just boring.

Dr. TONKIN: —and the four members who are left on the benches opposite, I can only say that I am pleased that they have some evidence of conscience. The Government's obsessional paranoia is obviously symptomatic of its present problems, and it has very acute and severe problems within its ranks at present. It is difficult to unravel its devious approaches and motivations and to understand its legislative direction and its policies. One suspects it is so much concerned with the pressure struggles that are going on within its own ranks that it cannot give its full attention to the matters of the State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Attorney-General has given them a few headaches.

Dr. TONKIN: Large though that problem may be, it is only the least of the problems that now face the State Labor Party. This Government is doing the best it can to obscure every aspect of its administration and to hide its basic direction, hoping that, if the electors cannot understand what is going on, they will lose interest and eventually vote for the Labor Party, as they have done before without any assessment of its performance. However, that is quite a ridiculous hope, and certainly will be vain. The Labor Government of this State is hoping it can survive on its past reputation and, in the meantime, is steadily degenerating into an incompetent, inconsistent, and frequently incomprehensible Government. More and more, it is trading on people's emotions and fears, and nowhere is this more marked than in the present financial morass that it has deliberately created.

Coming out of the last Premiers' Conference in Canberra, the Premier predicted further unemployment and the stopping of further State construction programmes, because the State had not received as much as had been expected in Loan funds. That cry, shrieked as it was, cut very little ice with people who had been in this Chamber the previous day and had heard the Deputy Premier rise in his place and, in answer to a question I asked him, explain that the \$20 000 000 which was to be transferred to the Loan Account from surplus funds was there specifically to make up for that short-fall in expectations in Loan funds. But the wires were crossed, and the Deputy Premier had not told the Premier: or perhaps it was the other way round, that perhaps the Premier had not told the Deputy Premier what to say.

The Premier made a proper fool of himself, to quote someone who spoke to me about it. The Premier is making

a fool of himself more and more frequently these days, and it is showing; and it is showing within the Party. The Premier made similar outrageous statements of doom in December last year, just before the Federal election (and I bet he wishes that he had forgotten all about that, too) when he predicted that 1 000 000 people would be out of work and that the inflation rate would be 30 per cent under a Liberal Government. If that is the value of his predictions or his financial acumen, all I can say is: heaven help this State!

More recently still, on his return from a visit to another State, he said, in relation to financial cuts, that it was the nurses and teachers who would suffer. As quick as a flash, the journalist interviewing him asked, "How will they suffer, Mr. Premier?" He said, "They will not suffer; we will not let them." What a *non sequitur*, what a ridiculous statement to make! If he believed that nurses and teachers would not suffer, why did he say that they would, if it was not for one reason and one reason only: to exploit emotions, to prey on fears, and to attempt to make political capital out of these fears and emotions of the people of South Australia?

Mr. Venning: He was performing once again.

Dr. TONKIN: It is the lowest form of political manipulation to trade on the fears and emotions of the electors. To understand the basic motivation for the despicable approach adopted by the members of the Government in the past few weeks, it is necessary to separate salient and cardinal points from the present deliberately muddled situation. First, let it be quite clearly understood by the people of South Australia that this State's Labor Government is firmly and absolutely committed to the policies that were so disastrous for Australia under the Whitlam Government. It was one of the few State Governments that agreed without question to the Land Commission, railways transfer, and Medibank arrangements. Indeed, it almost said, "Yes please" before it was asked. It subscribed, and still subscribes, to the proposition propounded by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, that State Labor members of Parliament should be working for the abolition of their own jobs so that State Parliaments and Governments will be replaced by one central Government in Canberra.

Its continued dedication to that cause, in spite of the change of Government in Canberra, is the reason for its blind and bitter rejection of the Federal Government's measures for returning responsibilities to the States, for controlling inflation and restoring the economy, and for tax-sharing proposals. It is a significant measure of this bitterness that the Premier now attacks the Fraser Government at every opportunity for a scheme of tax-sharing, which is essentially the same scheme as the one he strongly advocated himself at the State Labor Party conference in 1974, during the term of the Whitlam Government. I bet he wishes he had never opened his mouth on that score then, either. If he supported that proposal so strongly then, why should he now so bitterly attack the same scheme? The Premier's credibility is crumbling. The present Government offers back to the States a far greater measure of control over their financial affairs than they ever enjoyed under the Whitlam Government. South Australia was becoming more and more dependant on section 96 "tied grants" from Canberra rather than general purpose funds. These tied grants were grants where sums of money were totally and absolutely earmarked for specific purposes, where they could not be granted or accepted unless the State agreed to spend those funds in specific

areas and on specific projects. The following figures clearly illustrate the problem. They give total specific purpose payments to South Australia as a percentage of total payments to this State, telling us how much of our money we could spend: in 1971-72, the figure was 25.2 per cent; in 1972-73, 27.8 per cent; in 1973-74, 40.7 per cent; and in 1974-75, 46.7 per cent; in fact, we were told how to spend nearly half the money we received from Canberra, and told down to the last dollar and cent. If that trend had been allowed to continue for any length of time you, Mr. Speaker, would not now be sitting in your Chair, I would not be standing here, and this Parliament would not be meeting, because our total function would have been taken over by a central Government in Canberra. At about this time last year, or perhaps a little later, I said:

If we are to have a truly federal system with the States having some sort of power this alarming trend has to be stopped. Thus the percentage of specific purpose payments of total payments must begin to drop again so that the States can once again be masters of their own destinies so they will have to stand and fall by their expenditure decisions and not be able to blame the Federal Government.

Obviously this Government is not at all anxious to resume its true role of governing the State and is lashing out at the decision made by the electorate last December. The changes now coming about are designed to return financial responsibility to the States, but this Government does not want it any more. Perhaps it is out of practice, perhaps it does not know what to do. The policy itself, about which members opposite have been so critical and about which they have used every excuse and every reason they know to complicate the issue and confuse the public, can be summed up by the following extract from the federalism policy:

A coalition government will give the States permanent access to revenue raised through personal income tax. In future Commonwealth, State and local taxes will be separately identified on one tax assessment so every taxpayer will see the amount levied for each form of government. This new system will ensure that the States will have substantially the financial capacity to meet their responsibilities. Programmes financed by special grants, which are now well established and accepted, will be transferred to the States with appropriate adjustments in State revenues. Special grants will be used, where necessary, to initiate programmes in agreed areas of national need, to encourage innovation and to meet special situations, but not to make inroads into the constitutional responsibilities of the States.

That is the cardinal thing: it is a question of whether or not the States retain their autonomy and the right to decide what they do with their own funds. The quotation continues:

A fixed percentage of personal income tax will be earmarked for distribution through the States to local government to provide a "weighted" per capita grant to all local government bodies and an equalisation or "topping up" grant to be distributed through State Grants Commissions.

Just as one example of what has happened, although it was asked as long ago as last April to set up the machinery for a State Grants Commission, this Government has taken no action whatever to set up such a commission. The Opposition made it quite clear in the three days of sitting in June following the opening of Parliament that it was prepared to sit longer to allow legislation to be passed so that a State Grants Commission could be set up and so that local government could participate in the funds being made available directly to it from the Commonwealth through that grants commission. Instead of that, no action has been taken and we will not see any action until some time later in this session.

I should have thought the Premier, as Treasurer of this State, would be delighted to be given more financial independence of action from the Federal Government, especially when he himself had suggested the scheme previously, but obviously, from his reaction, he is absolutely and utterly blinded by political obsessions. I referred to cardinal points that must be kept in mind, and the first was that the State Labor Government subscribes to exactly the same theories as did the Whitlam Government and is dedicated to the same ends. The second cardinal point to be kept firmly to the fore in any consideration of the present situation is this: the Whitlam Government overspent to the tune of a \$3 600 000 000 deficit, and the economy has been stuck with this deficit. The Whitlam Administration gave scant regard to the inflationary effects of its policies, even in a time of high inflation, and pushed on with its political aims without any regard for the effect its actions were having on the average Australian citizen. I could paraphrase that and say that the South Australian Government is pushing on with its political aims without any regard for the effect its actions are having on the average South Australian citizen.

If the Whitlam Government had continued at the rate of spending that was current when it was dismissed from office, the estimated deficit would have been nearly \$4 500 000 000. Obviously, this was all part of its obsession with the centralist policy, the policy of controlling the States' affairs by controlling the finances of the States. In cutting out and by-passing the States' responsibilities, in taking away from the States the right to choose their own priorities and to decide just how their money should be spent, it was committed not only to destroying the role of State Governments but also to destroying the role of local government. Because of that policy, and because of the Whitlam Government's massive transfer of funds to the public sector, and because the transfer of those funds was so rapid, inflation was accentuated. Unemployment increased with the depression of the private sector, and the effect of that unemployment is still being felt.

We were at that stage heading towards the complete collapse of our economy, and we do not dare forget that; much as members opposite would like to take the heat off the previous Whitlam Government and put it on to the present Fraser Government, we cannot ignore that it was the Whitlam Government that put this country into the difficult situation in which it finds itself. There is a great need to support the private sector. That principle was acknowledged by three or perhaps four Federal Treasurers in the Labor Administration, but although they acknowledged that need they took no significant action. Finally, the electorate took a decisive step in December last and, at the ballot box, totally rejected both the Whitlam Government's handling of the economy and the massive trend towards a centralist administration.

Members opposite may take every opportunity to blame the Fraser Government; indeed, the Fraser Government is being blamed for almost everything that happens. We heard the Deputy Premier mention this when he talked of the Bolivar scheme. He did not say that Federal Government funds were not available; he simply said he did not think they would be available, bearing in mind the Federal Government's current attitudes. It is this sort of snide remark which is being repeated over and over again, without due reason and without just cause, that is tearing down the credibility of the Labor Party, if it but knew it. I have heard it said that the Premier would not have had to bother to go down to Glenelg to stop the tidal wave if the Fraser Government had been in power; he would have

stayed in Adelaide and let it happen and blamed it all on the Fraser Government. Even if the ceiling fell in, undoubtedly it would be said to be the fault of the Fraser Government. As we heard in the speech made this evening by the seconder of the motion, when Federal funds are not available Government members do not bother to say which Government withdrew the funds. I think we all know that Monarto has foundered and come virtually to a stop because the Whitlam Government did not respond to the State's request for more funds, and we know well that some educational establishments are not going ahead. The decision to withdraw funds was made not by the Fraser Government but by the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are your examples there?

Dr. TONKIN: We know that at present there is a big fuss about income tax, and the income tax under which we are now suffering was a Hayden Budget income tax. This Government has been slippery and has turned and twisted, but it cannot escape the blame that rests truly with the Labor Party, especially with the Whitlam Government. The Fraser Government is taking what action it can to contain inflation and return support to the private sector. Of course, at present it cannot provide as much money as the States would like. The Fraser Government has nothing more than a large deficit on which to work. Obviously, the State Treasurers are not pleased. They have every reason for not being pleased, having been left in a difficult situation. Under the Whitlam Government they were starved of funds, except section 96 funds. The States still must provide their services, and they find it difficult to do so, because the Fraser Government has not the funds to give them. Certainly, they will get more under the new scheme than they would have expected to receive under the Whitlam scheme but, allowing for inflation, which is only just beginning to be curbed, their needs are extreme.

I could say (and I think my colleagues would agree with me) that no Premier has protested so vocally and hysterically as has the Premier of this State. He has taken every opportunity to scare hell out of the people of South Australia, and this is another cardinal point. He would be the least affected Premier. No other Premier would have less reason to squeal than would the Premier of this State. The matters of the railways and the Medibank arrangements, etc., have left this Government with surplus funds of which the Premier was proud to boast a few months ago and on which he has now gone quiet. He had the effrontery to talk about good housekeeping, when he sold the furniture from the front room. We are left in that position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting.

Dr. TONKIN: The Government of this State has embarked on a wilfully dishonest campaign to sabotage the Federal Government's measures to control inflation. In doing so it is cutting off South Australia's nose to spite its face, and the people of South Australia are the ones who suffer. Under the Federal Government's policy, money will be available to the States. Some money that previously was strictly subject to section 96 grants will now come by way of general revenue, and this State Government will have to decide its priorities. It no longer can use the Federal Government to explain why it is not going on with one project and is going on with another.

The Government will have to make its own decisions on its priorities and take responsibility for them. It also

will have to justify those decisions to the electors. The "blame Fraser" campaign is wearing thin and becoming a laugh in the community. People are now asking why this State Government does not face facts. The federalism policy is in operation. We have a Liberal and National Country Party coalition Government in Canberra and, whether they like it or not, that is the position. There is a large Federal deficit that is a legacy from the Whitlam Government, and there will not be the unlimited funds available from the Fraser Government that there were from the Whitlam Government.

Money will be available, but the State Government will have to make its own decisions on the matter, so why does not this Government stop squealing? Why does it not shut up and get on with the job of governing South Australia? Its statements that it will not co-operate with the Federal Government are of no help to the people of South Australia. South Australia is not an isolated community: it is part of Australia, and the only way in which we will control inflation is by a national effort. It will be more difficult if people like the Ministers opposite do their level best to torpedo the scheme, the people who will suffer being the people of South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Have you spoken to Hamer lately?

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Ross Smith had been awake earlier, he would have heard me refer to the Premiers of the other States, including Mr. Hamer. Whether the Federal Government's policies coincide with the State's policies is not the point: South Australia must face facts and add its support to the efforts of the Federal Government to control inflation. Some of the statements that have been made are ridiculous, and I do not intend to go into detail about them. One has only to consider the wilfully misleading and dangerously inaccurate statements made by Ministers of the Crown in this State in the past few months to realise how foolish those statements are. One of the most ridiculous statements was made recently, and I think it was made by the Minister of Transport, who is not a bad hand at making ridiculous statements. His forte seems to be to appoint committees to investigate the reports of committees that have been appointed to investigate the reports of other committees. That Minister made a public statement that, because of the withdrawal of Federal funds, he would have to cancel or curtail many railway works, such as signalling and grade-separation programmes and the updating of rolling stock. There was a list of the matters concerned. Indeed, he said that he would not be able to proceed with works up to a cost of \$20 000 000.

Does he think we are silly? Now that we have got rid of the country railway system, we have got rid of some of our deficit. That deficit has been reduced by an amount that probably, in the forthcoming year, will enable the programme that he has in mind to be managed. I presume that he knows that. I imagine that he is not without some ability, even if he does not show it in his portfolio. He must know that, yet he has the effrontery (and he has difficulty keeping a straight face on television) to make that sort of misleading statement to the people of South Australia. It is totally and absolutely wrong. It is time that the State Government stopped grizzling and got on with the job. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I wish to speak to the motion, and make it clear at this stage that from my point of view this is not a grievance debate. I am speaking because, having looked at the weather map, it is apparent that there will be no rain as a result of this change in the weather. This means that the crisis point for the rural areas of South Australia is very close. I say that advisedly, because it takes about 14 weeks to grow a cereal crop, and one cannot normally expect to get any effective rain after October. So, the middle of August is really the deadline for the sowing of cereal crops this year.

On the other hand, we may get rain in the next 10 days. That is the sort of situation in which we live, and people like me with much at stake may be able to sleep peacefully again instead of losing much sleep worrying about the present situation and the possible consequences. On the assumption that it does not rain in the next 10 days, what will be the position? First, I suggest it is unlikely that any cereal crops will be sown although, because of the need for stock feed and to provide ground cover where land has been worked up, some people will undoubtedly still sow some crops. However, whether those crops will develop into economic crops is a matter of chance and, even if they do, it is unlikely that much grain will be delivered this year from the so-called wheat-sheep areas, because of the need to provide carry-on feed for livestock. There is and will continue to be a need to make provisions from the current crops, if they come to anything, because little, if any, surplus hay is available.

Only limited wheat and barley reserves are available at the bulk handling system; no oats are available. In either case the cost of these fodders is extremely high. With the concurrence of the member for Rocky River, a member of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, I should like to quote the most recent report by the General Manager to the board of that company. He pointed out that bulk grain stocks in the silo system at this stage had been reduced to 385 000 tonnes of wheat, 155 800 t of barley, and 4 400 t of oats, giving a total of 545 200 t, which is about 200 000 t less than what was in store in the bulk handling system during the third week of July last year. Technically, there are no oats available; they are already committed. Basically, they are at Thevenard, and they are expected to be shipped very soon. Other major reserves are in the Port Lincoln and Port Adelaide divisions of the major terminals. At Port Lincoln, there is 124 200 t of wheat, and in the Port Adelaide division there is 115 200 t of wheat. In the Port Adelaide division there is 83 500 t of barley, while in the Port Lincoln division there is 35 300 t. That is the total extent of existing grain reserves at present in the storage system. Not only is there no hay available, but there are only limited grain reserves available—far less than at this time last year. There is very little agistment, except around Broken Hill, for stock from the south. Fourthly, there are no carry-on paddock reserves because this has been one of the longest dry periods in history, and it has been worsened by the fact that it was preceded by a dry season.

In these circumstances, I put forward some suggestions, bearing in mind the need to consider local milling needs, possible seed grain requirements for next year, and the vital need to preserve breeding stock as a base from which to recover. I suggest that at this juncture all available grain reserves should be temporarily frozen, even at the risk of breaking existing contracts for sale, until the local needs have been fully assessed. The present price for wheat in South Australia is \$101.32 a tonne ex Port Adelaide and \$96 a tonne for barley.

These prices are less at local sidings, if available, by the amount of the freight differential that is applicable. For example, at Karoonda, the differential is \$6.54 a tonne, making the price of barley to the grower at the Karoonda silo \$89.46 a tonne. Regarding livestock, the Government has already agreed to pay 50 per cent of freight on all hay and fodder carted on to a farm, or 50 per cent of freight in connection with transporting stock to and from agistment. However, there is little or no hay available, and virtually no agistment. In these circumstances, it is unlikely that the cost to the Government will be very much, under its present proposals, particularly if the proposals are restricted only to those areas already defined. I say this because there are many stock on agistment from the Keith area, which is outside the defined area; in the Keith area, the drought is as severe as anywhere, but at present no assistance is available to these people. In present circumstances it would not be impossible or unrealistic to declare the whole State a potential drought area, including the Lower South-East. I believe that everybody should be able to claim, and each case should be treated on its merits.

With respect to stock, I put forward the following proposals for consideration. First, all stock of no commercial value (that is, sheep of less than 18 kg (40 lb.) or cattle of less than 100 kg (220 lb.)) should be slaughtered locally on the properties or in local government areas in conjunction with local government authorities; compensation should be paid, as is proposed in Western Australia, on the basis of 50c for each sheep or \$5 per head of cattle. Secondly, all stock of greater weight should be slaughtered for meatmeal production, if unsuitable for local or export trade, on the same or a better net basis to the producer. In this case the Government should pay all freight within a reasonable distance of Adelaide and this should be comparable to the subsidies payable on transporting stock to and from agistment. All charges, if necessary, should be included in the marketing, so that the price paid to the producer would be the same as that paid by the abattoir (that is, a price that I believe will be publicly announced shortly), together with the price paid in compensation if the animals were to be slaughtered on the property.

I have mentioned that the price for cattle here should be about \$5, but I have heard that as recently as today Victoria has increased its amount of compensation to \$10. As such slaughter and conversion could be profitable to the abattoirs only if a constant supply was maintained, the delivery would have to be regulated, preferably by the growers themselves, through their organisations and, in the case of sheep, in order to facilitate the rendering of these carcasses for meatmeal the sheep would need to be shorn before delivery. The removal of these non-commercial stocks from the market would remove unnecessary gluts and prevent the depression of the fat stock market, as is presently occurring.

As is the case in Western Australia, we should also be trying to initiate additional stock sales in order to slaughter as many fat and trade stock as possible whilst they are in suitable condition because, by doing this, we are relieving the pressure on feed. We are also reducing the amount of compensation that will have to be paid if such stock are carried over and become unsaleable in the trade. I believe that farmers should be encouraged to sell off all surplus stock progressively, retaining only an optimum breeding nucleus and, so that such a nucleus can be maintained, I suggest that a subsidy be paid on stock feed to the extent

of the freight between the terminal and the place of usage, or the nearest silo, whichever is the lesser, where grain is available in local silos or, alternatively, loans should be made available for buying feed and grain and for later restocking under reasonable terms, as is the case now in Western Australia.

Finally, I believe the situation is now so critical that, as three States are now involved, it is high time the Commonwealth Government was involved and provided assistance to producers in view of the crisis situation that the industry is now facing.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I join with the previous speaker in saying that it is time the Australian Government did something, but on a different matter. I refer to the statements that have been made in recent days by the Prime Minister and some of his Federal colleagues in relation to the Montreal Olympic Games and the attitude of the present Australian Government in its support for our athletes and sporting groups. It is fair to say that fortunately there has been a change in attitude by the Australian Government and the Prime Minister in the past few days. When the Prime Minister spoke to some of the competitors in Montreal two or three days ago after a round-table conference, he said that to say that the Australian people did badly put the wrong spirit on the Olympics, and that to compete to the best of one's ability is what is important. This summarises the Prime Minister's attitude. So far as he was concerned, Australia was doing as well as could be expected, and the fact that its team was competing to the best of its ability was satisfactory to the Australian community. If the Prime Minister had taken time to stay away from his trout-fishing activities for a few days and keep in touch with his colleagues in Australia, he would have found that there was tremendous public reaction to this sort of statement. Immediately after his statement, public reaction came, and properly so. We have now seen a change in heart of the Australian Government, and I am pleased about that. The Minister for Community Development said that he wanted to hold a post-mortem on Australia's performance at the Montreal Olympic Games. A press report of his comments is as follows:

He said last night that he would call a meeting of the Australian Sports Council soon after the Australian team returned.

There is no need for a post-mortem on what happened. An article in tonight's *News* under the heading "Ex Olympians: how to regain missing gold" states:

More facilities . . . better coaching . . . improved opportunities . . . stricter medical supervision . . . that is what South Australian sporting greats would recommend to a post-mortem on Australia's failure at Montreal.

These things are obvious to us all. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition talking this evening about new Federal policies and how the States are so much better off because they can determine where they are going to spend money and not be tied to specific grants.

The Australian Labor Party when in office established a Sport and Recreation Department. That department fairly determined that it would give grants to States, but that they would be tied. It was believed that the State should provide one-third of the cost of such facilities, that the local community and sporting organisations should provide one-third of the cost, and that the department would provide one-third. As a result, we found in its first two years of office the Whitlam Gov-

ernment provided \$3 000 000 to South Australia for sporting and recreational activities. In addition, the State spent about \$850 000 in 1974-75 and \$950 000 in 1975-76. The State took its own initiative by providing \$65 000 for the current financial year towards junior sports coaching. The Prime Minister and the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development do not need a post-mortem to ascertain what is wrong. Shortly after the election of the Labor Government, the Minister for Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Stewart) commissioned Associate Professor John Bloomfield to write a paper on the role, scope and development of recreation in Australia. It would be useful for members opposite to read the paper. Dr. Bloomfield referred to international sport and stated:

Australian sportsmen and sportswomen, officials and coaches have for many years requested help for our national teams to travel abroad. Our athletes have been, and still are, geographically isolated and need regular international competition, especially with European and North American competitors, if Australia is to maintain its present position in international sport. Without regular competition our performances will decline, as other developing nations adopt advanced coaching techniques and modern administrative procedures. . . All foreign Ministries of Sport and Recreation fund their Olympic Games teams to a greater or lesser extent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is that all you have to gripe about?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I believe this is a fairly serious matter. If the honourable member believes the Commonwealth Government is right in not funding sport and recreational activities in future, I believe his attitude is disgusting: it is typical of him. I hope that, as a result of my raising this matter, some of the more responsible members opposite might put pressure on the Federal Government to change its attitude. I should like to know where the member for Hanson stands on this issue, because I am sure he would stand with me and would not say that this matter should not be aired in this House. I am amazed at the honourable member for thinking in that way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In relation to administration, Dr. Bloomfield states:

In order that Australian athletes can represent their country without having a financial burden placed upon them, the Australian Olympic Federation should receive an equivalent grant to that paid to national sporting associations . . . for administrative purposes . . . Australia has now become an attractive venue for world championships. Europeans and North Americans appear keen to support such an undertaking, but are very much concerned with the lack of international level facilities. Provided these can be supplied, it is the writer's firm conviction that Australian associations would attract championships of this level to Australia. It is certain that each one would only occur every two or three decades and it would not place a heavy financial burden on the country to support such prestigious events.

It is suggested that for championships at this level, up to one third of the cost of the championship should be financed by the Federal Government. . . . The Canadian Minister for National Health and Welfare has strongly supported the development of a national sporting festival, which is known as the Canada Games. The writer has received many first-hand reports of these games and feels that it would be an excellent innovation in Australian sport. Some of the advantages could be as follows:

- (i) Such games would quickly encourage the build-up of badly needed national level facilities within each State. After the games they would be used for State and club level competition and for physical recreation purposes. Grants should be made on a matching basis with the State.

He also referred to other matters. This report has been available to members of the Federal Parliament for some three years. The Australian Labor Government commenced to implement the findings of the Bloomfield report.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It didn't do it much good in December.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member says that. Once again, he is taking a political outlook on this matter. All he wants to do is spend money where he thinks the votes are. The Australian Labor Government and this Government are concerned to spend money in the interests of the community, and it is a great tragedy that, in all of these programmes that were commenced by the State and Federal departments of sport, we could not use the redevelopment of the Olympic playing fields in South Australia, which would not have been provided without Commonwealth support. To take the steps that have been taken by the Australian Government and to do away with this form of support is tragic. I am surprised at the interjections I have had this evening from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because my remarks this evening were meant to be constructive. I had intended to call on members opposite, who, I would have hoped, would support my view and the general view of the Australian sporting community, to ask the Federal Government to change its attitude in this respect; but it seems to be a waste of time to make such an appeal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): To think that pronouncements such as we have just heard should follow such an outstanding contribution by the member for Mallee, on a matter that should concern every member of this State and of Australia, is beyond my comprehension. It is so similar to so much of the tripe we have had from the opposite side this evening. First and foremost, the member for Florey told us under section 12c of the Land Tax Act farmers could obtain relief. What he has failed to understand or tell this House is that there are grave limitations on the areas of the State to which section 12c of the Land Tax Act applies. It was obvious that the advice he was seeking to give the people of South Australia and this House was a misunderstanding and a misrepresentation of the facts.

The member for Semaphore, who has really swallowed hook line and sinker the bumf which comes from his own front bench, followed in the same vein. He openly stated that the down-turn in the bus development programme for South Australia was a problem of the Federal Government. It was a decision of the Whitlam Government before the Fraser Government even came into power. The member for Henley Beach spoke of the failure of the Olympic team, suggesting it is a problem of the Federal Government, which has been in power for only a little over six months, and certainly not for the duration of the training programme of the Olympians. Amongst the Olympians themselves, their trainers, and the officials who have been travelling with them, one of the major problems associated with the failure has been clearly shown to be a lack of self-discipline. Apart from that, we find, despite the statements of the member for Henley Beach, that many of our athletes have bettered their own times and have bettered world times in getting as far as they have in this group of Olympic events. Let us come back to reality.

Mr. Wardle: What about the population comparison?

Dr. EASTICK: I am not unduly worried about the population comparison but I am worried that members opposite should continually try to hoodwink the people of this State by saying that the problems that we suffer in South Australia are the making of the Federal Liberal and National Country Party coalition Government. It is not so, and if they stop to analyse the situation members will quickly realise that.

We have the situation tossed up about the removal of funds in relation to pre-schools, but the statement by Senator Guilfoyle on July 8 has put paid to that argument. We have the statement, so constantly made from the other side, that the Australian Government is unmindful of the real needs of the people of Australia. What the people of Australia really need is a sensible and rational approach to fiscal affairs so that everyone in the community can benefit from a drop in inflation, from the improvement in employment that will follow, and from the opportunity for every person in the community to be considered equal. It will not come from the type of inflammatory statement we are constantly getting from members opposite.

I turn now to Monarto. It was not the Fraser Government but the Government led by (as Sir John Egerton indicates tonight) Whitlam, the one-man band, which decided that \$500 000 was sufficient for Monarto in 1975-76, notwithstanding that more than \$11 000 000 had been previously committed to the project.

Mr. Coumbe: That was in the Hayden Budget.

Dr. EASTICK: Exactly. The main reason why I am taking part in this debate tonight is to pinpoint yet again that the people of South Australia have been given a wrong impression of the finances of the State by the statements made by the Premier in the past few days. I ask the Premier to state publicly how many accounts were outstanding at June 30 and how many people (for instance, bodies such as the Freeling District Council) who purchased equipment for firefighting services on the understanding that there would be a subsidy and who were requested to submit by February the amount of money expended on the Emergency Fire Services to December 31 in the expectation (as in the past) that the subsidy due would be paid by June 30, were not paid by June 30. How many other councils and organisations that had expended their own funds waiting for the subsidy guaranteed them received the money late in July, 1976? What other areas of funding have been denied to the rightful recipients by the due dates? What total amount of money has the Dunstan Labor Government in South Australia withheld from the people to whom it was due? Then, let us look at the figures in relation to the final accounts for the year.

We have heard, in reply to one of the many Questions on Notice today, that it is not yet possible to indicate the true situation in respect of land tax, either urban or rural, and that it is not possible to indicate how much money will have been raised by virtue of the tax placed on the South Australian public for the financial year 1975-76. How many people have not yet paid because they are in such a poor financial position that they are unable to pay? How many people are having a debt of this kind held over their heads? How many of those people, be they in urban situations directly dependent on agriculture or in agriculture, will be adversely affected by the sequence of events outlined a few moments ago by the member for Mallee? It is all very well for the Premier to say that the Government has been mindful of its responsibilities and has

conducted itself properly in the stewardship of funds available to South Australia for South Australians. Let him be truthful about all these matters. I suggest that he has not been in that position recently, or over the past two years. From day to day we are told that certain money is available, but it suddenly disappears or increases, depending on the whim of the Premier and the method that he wants to use to fool the people of this State. I remember that we were told we would be in the red by \$68 000 000 by June 30, 1976, if Parliament did not pass the legislation to transfer the South Australian country

railways to the Commonwealth. Having regard to the funds that we got from the Commonwealth, the State did not go into a deficit situation, because of the over-supply of funds.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 28, at 2 p.m.