

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 March 1982

**The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling; and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State was presented by the Hon. D. O. Tonkin.

Petition received.

## PETITION: WOMENS EMERGENCY SHELTER

A petition signed by 43 residents of South Australia praying that the House provide an additional allocation of \$5 000 to enable the continued operation of the South-East Womens Emergency Shelter was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

## PETITION: ABORTION

A petition signed by 11 residents of South Australia praying that the House do not amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act so as to restrict the rights of women in relation to abortion was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: CHELTENHAM RACECOURSE

Petitions signed by 1 405 residents of South Australia praying that the House will oppose the sale of Cheltenham Racecourse and any alienation to the present zoning as open space and support its retention for training of horses and the use of Cheltenham Racecourse for pony clubs, equestrian and other recreational activities were presented by Messrs Abbott and Whitten.

Petitions received.

## QUESTIONS

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 238, 243, 273, 289, 322, 324, 349, 367, 374, 377, 381, 382, 385, 386, 391, 392, 394, 396, 397, 400, 409, 411, 429, 433, 440, 449, 452, 456, 458, 461, 464, 466, 468, 474, 475, 481, 482, 484 to 486, 488 to 497, 499, 503 to 511, 513, 514, 516 to 520 and 522.

## CORPORATE PROSECUTIONS

In reply to the **Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (7 October).

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** During the examination of the estimates of expenditure of the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission by your Committee on Wednesday 7 October 1981, the Hon. P. Duncan asked whether greater

details of prosecutions could be incorporated in the annual report of the Commissioner, Corporate Affairs Commission.

I enclose herewith a schedule of prosecution proceedings covering the 1980-81 financial year. The honourable member also asked if greater details of prosecutions could be incorporated in the annual report of the Commissioner, Corporate Affairs Commission. The 1980-81 report is now being drafted and it is intended that the report will include remarks of general public interest relating to some significant cases that were finalised during that period.

**COMPLETED PROSECUTIONS IN 1980-1981**  
(not including prosecutions for failure to lodge Annual Return or other statutory returns under Companies Act)

Act and Section	Statement of Offence	Number of Prosecutions	Number of Charges
Companies Act, 1962-1981 s.7 (a)	Failure to produce books to an inspector	1	1
s.124	Director acting dishonestly	1	1
s.234	Failure to lodge Statement of Affairs	1	1
s.374b	Failure to keep proper books	2	2
s.347c	Knowingly contracting a debt	3	13
s.374g	Frauds by officers	1	4
Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978 s.176	Larceny	1	10
s.178	Falsification of accounts	1	7
s.270	Conspiracy to defraud	3	3
Total		14	42

## ON-THE-SPOT FINES

In reply to **Mr CRAFTER** (25 February).

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** At present the traffic infringement notice issued by South Australian police does state clearly that if the total amount of prescribed expiation fees is not paid within the specified time court proceedings may be taken. The form of the traffic infringement notice in South Australia corresponds with those applicable interstate in this respect. Although the honourable member regards revision of the form as being the most appropriate way to inform the public of the option of going to court, the Government is of the view that there is no inadequacy in the form in this respect. This matter and others however will be examined by the review committee which the Government has previously announced.

## RADIATION PROTECTION

In reply to **Mr SCHMIDT** (9 December).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Radiation Protection and Control Bill was introduced into Parliament on 3 March 1982 to ensure that high standards of radiation protection are adopted in all radiation-related activities, while allowing those activities which provide positive net benefits to continue. The Bill provides a comprehensive approach to radiation protection and control. In other States approaches vary with separate Statutes dealing with medical, industrial and scientific cases of radiation; the practice of radiography; and uranium mining and milling. The Government, in seeking to up-date this State's legislation, has included all these issues in one comprehensive piece of

legislation. It also considered the matter so important as to warrant specific legislation rather than being covered by general public health laws.

### MUMPS VACCINE

In reply to **Mr MATHWIN** (25 February).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** In my reply to the honourable member on 25 February 1982, I undertook to write to the Commonwealth Minister for Health to support representations made by the South Australian Health Commission for the free supply of mumps vaccine. Subsequently I have been informed of telexed advice received by the commission to the effect that a measles/mumps vaccine will replace the free measles vaccine later this year. Officers of the commission will keep me informed of progress and I will certainly write to the Commonwealth Minister for Health if delays occur in the introduction of the new vaccine.

### AMATA

In reply to **Mr ABBOTT** (24 February).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** My colleague the Minister of Community Welfare informs me that in the last six months, three offenders from Amata have been placed in the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre (SAYRAC). Details of placement of these offenders and comments on their health are as follows:

Offender No. 1

Held at the centre on police custody for two days—no health problems.

Offender No. 2

Remanded for three weeks then released to special intensive neighbour care programme in the Far North of the State. The offender had infected tattoos and was successfully treated.

Offender No. 3

Admitted on remand on 10 March 1981, and released on bail to a hostel for four weeks. He returned to the centre on breach of bail conditions and was then placed on a nine month detention order. An appeal was subsequently lodged against this order and he was released to his father in the Far North of the State. This offender had a serious case of an ear infection and was treated whilst on bail and in the centre.

These details show clearly that Aboriginal youths are not being held at SAYRAC for health problems, although the Department of Community Welfare cares for any problems which come to notice when the offenders arrive at the centre.

The Aboriginal youth who was at the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre for a long period of time was serving a sentence of detention order by the court and as he was under the age of 15 years, he was looked after at SAYRAC. This is in accordance with the department's usual procedure with youths of that age.

Of the three youths from Amata detained at the centre two were able to speak English. Initially language was a problem for the third youth but, as is the practice at SAYRAC, an interpreter was arranged through the Aboriginal Community College to assist with communication until his ability to converse with staff improved.

In addition to the three youths from Amata, three other youths from the Far North of South Australia were detained in SAYRAC during the last six months. These youths remained in SAYRAC for periods of six days, 16 days and one day respectively, and none appeared to have problems

with health. Two of the youths had been remanded by the court and the third youth had been placed in SAYRAC overnight on a police custody order.

### JULIA FARR CENTRE

In reply to **Mr MILLHOUSE** (17 February).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I have considered the honourable member's comments on the non-utilisation of the School of Nursing at the Julia Farr Centre and I have investigated his allegations in relation to a course in geriatric nursing for enrolled nurses at the Southern Cross Homes Inc.

The School of Nursing at the Julia Farr Centre has not been utilised as a School of Nursing, since the closure of the basic enrolled nurse programme in 1979. Some of the equipment from the school is being utilised in other wings of the centre for inservice and continuing education for staff.

Discussions with executive staff from the Julia Farr Centre have indicated that in the future the centre would like to have post-basic courses in geriatric and rehabilitation nursing for both registered nurses and enrolled nurses, and should this occur, the presently under-utilised facilities would again be fully utilised.

The provision of a post-basic enrolled nursing course in geriatric and rehabilitation nursing at the Southern Cross Homes Inc. would seem to be appropriate and is being funded from resources made available by Southern Cross Nursing Homes Inc.

### TRESPASSING

In reply to **Mr GUNN** (24 February).

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The honourable Attorney-General has informed me that he is aware of the concerns expressed by the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc. on the matter of trespassing on rural land. The law of trespass together with the general law relating to occupiers liability is under review and the views expressed by the United Farmers and Stockowners will be taken into account in the course of that review. There is no indication when this review will be completed.

### 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:

Port Pirie Harbor (Improvements to Navigation Channel and Beacons),

A.D.P. Centre (Glenside).

Ordered that reports be printed.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOUSING LOANS

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We will now have the statement.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am bound to say that I very much welcome this return to sanity in this particular matter.

I conferred yesterday afternoon with the Chairmen of the Savings Bank of South Australia and of the State Bank

on the implementation of the Commonwealth Government's housing loans package. They have agreed that, subject to the approval of the boards, which they feel certain will be forthcoming, they will on balance at least match the measures promised by the private banks and the Commonwealth Savings Bank to cushion the effects of the 1 per cent increase in interest on housing loans and to provide an increased flow of housing advances.

The \$400 000 000 outstanding loans by the State Bank at concession rates will not be affected by the 1 per cent increase in rates, although those who are first home owners (and most are) and have had their loans for no more than five years will receive the proposed income tax rebates.

The outstanding volume of non-concessional housing advances from the two banks is nearly \$500 000 000 of which rather more than 95 per cent has been provided by the Savings Bank.

The two banks propose to operate a common policy for other than concessional loans. Those recent borrowers who have relatively large mortgages will, upon request, be permitted to defer the requisite increase in instalment by up to two years and the Chairmen have suggested a 0.5 per cent increase after 12 months and a further 0.5 per cent after two years. They will offer an option for low-start loans to persons of low and medium level incomes which they expect will give a significantly lower starting instalment than the private banks propose, but which will be stabilised after about five years, rather than continuing to increase over the whole loan period. They will offer up to 30 years repayment period rather than the 20 years indicated by the Commonwealth Treasurer's package.

At the present time there is no waiting period for non-concessional loans from either bank, though, of course, each requires for eligibility a minimum extent and period of deposits before approval. The banks are prepared to ease their eligibility requirements and to increase their allocation of funds sufficient to raise their combined lending rate from a current \$8 000 000 a month up to \$10 000 000 a month. This is apart entirely from the rather more than \$7 000 000 a month being lent by the State Bank under its concessional loans scheme, which will be fully maintained. The two State banks anticipate that the whole of the increased interest which they will receive as a consequence of the 1 per cent on housing loans will be passed on in increased interest to depositors in an effort to ensure a greater flow of deposits so as to sustain a higher level of lending now to be undertaken.

The Chairman of the Savings Bank has explained to me that comparisons between the proportion of his bank's deposits which have been invested in housing and the proportions invested by the private savings banks are invalid. These other banks all have trading bank counterparts, whilst the Savings Bank of South Australia also receives deposits of a trading bank nature which the others do not and it is authorised to undertake certain commercial lending and personal loans which are carried out by their trading bank counterparts. This difference, however, he has assured me, will not be allowed in any way to prejudice a proportionate increase in home lending over the next 12 months at least comparable with what the other savings banks may undertake.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LABORATORY AND EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** On 5 March 1981, I tabled Professor Bede Morris's Report on his Inquiry into the Use of Laboratory and Experimental Animals. As honourable members will recall, Professor Morris made a number of recommendations aimed at safeguarding the welfare of animals. These included properly structured animal ethics committees, provision of adequate accommodation and facilities, adoption of appropriate procedures, and the development of a satisfactory legislative framework.

At the same time of tabling the report, I indicated that I regarded implementation of the recommendations as being of such importance that I intended to invite Professor Morris to return at the end of the year to review progress. Professor Morris conducted his final review in March and has submitted his report, which I now table.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You didn't mention that in the debate.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** He had not submitted it then. It is clear from this report that the majority of the Morris Report has been put into effect since the inquiry. As Professor Morris states:

... the example given by the South Australian Government has contributed to the formulation of new standards for assessing the conduct of animal experimentation.

He goes on further to say:

... I believe that there is a changed attitude towards the use of experimental animals in Adelaide and elsewhere in Australia for which the South Australian Government and the Parliamentary process can take credit.

Clearly, Professor Morris recognises the significant advances introduced as a result of his inquiry and has commended the action taken. Even so, there still remains some important work to be done. The post of the Clinical Veterinarian is yet to be filled, but applications have been received for the advertised position. The Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has recognised the critical nature of this position and, together with the Department of Agriculture, is seeking a person of high professional standing to fill the position. The appointee will have direct responsibility for the animal operating and holding areas, with the executive authority endorsed by Professor Morris in his report.

The ethics committee at the institute is now completely satisfactory and Professor Morris is 'now convinced that its membership and the philosophy and intent of the committee is such that the best interests of both research and the welfare of the animals being used for experiments will be safeguarded'. I have been assured by Professor Morris that, under the current arrangements, the use of animals at the institute is in accord with proper ethical practices and that the committee has individuals with the necessary strengths of character and purpose to make it work. It is notable that Professor Morris has not suggested the enshrinement of such a committee in legislation and clearly recognises that the instilment of an ethic on animal care and welfare must come from attitudes inside the institution itself.

Animal accommodation at the institute has been reviewed and works are under way to further improve the animal holding areas as outlined by Professor Morris. The majority of these capital works will be completed in the middle of this year. Meanwhile, the animals have been rehoused and are receiving excellent care and attention.

Whilst the principles espoused by Professor Morris regarding the need for adequately trained and committed people are clearly recognised, honourable members will appreciate that his statements regarding salary classification of animal attendants necessarily involve consideration of the delicate relativities that exist between industrial awards and groupings. The issue of the salary classifications of animal attendants is still under review. A further case has been submitted to the Public Service Board and the salary

levels, necessary qualifications and other criteria will be established in any revised structure.

In his concluding remarks on the I.M.V.S., Professor Morris has recognised the clear intent of the institute to get its house in order and further improve the already high standing in the veterinary division.

In his first report, the Adelaide Childrens Hospital sustained the major criticism of Professor Morris, both in respect of its lack of an Animal Ethics Committee and the squalid facility that housed the small animals. As Professor Morris reports, the ethics committee has now been established but there still remains much work to be done to ensure that the staff of both the hospital and the University of Adelaide working in the hospital develop the correct ethical approach toward animal care. Under the direction of the board of management, the newly-formed committee is addressing its constitution and procedures, taking into account the development in other health units and the Morris recommendations.

The capital programme at the Adelaide Childrens Hospital is totally committed and a review of the redevelopment of the hospital is presently under way. The consultants conducting the review have been requested to consider the Morris recommendations about animal facilities at the hospital. One option is that large animal experiments and holding areas should be confined to the I.M.V.S. facilities and that the Adelaide Childrens Hospital retain facilities for small animal holding only. The Health Commission is likely to support such a policy. Meanwhile the small animals at the hospital are accommodated in new accommodation.

The remaining health units, namely, Flinders Medical Centre and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, have implemented the appropriate recommendations and ensured that adequate veterinary input is provided in their institutions. I understand that the Legislative Review Committee into the Cruelty to Animals Act has taken into consideration the recommendation of Professor Morris regarding the foundation of an advisory council.

I have forwarded a copy of the final report of Professor Morris to each of the Vice-Chancellors of the Adelaide University and Flinders University, with a covering letter making clear that university staff working in Government hospitals and the I.M.V.S. are bound by the rules and procedures of the Animal Ethics Committee of these institutions and are required to conform to the ethical standards set by these committees.

In conclusion, therefore, it is clear that Professor Morris's recommendations have been implemented by the respective health units and much has been achieved. Some work still needs to be done. Nevertheless, the House can be assured that there are now introduced procedures for the adequate care of and attention to animals in institutions under my control and that there will be ongoing reviews through the respective Animal Ethics Committees.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Trustee Fees.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. South Australian Teacher Housing Authority—Report, 1980-81.

Trustee Act, 1936-1980—Regulations—

- ii. Change of Name.
- iii. Trust Funds.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Planning and Development Act, 1966-1981—Regulations—

- i. Non-conforming use.
- ii. Mid North Planning Area Development Plan—City of Port Pirie Planning Regulations—Zoning.
- iii. South-East Planning Area Development Plan—City of Mount Gambier Planning Regulations—Zoning.
- iv. Metropolitan Development Plan—City of Tea Tree Gully Planning Regulations—Zoning.
- v. Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Report, 1980-81.
- vi. Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Report, 1980-81.
- vii. Riverland Regional Cultural Trust—Report, 1980-81.
- viii. South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Report, 1980-81.
- ix. Building Advisory Committee—Report, 1980-81.
- x. City of West Torrens—By-law No. 16—Nuisances (Smoke).

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1978—Regulations—

- i. Fees.
- ii. Driver Bailment Agreements.
- iii. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Loxton.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Racing Act, 1976-1980—Greyhound Racing Rules—Reserves.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

Harbors Act, 1936-1981—Regulations—

- i. North Arm Fishing Haven—Fees.
- ii. Port MacDonnell Boat Haven—Fees.
- iii. Robe Boat Haven—Fees.
- iv. Fees.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*By Command—*

- i. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Inquiry into the use of Laboratory and Experimental Animals—Final Report.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. J. W. Olsen)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Architects Act, 1939-1981—By-laws—Qualifications.
- ii. Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1975—Amendments to General Laws—Manchester Unity I.O.O.F. in S.A. and National Health Services Association of S.A.

#### QUESTION TIME

##### STATE ECONOMY

**Mr BANNON:** In view of the total conflict in his statements of recent weeks, will the Premier clarify in precise terms his view on the current state of the South Australian economy? On 11 February the Premier said that our unemployment rate had stabilised and was starting to fall. A day later he was reported to have advised the State Council of the Liberal Party that he was confident that South Australia was on the brink of a new era of development and prosperity. No doubt the member for Todd heard him make those very statements. The Premier also said that his Government had created 22 100 jobs since coming to power. A few weeks later, the February unemployment figures were published, and rather than showing a fall they in fact had increased

to record levels. Last Friday on radio 5AD the Premier drastically amended the figure of 22 100 jobs: it became, and I quote his words, '13 000, or just about 12 000, or 12 000 something'.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** Is that when he said we were going backwards slower than anyone else?

**Mr BANNON:** I will come to that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BANNON:** Even ignoring the unseasonal comparison method used by the Premier, if one compares September 1979, when the Premier came to office, with January 1982, which is the latest available, the figure shrinks still further to 4 000. During the radio interview the following exchange occurred, and I shall read from the transcript of the interview. Mr Kevin Crease, the interviewer, had talked to the Premier about some economic indicators, and the interview proceeded as follows:

Crease: But those statistics of your's are cold comfort, aren't they?

The Premier: Well, would you rather have it the other way?

Crease: No.

The Premier: What are you saying?

Crease: Yes, I'd rather have it that the statistics were going the other way, things not getting worse but getting better.

The Premier: Going the other way? They are getting better. Let's face it, an increase of 1.1 per cent compared with an increase of .5 per cent on the national average. You are always wanting to compare us with other States. You did last time. Now why don't you want to now?

Crease: I do.

The Premier: We're doing better. We're doing better than the other States.

Crease: We're doing better in the negative sense.

The Premier: Yes, we're slowing . . . going backwards at a far slower rate than the other States. That means we're turning.

To top it off, yesterday in the *News* the Premier was quoted as saying:

South Australia faces very tough times over the next 18 months or two years.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for taking up one of the issues that was going to be raised by one of my very concerned members on the back bench. I am always delighted to answer the very detailed questions that the Leader of the Opposition seems to have at his fingertips immediately after I have been on a radio programme with Mr Kevin Crease, formerly a press secretary for Mr Don Dunstan when he was Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I always find it very fascinating that Mr Crease has done so much homework before I go on his interviews. The Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that the number of jobs created since this Government came to office is measured on a month by month basis. He knows that the best way of dealing with this is on an August to August basis over the 12 month period. If that figure upsets him, whether it be 9 000 or, as it was, up to that 8 900 figure from January 1981 to January 1982—if he knows all of those things—it seems to me that he should also make the point quite clear, as I have done in this House very frequently, that in the last two years of the Labour Party's term in office 20 600 jobs were lost. That is a figure that the Leader cannot get away from. I do not know why he constantly brings the subject up. His own members, particularly the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, have always said that it would not be possible to create the 7 000 jobs which we said could be created at the time of the last election. Whatever figure is quoted, it is still in excess of that 7 000. So the fact is—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** You've got the highest unemployment in history.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I will come to unemployment in a minute. I am also going to deal with the Leader's very

grave lack of understanding about the State's reserves and the rather irresponsible and quite remarkable statements he has made on that particular score, too. Let me just finish dealing with this question of employment: 20 600 jobs were lost in the last two years that the Labor Party was in office. That is a factor they cannot get away from. They have never really tried to: they try to fudge the issue. At present, if you take the present figures on a monthly basis, 11 300 is the number. That will vary from month to month, as the Leader knows, but constantly it is above the 7 000 that the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy said could not be done. That is the very clear fact that comes through.

Secondly, let us talk about the unemployment situation. Of course, the unemployment levels are too high in Australia; they are too high in South Australia, but I would have thought that Opposition members, who have been so vocal in making comparisons and showing such concern in the past, would be the first people to be pleased that we were off the top of the unemployment ladder and that for three months in succession we have been off the top of the unemployment level. Unemployment has gone up throughout Australia. It has gone up to an appalling extent in Tasmania. In fact, one could refer to the New South Wales situation, and I am not too sure what is going to happen to the figures there if the power situation goes on. There is no question again, where the national level went up by .5 per cent, our level went up not by not 1.1 per cent, as the Leader quoted across the House—

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** You said 1.1 per cent and I think you got it wrong. It rose by .1 per cent and in so doing South Australia is in fact resisting the slide backwards. There is no two ways about that.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** What about my forecast of 50 000? You said I was wrong about that.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** No, you said that that was going to come in January in relation to the rest of the unemployment situation. The Deputy Leader was wrong again.

**Mr Ashenden:** As usual.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes. The unemployment situation in South Australia therefore is very much better compared with the rest of Australia in terms of the rate of increase.

That is nothing about which the Leader or his Party could be pleased, because it was their policies which lost those jobs and which put us on the top of the table at the time we took office.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** As I said, I find it quite extraordinary that members opposite should continue to draw attention to their disastrous record in job creation while the Labor Party was in office.

I want to turn to another matter not directly on the subject of the Leader's question, but one which I believe should be ventilated, because the efforts of the Leader, in trying to find some deficiency in this Government's record of economic management, have simply resulted in demonstrating his appalling lack of understanding, and I guess his immaturity, in the area of fundamental economics and book-keeping. I was thoroughly surprised to see the Leader's comments published in the paper this morning about the whole question of reserves. I find it hard to believe that those comments could be made by a member of Parliament (someone who should be able to understand the Budget document), let alone the Leader of the Opposition. We have some figures which I think are most significant, and I think the matter is sufficiently important for me to put the record straight.

The main quote that the Leader has depended upon is a quote from page 34 of the document entitled, 'Recent trends in South Australian public finances and the 1981-82 outlook', tabled in this House about three months ago. He gave great emphasis to the statement that there was a run-down of cash and investments of about \$57 000 000 in 1980-81 and that the expectation for 1981-82 is a further run-down of about \$82 000 000. I find it extraordinary that he should be complaining about this or even finding something odd about it. Obviously, he does not understand what it is all about.

Let me take the first issue. He is blatantly misled in making that statement, because the overall figures he has used include both the Budget and non-Budget sectors, which include the Electricity Trust, the State Transport Authority, the South Australian Housing Trust—

**Mr Becker:** Where did he get all those figures?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** We published them; we believe in open government, but the Leader cannot interpret them. During the two-year period that he is talking about, the Electricity Trust has been planning and following a planned capital programme which includes the running down of reserves and the putting of those reserves into capital projects planned literally for years ahead.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** Like a new power station up north.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Like a new power station up north. The planned use of reserves is \$8 000 000 in the first year and \$30 000 000 in the second year.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Surely his inclusion of those figures was a genuine mistake.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not know whether it was a genuine mistake or whether he does not understand the situation. He looks at the State Transport Authority. Of course there has been a run-down of cash, investments and reserves in the Budget sector in 1980-81 and 1981-82, because this has been planned. It is a planned use of reserves built up specifically by the State Transport Authority to put into effect the capital works that have been planned. The State Transport Authority is going ahead with its busway proposals, the rail-car depot, and a number of capital works. Is the Leader suggesting that we should not go ahead with those projects or that they do not cost money? Is he suggesting that we should not be spending that money? I cannot understand or follow the Leader at all. He has no grasp at all of the housekeeping necessary to put aside reserves sufficient to undertake normal capital works.

If we look at the \$3 500 000 set aside to repay the Commonwealth indebtedness in respect of Monarto, does he suggest that we should be going on with Monarto? Even if we did not go ahead, does he suggest that we should not have discharged that debt and that the taxpayers of South Australia should continue to pay interest at exorbitant rates on a daydream?

The Leader has forgotten about the \$4 000 000 financial restructuring of Samcor, something which former Labor Government Administrations left in such a mess that we had to bail them out. This was all a matter of planning. These reserves were used in a planned and proper way. It is all part of the run-down. If we look at the advances in question, it will be seen that at 30 June 1981 we had built up almost \$38 000 000 in the trust account advances for housing against future planned known needs. This account is being run down heavily in 1981-82 because the funds are being paid to the Housing Trust and the State Bank to support welfare housing programmes. Is the Leader so naive as to suggest that we should not be using those reserves for the purpose for which they were set aside, to build welfare housing? I am at a loss to understand his reasoning, and indeed I am quite concerned about it.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier might be at a loss but the time is now 2.30 p.m., and I ask you to rule whether or not the Premier should continue to make a speech like this for the rest of the afternoon.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. I have previously indicated that the Chair is not responsible for the content of an answer given by a Minister. I point out that in other Parliaments, and most recently in Federal Parliament last week, a clear indication has been given that the Chair takes the view, and the House accepts the premise, that matters unrelated to the original question are not to be proceeded with. This matter will soon be given due consideration by the Standing Orders Committee, but the practice of this House is that the Premier may continue, being responsible for the authorship of whatever he states.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I may point out that I was asked to comment on the State's finances and its economy, and I am doing just that. Virtually all these larger movements, including normal transactions on the trust account (and I refer the Leader to the Auditor-General's Report (statement G)), have been carefully planned for, and that planned movement is part of a deliberate policy of financing Government activities over the longer term to avoid the year-by-year disruptions which would normally come otherwise from sharp changes in Commonwealth policy and in moneys that come by way of grants and loans. There is no suggestion at all that the current spending of those reserves on the projects for which they were set aside is anything but entirely proper. Again, I am at a total loss to understand how the Leader could interpret it in this way. Perhaps he should have a word with the member for Hartley, who I am quite certain would be pleased to put him right.

Just to sum up this whole sorry episode, may I point out that those trust funds, those reserves, which have been set aside for specific purposes and which are now being spent for those purposes were in fact largely built up by this Government in the 1979-80 year, when I would remind members that we finished with a surplus of record dimensions of somewhere near \$37 000 000. As a result of that surplus, funds were transferred into the reserves for future use, and they are now being used. Housing is improving, transport is improving, and the other matters they have been applied to have—

*An honourable member:* You must be joking.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** We are doing very much better than the honourable member will ever do. I am pleased that we were able to put aside such reserves, and I am pleased that we are now being able to use them so efficiently for the benefit of every citizen of South Australia.

## COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAMMES

**Mr RANDALL:** Can the Minister of Health state the extent of the Government's commitment to community health programmes? It was disturbing to read in the *News* last week comments attributed to Dr John Potter, South Australia Vice-President of the Australian and New Zealand Society for Epidemiology and Research and Community Health, which I am sure honourable members on this side and opposite read. Dr Potter was quoted as saying that community health programmes are under threat and that there is evidence of conflict within the Health Commission regarding administration of community health programmes. I believe that such statements need to be corrected.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I was astounded, to say the least, to read the statements attributed to Dr Potter in the *News* last week, because I had heard him speak at

a function at which I launched a monograph on working papers in community health, which was published by *Ansearch*, of which Dr Potter was an editor. In his response to my launching, I would swear that he did not say what was attributed to him in the *News*.

He may subsequently have made statements of that nature, but he did not make them in my presence. Indeed, it would be very difficult for anyone to suggest that community health in South Australia under the Liberal administration was under threat, because the figures demonstrate exactly the opposite. In the year that we assumed office, 1979-80, the community health budget was \$8 500 000. The following year it was increased to \$10 900 000, which represented 2.8 per cent of the total health budget. In the current year the budget allocated to community health services is \$18 500 000; that is to say, 4.5 per cent of the total health budget.

No other area of the health services has seen such a rapid expansion in its budget, nor such a forceful policy direction given to the Health Commission to ensure that these services are expanded to meet consumer needs. I would say, in response to the allegation that there is division in the Health Commission on the question of community health policy, that Dr Potter may perhaps have been referring to the difference of opinion among community health professionals, not within the commission but throughout the State, on whether it is more appropriate for community health units to be administered by individual boards of management or to be associated in some way or other with either a hospital or some other larger institution. In that area there certainly is a lively debate.

The commission and the Government recognise that there are cases for and against both options. Consequently, the commission has adopted a policy of judging each situation on its merits. At Ingle Farm, for example, where there was a history of very sound health and financial management of a community health centre, that centre has been incorporated under its own board of management. The Women's Community Health Centre, which I established in 1980, also has a separate board of management, but, at a centre which I opened last week in the electorate of the member for Mawson, at Morphett Vale, it was appreciated that, whilst the need for services was there, the administrative and management experience was not of an order that enabled such services to be effectively delivered if the unit had been separately incorporated. As a result, that health centre is administered by the Board of Management of the Flinders Medical Centre.

I was interested to learn from the staff of that centre of the enormous strengths and benefits that the centre is drawing from its association with Flinders Medical Centre and, through it, with Flinders University. The fact that staff can be rotated between the hospital and the centre is of enormous benefit when rostering staff. The fact that the centre can call upon all the research facilities of the hospital, can have access to its morbidity statistics and, consequently, be better informed about the kinds of diseases and the kinds of health problems prevalent in the area, is making a very great difference to the responsiveness of the health centre to the needs of people in the southern suburbs.

The facts demonstrate that no other State Government, I venture to say, throughout Australia has made such a firm and strong commitment to community health as has the South Australian Government, and the commission and the Government are firm in the opinion that each community health situation needs to be assessed on its merits and that its management will be determined according to what is appropriate in each situation.

## FRASER GOVERNMENT

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I direct a question to the Premier. Does the action by the Minister of Industrial Affairs last week in telling Mrs Tamie Fraser 'to whisper in the Prime Minister's ear that South Australian Liberals thought he was doing a marvellous job' confirm that the Tonkin Government's repeated attacks on the Fraser Government are phoney attempts to hoodwink the public into believing the Federal Government is to blame for the State's problems? If not, does the Premier intend to discipline the Minister of Industrial Affairs for his embarrassing statement?

On 17 March the *Advertiser* reported the statement made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs in front of the Beaumont women's branch of the Liberal Party. Within two days, the Minister of Transport (Mr Wilson) was trying to blame the Fraser Government for the second increase in motor registration fees in two years. On 1 February the *Advertiser* carried the headline 'Tonkin demands changes; campaign against Fraser Government stepped up.'

The Premier has been highly critical of the Fraser Government over rising house mortgage interest rates, etc. Recently, the Minister of Agriculture attacked the Federal Government over lack of aid for fruitgrowers. The Minister of Health has been critical of the Fraser Government over new hospital funding arrangements. Who is right? Are they, or is the Minister of Industrial Affairs?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I do not really feel it is possible to answer such a pathetic and trivial question.

## COOBER PEDY WATER

**Mr. GUNN:** Is the Minister of Water Resources aware of the concern that has been expressed by residents of Coober Pedy at the high cost of water that has been supplied by his department, and, further, has his department carried out a detailed survey of the surrounding areas to find out whether there are suitable supplies of underground water of the quality and quantity that would meet the needs of that area? The Minister would be aware, having visited the area in his capacity as Minister, of the problems associated with the cost and provision of water. If the Minister does not have the information available, I would be grateful if he could supply me with details of his department's views on the matters I have raised.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The Engineering and Water Supply Department has carried out quite extensive investigations in relation to underground waters in the Coober Pedy area, and in particular in relation to the distance that water from a source of acceptable quality would have to be transported. It has been determined that water would have to be transported many kilometres. The cost has also been determined: I do not have the figures available at present, but I understand that the cost would be millions of dollars. As the honourable member would be aware, the recent upgrading of the reverse osmosis desalination plant in Coober Pedy has improved the domestic water situation, but it certainly does not provide the volume of water that would be required for a reticulated water supply system. Undoubtedly, a reticulated water supply could be provided at a cost, but at present that cost is astronomical.

The department is still considering whether other sources that are nearer to Coober Pedy can be found, but at present the source of water that would be acceptable for a reticulated water supply for domestic purposes is many kilometres away from Coober Pedy and, as such, the cost is quite astronomical. However, I will obtain the details of the studies that have been undertaken to date, which will give the honourable member the latest information on this matter.



## SHEEP CARCASSES

**Mr WHITTEN:** What action does the new Minister of Marine intend to take to ensure that the health of South Australians is not put at risk by the dumping of dead sheep carcasses in the sea off Port Adelaide? It is the practice to dump dead sheep over the sides of ships when vessels leave Port Adelaide and these carcasses are then washed ashore in various stages of decay and must be removed by the Port Adelaide council. Grave concern for the health of all South Australians was expressed at a recent meeting of the Port Adelaide council at which the council was discussing a letter from the Minister of Health. The letter stated that the Government could not prosecute offenders, because of an impediment in the legislation covering the issue. In the Messenger press of last Wednesday, 17 March the Mayor of Port Adelaide was reported as saying:

I am objecting to the attitude of the Government on this matter. I think the Minister is trying to avoid the issue. Ships agents or shipping companies should pay for the clean-up. Legislation could be easily tightened to prevent sheep dumping in gulf waters.

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Of course the Government is not resiling from the situation, and the honourable member is quite correct in saying that the Mayor of Port Adelaide has made certain statements. He has also been in touch with me and I will be discussing this matter, among other matters, with him this afternoon. It is not the practice, nor is it allowed, that carcasses of sheep be dumped at sea. The correct procedure is that they should be cut up and should not be dumped in the ocean. I will be having discussions with the Mayor of Port Adelaide this afternoon, the matter will be proceeded with, and the honourable member will receive a detailed reply at the appropriate stage.

## EGGS

**Mr BECKER:** Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether the egg industry proposes to market eggs in South Australia without the traditional identification mark of the Egg Board brand? The egg marketing proposal was given publicity this morning on radio 5AD on the Bazz and Pilko programme.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BECKER:** It is a very popular radio programme.

**Mr Hamilton:** Did he give you a mention?

**Mr BECKER:** The member would have no hope of getting a mention.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BECKER:** It was suggested that eggs would no longer be branded. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture is responsible for the egg industry in South Australia and that the Act requires certain public protection procedures concerning the identification of eggs. According to the publicity, that may have been circumvented.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** It is true that the egg industry in South Australia has launched a campaign to lift the marketing of its product. The industry is currently selling some 150 000 000 eggs per year, and it aims to lift that figure. In recognition of the natural and nutritious product involved, I aim to assist it in that programme.

With respect to the identification of eggs, it is true that, for the public's protection, under the Act the board is required to insist upon appropriate identification for eggs if they are to be on sale to the public. The traditional practice has been for the board's stamp to appear on each egg. In this new campaign, it is proposed that the cartons carrying those eggs, whether they be one dozen or one and a half dozen cartons, will carry the identification of the

board and will cite the grower, the licence number, etc. Therefore, if there is any problem at all about the contents, the grower can be quickly and clearly identified. Therefore, this will do away with that little red Egg Board brand on each egg.

Surveys among the public have demonstrated quite clearly that the Egg Board stamp is a deterrent to the marketing of eggs in this State. According to a survey, people seem to shy away from that Egg Board identification, and, according to the survey taken, that identification apparently implies that the Egg Board is the authority that handles, grades and packs the eggs.

That is not true in this State even though it is in a number of other States. In South Australia the Egg Board is, under the Act, an administrative and marketing authority, but it does not receive the product; it does not grade the product, therefore, nor is it responsible for the packaging and distribution to the retailers.

Our farm eggs in South Australia go direct from the farm, or the packer engaged by that farm, to the retail outlet. There is no housing for freezing, chilling or packaging done by the board at all. Further, the period between the 'paddock and the plate' is limited to around four days; generally from the producer to the retail outlet where a customer has access to the eggs there is no need for a period of longer than four days to occur. There may be isolated cases where if eggs are delivered immediately prior to a weekend, say on a Friday, that period might extend, but in ordinary circumstances eggs laid on Monday can conveniently be marketed on Thursday in the same week.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I did not catch the comment by the member opposite, but I do not need him to tell me how to suck eggs. Concerning the identification matter raised initially by the member for Hanson. I am satisfied that it is being applied under the terms of the Act and within the intention of the industry not only to identify their product but also for the people themselves to be identified with the product at the consumer level. It is a good, healthy and nutritious product, and I commend its wider use to all South Australians.

## CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT

**Mr SLATER:** Is the Premier concerned about the current involvement of interstate criminal interests in the entertainment industry in Adelaide? Will he obtain a report for this House from the Attorney-General on the business interests in Adelaide of Mr Abe Saffron and ascertain what has been done legally to impede such involvement in business affairs in this State? I and other Opposition members are receiving persistent reports from reputable members of the community that there is a growing involvement of interstate criminal elements in the Adelaide entertainment scene. I have also been reliably informed that money obtained interstate from these activities is being laundered through several Adelaide businesses including nightclubs, restaurants, and so on. Information also appeared in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday 3 March concerning hearings before the New South Wales Police Tribunal. In those hearings, suspended New South Wales Deputy Police Commissioner, Mr Allen, spoke of six meetings he had had with the person concerned, Mr Abe Saffron, at police headquarters in Sydney last year. The report stated that Mr Allen had said that at those meetings Mr Saffron had mentioned his business interests in both Adelaide and Perth.

The Premier may be aware that Mr Saffron has been summonsed to appear in court in Adelaide over an alleged breach of the Licensing Act by a suburban hotel with which



he has business links. The summons relates to alleged under-age drinking at the Castle Hotel-Motel.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will recognise the delicate nature of the *sub judice* rule, and I ask him not to transgress in any way.

**Mr SLATER:** The summons relates to alleged under-age drinking at the Castle Hotel-Motel, Edwardstown. May I point out—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have tried to indicate to the honourable member that I am not interfering with his right to question, but I do point out the delicate nature of the *sub judice* rule that does make it very difficult for the Chair to accept any further comment from the honourable member if he is going to be specific about a case pending before the courts.

**Mr SLATER:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The licensee of the Castle Hotel-Motel is Cook's Hotels Pty Ltd, of which Mr Saffron is a Director. I am reliably informed that Mr Saffron's business interests in Adelaide are far more extensive than that. Will the Premier obtain from the Attorney-General a report on the extent of Mr Saffron's operations in South Australia?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Yes.

### TOURISM

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** Will the Minister of Tourism tell the House the purpose of the South Australian Tourism Development Conference to be held in Adelaide on 14 and 15 April next? I have received several representations from constituents in my electorate applauding this initiative and asking who may attend this conference, whether the number of participants will be limited, and whether the conclusions of the conference will be acted upon by the Government. They have also indicated a supportive belief in the future of tourism development and an active participation in it.

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The purpose of the Tourism Development Conference to be held next month in Adelaide is exactly as its name implies: to try to involve all industries in South Australia which are affected in one way or another by tourism and tourist development in the formulation of a policy which can be seen to provide guidance to all spheres of Government—Federal, State and local—and all sections of the industry, even those whose activities may not appear initially to impact directly on tourism, to take part in a common policy which can be readily understood by everyone and which can serve as a guideline for future development. The idea is to develop a five-year plan which can then be modified annually to ensure that long-range planning can be undertaken by Governments and by the industry.

A fortnight or so ago, I personally signed more than 4 000 letters addressed to South Australians who are in any way involved with the tourism industry. Recalling the addresses, the letters were sent to people ranging from the Proprietor of the Cactus Corner Caravan Park, at Iron Knob, to the Town Clerks of all local government authorities in South Australia, all members of Parliament, both State and Federal, management consultants, accountants, members of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, the Retail Traders Association, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry—in other words, every aspect of industry in South Australia.

The conference is limited in its attendance only by the size of the venue, the Australian Mineral Foundation at Glenside, and 4 000 invitations have gone out. Anyone is welcome to attend, but I would think that once the 350 to 400 mark is reached, the books will have to be signed off. I understand that bookings are going very well indeed, and

those who are not able to attend have asked to be given a report of the proceedings.

The conference was originally designed by the task force established by the South Australian Tourism Development Board in order to ensure input from industry in South Australia. That task force consisted of 24 people, comprising 22 from private industry and two from Government, and its job was to do the preliminary planning for this development conference. It is the first such conference to be held in South Australia, and I believe one of the first to be held in Australia. The two key speakers will be Mr Rodney Walsh, Managing Director of Walsh's World, recognised as one of the most dynamic members of the tourism industry, and Mr Rob Tonge, senior partner in Rob Tonge and Associates, which did the study for the restructuring of the Department of Tourism.

I hope that the conference will bring home to South Australians (and I look for the co-operation of the media to ensure that this occurs) the great economic importance of tourism to this State, its capacity for developing jobs especially for young people and for unskilled women, and that it will ensure that a plan that will be put before the Government for consideration and possibly modification is a plan that can be generally supported by the industry at large, by trade unions which have also been invited to participate and by all three levels of government.

### MURRAY RIVER DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Will the Minister of Environment and Planning confirm that he and his Government are about to withdraw the regulations gazetted on 23 December in respect of control of development along the Murray River? As my question implies, long awaited regulations were gazetted just before Christmas in relation to the control of development on the Murray flood plain and the fringe zone on the flood plain. It has been put to me and to certain of my colleagues by people who say they are in the know that these regulations have caused a great deal of concern and that there is pressure on the Government to withdraw these regulations from people who want to be able to continue to do what they have been doing unfettered along the Murray or who, on the other hand, are involved in local government and believe there is too much centralism in the way in which the regulations have been drawn. For those reasons, I ask the Minister to clear the air so far as the public is concerned.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The regulations to which the honourable member has referred were discussed for a period prior to their going before Cabinet. There was a great deal of discussion about these regulations with local councils and local interest groups along the Murray River. The Government has made its position quite clear in relation to its policy on development in that area. However, a request has been made for the regulations to be redrafted. I do not know whether the honourable member opposite has noted the regulations, but if he has he will recognise that one of them has to be redrafted, and it has been suggested by at least two of the councils in that area that we should look at the redrafting. I believe that that is quite satisfactory and that that should happen. It is important that councils should know, because they are concerned about the possibility of litigation if it is not made quite clear. I do not know, but I suspect probably that the member for Baudin has not even looked at the regulations.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** I beg your pardon; they are on my desk.

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** Well, if he has seen them he will know what I am talking about and acknowledge the

need for redrafting at least one of those regulations. That is what we are looking at at the present time. I have instructed my department to do something about the redrafting as a matter of urgency.

### LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

**Mr LEWIS:** What factual information can the Minister of Agriculture give in relation to assertions made recently by the Animal Liberation League spokesperson at the W.E.A. seminar on matters such as the expected annual on-farm mortality of full-mouth or broken-mouth wethers? I would like to quote briefly from a report by Carolyne Miller in the March edition of *The Farmer and Stockowner* concerning that seminar, wherein she pointed out that the spokesperson to whom I have referred based his opinion on the high death rate of sheep particularly when accidents occurred on ships. This was responded to by a member of the audience who asked:

You say we should stop the export of live sheep because of a few natural disasters, but have we stopped passenger liners operating since the *Titanic*?

The article continued:

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask honourable members to reduce the level of audible conversation.

**Mr LEWIS:** The article referred to the Animal Liberation League, as follows:

For instance—they argued that because the average death rate for live sheep exports was 1.5 per cent the total death rate for a year (averaging 17 three-week journeys) was 25 per cent. True . . . if the same sheep were transported on the same ship for 12 months. 'A large number of people would benefit from the cessation of this industry.'

Which people would benefit if we stopped exporting live sheep and, indeed, which people would suffer?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** I have listened with interest to the matter raised by the honourable member, and I appreciate his involvement in this subject and, indeed, his efforts on behalf of the primary producers in that part of the State that he represents. I was not able to be at that seminar (in fact, I am not sure I was even invited to attend), but reports that have emerged from it indicate that emotion was running high, which it invariably does when this subject is raised at the public level or at forums of that kind.

I read the references of Carolyne Miller to Mr Taylor's approach to the subject, and it is consistent with his and his Animal Liberation League's attitude, over a long period, to live sheep exports. I am not in a position to argue a case against him. I simply support the case that we have already been promoting recognising that trade as a vital part of our own sheep industry in Australia and consistent with the needs of the customers who buy live sheep from us. There is no basis for the claims made from time to time by Mr Taylor and his associates that jobs are in jeopardy in Australia as a result of live sheep exports. Indeed, article after article produced on this subject confirms that jobs are created as a result of our gaining and enjoying this market outlet.

I am sure, Mr Speaker, that you, possibly above all other members of this House in your position as a prominent member of the R.S.P.C.A. in this State, would acknowledge that that authority appreciates the importance of the live sheep export trade. In fact, at the seminar to which the honourable member referred Mr Harries, Secretary of the R.S.P.C.A. in South Australia, said that he would not stand on the sidelines saying "Ban the trade" because he believed a lot of work was being done to improve the standards within this industry.

I am not in a position to argue the point Mr Taylor has made in his emotive outbursts from time to time. His most

recent outburst, wherein he multiplies the number of trips that are possible to be undertaken in a year (trips between say, Outer Harbor and the Middle East recipient countries) by the number of days it takes to traverse those distances, and says that if sheep were carried over a 12 month period (that is the same sheep) a 25 per cent loss factor would be involved, really is quite ludicrous. That is a reference made by Mr Taylor that does not deserve any sort of an answer.

The facts of the matter are that no sheep traverse the high seas between Australia and the Middle East or any other country for the whole year round. Sheep on the land all year around in Australia incur losses in their ordinary natural state of about 9 per cent per annum.

Improved standards and methods of moving live sheep between Australia and the Middle East have resulted in reductions as low as 1.5 per cent, which is a tremendous breakthrough and achievement by the parties involved in purchasing, loading, transporting and marketing livestock in this country. I do not suggest that standards and methods that apply should just be cut off at this stage: they should be continually subjected to review, and improvements should be implemented where they can be identified and are reasonably practical to implement in the industry's interests.

So, whilst not able to clarify the position for the member for Mallee in relation to statements made by Mr Taylor, I hope that the other points touched on clarify the Government's position on the live sheep export trade, as well as my own position as Minister of Agriculture representing our primary producers. The only other point I make briefly in the time available relates to the disposal of stock whilst in transit between the supplier country and the recipient country. A question on this matter was asked today of my colleague the Minister of Marine. Of course, those sheep that die in transit or are considered sufficiently unhealthy to be disposed of are disposed of at sea. The practice laid down and adopted is that those carcasses will be cut up to such an extent before disposal that when dumped in the outer waters (that is, not adjacent to our ports or coastline, as alleged in the question raised) they sink.

If the whole sheep carcasses have floated ashore at Port Adelaide (and I have no reason to disbelieve that; I accept that it has occurred), clearly those sheep could not have come from the authorised live sheep carriers. They have come from some other form of carrier, maybe within State waters.

**Mr Keneally:** Perhaps they were down having a swim.

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The honourable member can joke about this if he likes, but it is a serious subject, of which I am very conscious. I recognise the need to ensure that sick or dead sheep being transported on such carriers are disposed of appropriately and that when cut up they sink and do not float ashore, as suggested by the honourable member earlier today. I know I am not answering the question from the other side; I am answering a question from the member for Mallee, but the two points are relevant and ought to be clarified. As I indicated, I am very aware of this matter. It is not unusual to have sheep float up around South Australian shores. They have floated up in front of my property. They could well have fallen off the cliffs whilst trying to get food at that level and, on the ebb and flow of the tide, they have come up on to the beach.

I am not sure of the source of the sheep carcasses found at Port Adelaide, but sheep are earmarked and branded, and if someone really did his homework I do not think it would be too difficult to identify from which vessel, if it is a vessel, those sheep have floated on to the beaches. I suggest to the honourable member that the earmarking and branding livestock system in South Australia would be such that it would not be difficult to identify where these sheep come from. I wholeheartedly support the transporting of

live sheep to those customers that want them, as I support upgrading the methods when the need for such upgrading can be identified.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Has any attempt at identification been made?

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I am not aware of that. That responsibility is not directly associated with my portfolio, but I would not be surprised if it will be, following the subject being raised today. In my view, it should be.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust Act Amendment,  
Audit Act Amendment,  
Building Act Amendment,  
Collections for Charitable Purposes Act Amendment,  
Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment (No. 2),  
Land Settlement Act Repeal,  
Levi Park (Repeal),  
Local Government Act Amendment (No. 3),  
Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Amendment,  
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment (No. 2),  
Petroleum (Submerged Lands),  
Real Property Act Amendment,  
Riverland Co-operatives (Exemption from stamp Duty),  
Rural Advances Guarantee Act Amendment,  
Stamp Duties Act Amendment (1982),  
Technology Park Adelaide.

### PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING COMPLEX

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I seek leave to make a statement.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** The Public Works Standing Committee report on the proposed new Automatic Data Processing Complex was tabled in the House today. The report indicates that the committee did not make a recommendation on whether the project should proceed. In addition, the report raises a number of questions. As the Minister responsible for data processing, I will be having discussions with the Minister of Public Works so that further clarification can be obtained on these questions. There will be a new reference of this project to the committee so that the questions raised by the committee can be addressed. We are confident that the proposed project is the most economical means of providing suitable accommodation for the automatic data processing operations. We will therefore request a further report from the committee on the project, and we hope that hearings will be held as soon as possible.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WINDY POINT RESTAURANT

**The Hon. J. D. Wright (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.  
Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Following a question I asked in Parliament on 3 March 1982 regarding the financial means of Roxburgh Investments Pty Ltd, the company that had been granted Government approval to build a restaurant complex at Windy Point, the principal director of that company, Mr Bill Sparr, offered the Opposition the opportunity to inspect his financial records. I nominated two persons to do this. I am now able to report to the House that the books have been viewed and reveal that the Sparr Group Unit Trust, which is the asset holding entity in Mr Sparr's group of companies, appears to be of substantial means. The information shown to my nominees was not available in public records at the Companies Office and is not required to be there at law. Further, the Premier has now written to the Opposition advising:

I have had officers of the Corporate Affairs Commission examine the company. Nothing has been discovered that would suggest any irregularities.

It is not the role of the Opposition to take on the function of corporate investigators. That is the function of the Government, and more so when public property is involved. According to my nominees, the principal director, Mr Sparr, complained that he had, by inference or implication, been linked to Mr Abe Saffron and/or his companies. This was referred to in the *Advertiser* report and not by me. I did not mention Saffron. It was Mr Sparr himself who brought up Saffron's name.

My nominees have also reported to me that Mr Sparr was extremely critical of my actions in raising this question in the Parliament. He has also voiced these criticisms publicly. As the House knows, Parliamentary privilege is an ancient right, and I do not consider that I have in any way misused that right.

### CORRECTIONAL SERVICES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

### DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman (Minister of Agriculture)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dried Fruits Act, 1934-1972. Read a first time.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

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

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Bill

The Dried Fruits Board is an industry-funded authority charged with responsibility for the orderly marketing of specified dried vine and tree fruits through the regulation of producers, dealers and packing houses. All dried fruit produced for marketing is inspected to ensure that it is of export quality. This inspection function is carried out by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry for the reason that, at the time of packing, it is not generally known whether the fruit will be sold on the domestic or export market.

Under a long-standing industry agreement, State boards have re-imbursed the Federal Government a proportion of these inspection costs on a basis which is acknowledged by

industry to have been most favourable. The basis of reimbursement was 50 per cent of the average of the previous 10 years on actual costs apportioned between home consumption and export sales. In February last year the Commonwealth Government advised all State Dried Fruit Authorities that fees for Department of Primary Industry inspection services would be fully recouped and that the increased fees would be phased in over a three-year period commencing retrospectively in 1980. This decision will increase inspection costs to the industry by 300 per cent by 1982. For example, in 1980 inspection fees were calculated to be \$13 616, but under the new formula would increase to \$37 015 (at 1980 costs) for 1982.

Given the intention of the Federal Government to levy the increased charges, the South Australian board has anticipated a need to raise revenue to finance these additional inspection charges. This revenue will be sought by raising the levy on packing houses. The level of the expected levy, however, exceeds the ceiling amount presently provided under the Act.

Section 18 (2) of the Act authorises the board to strike a levy against all registered packing houses, but the levy is restricted to an upper limit of \$3 per tonne of vine fruits and \$6 per tonne of all other dried fruit packed. Basing estimates on 1980 prices and the Commonwealth Government's inspection costs recovering formula, the board expects to be required to pay the Commonwealth fees of \$27 761 for 1981 and \$37 015 for 1982. However, these funds simply cannot be raised by the board given the limitation of section 18 (2) of the Act. The board's financial reserves will be adequate to meet the increased charges for the 1981-82 financial year, but not beyond. It is proposed, therefore, to amend section 18 (2) of the Act to replace the upper limit of the packing house levy with a new limit, which will initially be \$8 per tonne for vine fruits and \$16 per tonne for other dried fruits. These limits will be capable of adjustment by regulation. This will allow the board to declare a levy consistent with expected expenditure.

Some four years ago the industry, represented by all packers and the board, agreed to establish a quality grade standard for a retail package of 'dried tree fruit salad'. The industry thought it necessary to maintain a quality standard and provide minimum standards for all tree fruit varieties included in the pack. The grade standard adopted proved effective in maintaining the quality product. But 'dried apples' should be included within the ambit of the Act so that standards for that fruit can be formally included within regulations. The Bill therefore makes an appropriate amendment to the Act to achieve this purpose.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 adds 'dried apples' to the definition of dried fruits. Clause 3 amends the limitations on the amount of the contribution that a packer may be required to pay towards the board's estimated expenditure in the manner outlined above.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March. Page 3341.)

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** In rising to speak first on this Bill, I indicate that the member for Mitchell will be leading for the Opposition, and I have deputed him to take the unlimited time normally available to the Leader of the Opposition.

In the 2½ years since coming to office, this Government has chosen to create completely unrealistic expectations

about the extent and the timing of possible benefits from the resources project at Roxby Downs. We have seen a barrage of grossly inflated claims, and a crazy auction of predictions, particularly about employment and possible royalty income.

This Government has encouraged the fiction that the commencement of the project was beyond doubt and only a year or two away. It has abused anyone who has questioned the wisdom of South Australia's locking itself into the nuclear fuel industry, and for 2½ years it has tried to divide the community on the question of uranium mining, simply because it believed that to do so would give it some electoral advantage.

We now have before us the indenture and the opportunity to test the claims against the provisions of the indenture and what it says in specific terms. Let me make immediately clear that on almost all points the provisions of the indenture fall far short of what the Government had led the people of South Australia to expect. Let me also make clear that, in its present form, the indenture ties the South Australian Government, and the South Australian community, to an industry whose safety is unproven and whose future is uncertain.

The passage of this indenture in its present form will commit the people of this State to the nuclear fuel industry as of 1982, with no regard to the circumstances or the conditions that might prevail if and when the project goes ahead. It means that now, in 1982, we give up our right to decide this vital question for the rest of this decade and beyond.

It means that at least until 1991 if the project fails to go ahead, and for very much longer (into the next century) if it commences, the question of uranium mining is in the hands of the companies; we will have transferred our right to decide from this Parliament to the boardrooms of London and Melbourne. The State has its hands tied in regard to conditions.

The Opposition does not deny the size and significance of the ore body at Roxby Downs. The deposit is very large and contains copper, uranium, some gold, silver, and rare earths. These occur at medium to low grades throughout the ore body, which is more extensive and more complex than was at first anticipated. At present, the companies cannot be definitive about any particular mining technique at any one spot.

Many factors remain to be determined. The remote location, the cost structures and the size, grade, distribution and depth of the deposits must all be considered. Finance, market access, knowledge of the ore body, and an overall assessment of commercial and technical risk factors must all be available to complete a final, definitive feasibility statement or what could be more accurately described as a pilot developmental scheme. We believe and state clearly that the limits and reserves of that ore body should be defined and evaluated.

Indeed, feasibility studies which this indenture seeks to continue were begun following negotiations with the previous Labor Government in 1979. All that has been done to date at Roxby Downs has been done under the terms and conditions of the agreement between the companies and the former Labor Government. All the money that has been spent on the project so far has been spent under the terms and conditions of that agreement. The companies were prepared to carry out that work and spend that money fully aware of the implications of the policy of the Australian Labor Party on the mining and export of uranium.

So it should be clear to this House and to the people of South Australia that the Opposition has not stood against and will not stand against a proper evaluation being made of the potential of the Roxby Downs ore body, but what

we do question is the need for an indenture of this kind and at this stage of the project, because what we have before us is not an indenture for a mining project. It does not contain a commitment by the companies to a commencement date, to actually start mining and producing. It is merely a commitment to complete the feasibility studies, to define the limits and reserves of mineralisation and to evaluate the geological, economic, engineering, mining, environmental, metallurgical treatment and marketing aspects of the development. This is set out in recital (b) and the extent of the commitment is made clear in clause 6 of the indenture, which states:

(1) (a) The joint venturers shall use all reasonable efforts to complete, by 31 December 1984, such detailed studies and evaluations of the nature referred to in recital (b) as in their opinion may be necessary or desirable to enable them, or any of them, then to undertake necessary final evaluations and negotiations with respect to finance and the sale of product, prior to taking any decision to proceed with the initial project.

Let me return to what has already taken place at Roxby Downs. On 7 May 1979 the former Premier, the member for Hartley, wrote to the Executive Director of Western Mining Corporation. In that letter he set out the conditions under which the Government would allow exploration and appraisal of the Olympic Dam deposit at Roxby Downs to take place. The key passage of that letter has already been referred to by the Minister in his second reading explanation. It gave the company the right to acquire mining tenements which would remain in force until such time as a viable mining operation is proven to the satisfaction of the Minister of Mines and Energy in consultation with Western Mining Corporation Limited and any other participants in the project, taking into account normal commercial considerations and any conditions imposed in the light of Government policy with regard to uranium.

It further set out that at such time as a viable mining operation was proven, the Government would recognise the company's right to acquire a mining and development title over the project area under the aegis of a mining and development indenture. Those conditions were agreed to by the company in letters dated 28 May, and confirmed by the former Premier, the member for Hartley, in a further letter dated 15 June, in which he again reiterated that a formal agreement or indenture would only be considered at a later stage, and then only if the company had taken a decision to develop and mine the site. These letters, which have been tabled, show that the companies were prepared to invest money in this project without an indenture and without the possibility of an indenture until they had proved that a viable mining operation was possible. Now we are told that this indenture is necessary if large sums of money are to be spent; however, we know that as much was spent under that exchange of letters as is committed to be spent under this indenture.

That exchange of letters gave the companies the securities and assurances necessary to raise the finance for evaluation. The amount mentioned of \$50 000 000 is, of course, in 1979 prices, and taking into account the various tax or other concessions that accrue to development of this type, is in fact quite a bit more than the \$50 000 000 that is being talked about proposed to be spent in the second phase of the pre-feasibility study. The exchange of letters gave the companies those securities and assurances necessary to raise the finance for evaluation. The letters themselves made clear that any decision about mining would be taken in light of the then Government's uranium policy, and made clear that an indenture would not be considered until the actual decision to mine the deposit had been made.

Now, less than three years later, the Government presents us with this indenture which it says is absolutely necessary and vital. What has changed in those three years? South

Australia now has a Government which is totally politically compromised on the issue of Roxby Downs, and in particular on uranium mining. We have a Premier who, while still Leader of the Opposition, described the project as 'a beacon on the hill, a light in the future, our only hope', and who is on record as believing that 'no Roxby Downs means no jobs, no prosperity, and no future'. It is a Government that has made clear from the outset almost from the day it was elected, that the only aspect of its economic thinking was to hope for a flow-on from a resources boom associated with this project.

We now have in power a Party that has based its strategy for electoral survival on extravagant rhetoric and bullish posturing that has become the hallmark of this project. Faced with a Government so committed in the electoral and the political sense, as this Government is, no-one could blame the companies for taking the best deal possible, for trying here and now, while this Government is still in office, to tie up the project under terms and conditions that they find most favourable. If the Government was determined to sell out the State as quickly as possible, and determined to tie itself come what may into a commitment to this project, an unequal treaty, one cannot expect a commercial organisation not to take advantage of the offer. I do not criticise the companies for that. They are exploiting the weakness of the Government's position, and, indeed, that brings this indenture before us and brings with it the accompanying statements that it is absolutely necessary.

I turn now to some of the details of the indenture. Where in its provisions are the predictions of the Government to be fulfilled? I suggest that its provisions fall far short of even the Government's most modest predictions. On a wide range of matters it is vague and imprecise. Indeed, its lack of detail in so many areas confirms that this indenture is premature. It must be so, because the final evaluation and decision to mine cannot be taken, and while that is still in process obviously there are matters that cannot be covered except in a vague or general way by the indenture and its provisions.

A Select Committee to look at those provisions in detail will be required, and no doubt, will determine and examine some of the precise details that are contained in the indenture. However, the facts are that even before we have a report from the Select Committee there are some areas in which we are given some concrete details. I refer to the case of royalties. Let us compare what is in the indenture with the predictions made by the Government.

In October last year the Minister of Mines and Energy predicted that annual royalties from this project would be near \$100 000 000. Since then other members of the Government have added their bids. In November the Premier felt able to talk in general terms of 'a billion dollars worth of income to the people of this State'. In December, he reduced his sights to between \$80 000 000 and \$90 000 000, about the same level as Queensland and Western Australia. In that same month the Minister of Transport was preferring the Deputy Premier's assessment of \$100 000 000. Now it has come back to between \$30 000 000 and \$40 000 000, and even that is an extremely optimistic forecast that will be impossible to achieve unless there is a dramatic increase in world commodity prices and maximum production is achieved immediately. As for the State sharing in additional surpluses, the trigger point is so high that it is difficult to imagine the tax generating significant revenue. In fact, on current bond rates it does not even commence until after tax return on funds employed reaches 18 per cent, an extremely high figure. So much for royalties and the uncertainty surrounding them.

I refer now to jobs. On the question of the possible employment arising from this project, this Government has

been most cynical and most dishonest. While still in Opposition, the present Premier claimed that 20 000 jobs would be directly created. Immediately after the election, he increased it to 'about 50 000', both directly and indirectly. Meanwhile the Minister of Industrial Affairs entered the lists with a prediction of 10 000 new jobs immediately and a potential for 30 000 to 40 000. All of these predictions were wrong. All of them were hopelessly exaggerated. All of them point up the way in which this project has been used by the Government in totally cynical and dishonest terms. We are now talking of 2 000 to 3 000 jobs. We are now talking about an employment level which would not even erase the increase in the jobless since this Government came to office, even assuming that these jobs could somehow be created now and not, as is more likely, by the most optimistic predictions, in the next decade.

Surrounding all this rhetoric, all these exaggerated boasts about the project, we have the spectre created by the Government of a 'Mount Isa of the South'. The Government has tried to associate this project with the Mount Isa mine and township in Queensland.

Anyone looking for immediate economic salvation and comfort from this comparison (and we have immediate and major problems in this State which must be tackled and solved) should remember that the Mount Isa ore body was discovered in 1923 and the town reached a population of 7 000 in 1956, the year in which Mount Isa Mines paid its first dividend. It took a further 25 years to reach its present population of 26 000.

As to the costs (and this is important, because, against these possible benefits to the State, we must measure what the Government is going to have to contribute) the Bill gives no indication of the upper limits of the State's commitment to infrastructure. To give undertakings for 1991 in 1981 dollars is to virtually accept an open-ended commitment. In other areas the indenture is imprecise or contradictory. For example, on electricity prices there is a potential conflict between the provision that there be no subsidy to the company, and the further provision that tariffs to the company will not rise more quickly than average increases. Is anyone able to say with certainty exactly what the costs of supply will be in 10 or 11 years time?

An on-site smelting operation has always been presented by the Government as an integral part of the project. If one looks at the indenture to find the firm commitment to establish such an operation, one finds that it is not there. It is to be reviewed, the indenture says, within three years of the initial project. The initial project, of course, refers to that stage at which production mining commences; that is, no earlier than 1985, possibly well after that date into the 1990s. Again, it is not surprising that there is not a commitment contained in the indenture. The companies, unlike the Government, are clearly unwilling to make too many commitments so far in advance of a decision to go ahead.

The companies clearly regard the clarification of too much detail, as far as their particular commitment is concerned, as being premature. The Labor Party's policy is quite clear and unequivocal. We will not permit the mining, processing or enrichment of uranium until we are satisfied that the present unresolved economic, social, biological, genetic, environmental and technical problems associated with the mining of uranium and the development of nuclear power have been solved.

We also believe that it is incumbent on any State or nation with responsibility which seeks to mine and sell uranium to be absolutely certain that it is safe to provide uranium to customer countries. This policy is not based on any doctrinaire attitude, nor is it the result of emotion. It

is the result of a realistic and hard-headed analysis of the present uncertain and very often dangerous state of the world nuclear industry. That is something the present Government chooses to ignore. It is also firmly based on the realisation that there is an undeniable link between the nuclear fuel industry and the production of fuel for nuclear weapons and nuclear warfare. I believe it is significant that not one word of protest or concern has been heard from the Premier or the Minister of Mines and Energy about the recent collapse of Australia's bargaining stance on a safeguards agreement with Japan covering the sale of uranium.

In January the Federal Government initialled a nuclear safeguards agreement with that country following three years of discussions. That agreement, negotiated in the climate of a badly depressed world uranium market, amounts to a significant weakening of the Federal Government's so-called commitment to securing firm international safeguards, yet we heard not one word from the State Government, which, I thought, would have been concerned about it. I understand that the agreement indicates that Japan will not be required to obtain approval from Australia before it transfers Australian-sourced nuclear material to any other country. That was central to the safeguards policies that the Prime Minister committed Australia to in 1977. Apparently, it is not applying in this latest agreement. The Federal Government is also believed to have dropped its requirement that Japan obtain approval from Australia before it be allowed to reprocess uranium, or enrich Australian uranium beyond 20 per cent. Then there are questions of the permanent disposal of high level waste. Whatever the Minister of Mines and Energy attempts to say or demonstrate, the fact is that those problems have not been resolved. It may be possible in the long term, in the future, to solve them, but at the moment they have not been solved. That is beyond question.

There is now world-wide expert disagreement over the suitability of the vitrification process. Mr Justice Fox, formerly Australia's ambassador at large on nuclear matters, told a Select Committee of the South Australian Legislative Council 'as far as I am aware no-one has yet tried to dispose permanently of one milligram of high level waste'. Even last week, Senator Sir John Carrick, Minister for National Development and Energy, told Parliament that he had no knowledge of any firm proposals to construct facilities for the final disposal of high level nuclear waste. There are also concerns that the current levels of radiation exposure at mines, accepted in the Australian Code of Practice for the Mining and Milling of Ores, may be up to four times too high and should be urgently revised.

The Government's silence, and indeed lack of concern, about these issues is ironic when one considers that in 1976 the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, moved a motion of censure about the then Labor Government's supposed lack of concern over problems relating to the nuclear fuel cycle. We also remember that in 1977 the present Premier, and his Deputy, then in Opposition, supported a resolution by the then Premier, Don Dunstan, calling for a moratorium on uranium mining. They are now apparently telling us all those problems and concerns have been solved. Cynically, neither the Premier nor his Deputy has yet explained what changed their minds. Many claims have been made for this project and this indenture. The Government would have this House and the South Australian people believe that it is the only thing that stands between this State's present dire economic situation and prosperity. This is absolute nonsense. Even under the terms of this indenture, a commitment to a mining operation is not possible until 1985, and not likely until the end of 1987. Indeed, any reasonable assessment of the world economy, and in particular world

commodity prices, makes clear that the real decision date is more probably into the 1990s.

So this, the 44th Parliament of South Australia, is being asked to tie the State to terms and conditions for a project unlikely to begin until we see the sessions of the 47th Parliament. In the intervening time, the people of South Australia will have gone to the polls possibly four times. A large number of the people voting in the first election in the 1990s are at this time still only in our primary schools, but this Government seeks to commit them to the uranium mining industry. It seeks to tie them into terms and conditions which are unequal; terms which may be simply not relevant in 10 years time. It seeks to fight the next election around this particular project when it is not the next Government that will make the decisions as to whether the project will go ahead. It is simply not possible to write that sort of contract, nor do I believe it is responsible or desirable of any Government's looking after the interests and welfare of this State and this community.

Since this Government came to office, resource development, and in particular the Roxby Downs project, have been for this Government simply a political exercise. It has, over the past few months, cynically exploited the possibility of this indenture in an attempt to hide its failures in other areas of Government. We are opposed to this indenture as it presently stands. However, we believe that it should go to a Select Committee so that the full extent of the Government's political cynicism can be exposed and, most importantly, so that its terms and conditions can be thoroughly probed. Consequently, we will support it going to the Select Committee, and seek to move amendments and promote questions and discussion that will be considered when the indenture comes back to the House from the Select Committee. Let no-one misinterpret that decision.

Our uranium policy is firm. If the Government will not accept that a decision about uranium mining cannot and must not be made in 1982, that the State cannot and must not be locked into the terms and conditions of this project, whether or not it includes uranium mining in 1982, we will vote against the Bill at the third reading. The exact details of our amendments will be based on the deliberations of the Select Committee and the information that it brings forward. Let me suggest a seven-part plan to amend this Bill so that it is more acceptable to the whole community of S.A. and ceases to be a divisive issue in the community.

First, we are prepared to allow the completion of the final pre-production assessment, that is, to the initial project stage. We are prepared to facilitate that, but the question of mining, processing and export of uranium must wait until the conditions of our Party's policies are satisfied at the time that decision is to be made. Secondly, we recognise that the company requires some degree of security of tenure of its leases if it is to spend large sums on further exploration and pre-feasibility. Consequently, we would be prepared to allow a 50-year lease, subject to periodic review. Thirdly, we believe that the indenture as it presently stands is totally one-sided. It gives away to the companies all rights of decision about whether the project be commenced or deferred. We would ensure that the ultimate control of this resource stays with the Government and the people of South Australia. It is their decision.

Fourthly, we do not believe that the Bill contains adequate radiological safeguards, nor do we believe that any associated legislation presently before the House provides those safeguards. We would ensure that adequate safeguards are written into any agreement with the companies. Fifthly, we would require that special workmens compensation provisions be drawn up for those persons currently employed in the feasibility and exploration phase which could then be implemented at the mining and development stage. We would

require that there be continuous monitoring of the health of any person employed in the project. Sixthly, the question of tailings disposal is not addressed by the indenture and we would require that this be a part of any agreement. Seventhly, in accordance with the provisions of Commonwealth e.i.s. legislation, we would require that that legislation be invoked and that a public inquiry into all aspects of this project should be allowed, to allow those in the community who wish to have their views heard and explored an opportunity to do so.

That, we suggest, is a rational and responsible way of looking at a major resource development project in all the circumstances of today. That is a quite firm and unequivocal statement of policy that I and my party believe is a rational approach that should be taken by any Government with the interests and welfare of the people of this community at heart. We are not just looking here and now in 1982 or in terms of short-term electoral gain. We are looking at the welfare of this State and its community well into the future and, as such, this indenture in its present form is not accepted. We must let the Select Committee do its work and then heed the advice that comes from its deliberations, to ensure that we do not tie ourselves in, as the Government seeks to do, into the future.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** This measure is one of the most important ever to have come before the South Australian Parliament. It represents a very real opportunity for South Australia to substantially broaden its economic base while at the same time providing direct assistance to existing industries. With the possible exception of Japan, most Western industrial economies are at present experiencing severe contraction. No-one is suggesting for a moment that South Australia can avoid the impact of this world-wide trend, which has been caused by factors outside the control or influence of any State Government—rising inflation, rising interest rates, and declining international markets. The O.E.C.D., in its latest forecast, points out that the Australian economy will feel the effects of these international difficulties throughout 1982. But it does give two specific areas of encouragement: a reasonably healthy consumer market, and continuing investment in resource development.

These are two areas in which South Australia can and must benefit. Our key manufacturing industries, particularly motor vehicles and white goods, must work aggressively in the local, interstate and overseas market place to maintain their existing levels of viability. These industries have already undergone major rationalisation, in South Australia in particular, making them more efficient and competitive. The rich petroleum and mineral wealth which we have in the North of the State must be developed, processed and marketed responsibly.

With the assistance of the hundreds of millions of dollars which resource development will ensure is spent in South Australia in the immediate future, the State can and will survive the current economic difficulties better than most others. Already the advantages of the massive growth in exploration and development which has taken place in the past 30 months are now beginning to reflect in South Australia's improved economic situation. Major economic indicators show clearly that South Australia is bearing the brunt of current difficulties better than are most States, and that that situation is improving.

The most significant development, of course, has been the liquids pipeline scheme now being built from the Cooper Basin to Stony Point. An indenture Bill giving the green light to that project was approved by this Parliament last year. In the Roxby Downs indenture Bill we have legislation with the potential to bring enormous additional benefits to



South Australia, benefits which would be the equal of the Cooper Basin project.

If the Roxby Downs mine is developed to its full capacity it will become South Australia's third billion-dollar resource-based project. One of those, the B.H.P. steel complex at Whyalla, was established following the passage of an indenture Bill through this Parliament in 1937. The far-reaching benefits of that agreement are still being felt throughout the South Australian economy today—45 years later. It was an agreement which spearheaded South Australia's post-war industrial boom.

B.H.P.'s decision to establish at Whyalla before the war has, in one way or another, affected every man, woman and child in South Australia. For example, B.H.P. has fixed assets in Whyalla worth a replacement value of almost \$1.2 billion. In the year ending May 1981, B.H.P. paid wages to South Australian workers totalling \$98 000 000. The company paid \$87 000 000 to South Australian supply firms in the same year. Payments to the State Government totalled \$10 600 000, mainly in electricity and water charges, payroll tax, and, of course, royalties. That type of benefit will continue to flow into South Australia from the B.H.P. Whyalla investment into the next century.

The same impact on the South Australian economy, and its inevitable financial benefits to people across the State, will be created by the billion dollar Cooper Basin liquids project. Roxby Downs has the potential to equal or even eclipse the enormous investment and returns of either Whyalla or the Cooper Basin. With the great leap forward achieved in the Cooper Basin project since 1980, and the promised investment in Roxby Downs, South Australia has the capacity to cushion the impact of that current international economic downturn, and to do it well. I would say that few States or countries in the world are in such a fortunate position as is South Australia at the present time.

Enormous progress has been made on the Cooper Basin liquids scheme since it received the unqualified backing of this Parliament only a few months ago. The benefits are already being felt in additional employment opportunities, both directly associated with the construction of the pipeline, and in vital support services. Similar short-term financial and employment advantages will flow to South Australia if further feasibility studies are carried out at Roxby Downs.

No-one in this Parliament can afford to let this extraordinary opportunity for economic advancement and stability be lost. Let there be no mistake at all, no misunderstanding. If this indenture Bill fails to win the support of this Parliament, the Roxby Downs project will be in jeopardy. This is not only my assessment, or the assessment of the public servants who have done so much to make the indenture a reality. The joint venturers, British Petroleum and the Western Mining Corporation, have made it quite clear. They said in a book published earlier this month:

... to proceed with investment in a project of this size could not be contemplated without such an agreement.

In other words, the developing companies have made absolutely clear that an indenture agreement ratified by this Parliament is essential before further significant feasibility studies can be carried out.

This indenture, let me make clear, is not something demanded by my Government. It was drawn up at the request of the joint venturers. They would seek no more and no less from any government, or whatever political persuasion. Anyone who suggests that the indenture Bill is an unnecessary political stunt is displaying an elementary ignorance of the issue before this Parliament. To ask the joint venturers to invest another \$50 000 000 on top of the \$50 000 000 already spent on further research without some guarantee of continuity is rather like asking a punter to lay a bet at the T.A.B. with no guarantee of collecting his

winnings if the horse he backed won a race. That is basically it. Equally, anyone who claims Roxby Downs does not have the potential to bring enormous short, medium and long-term benefits to this State has either failed to comprehend the sheer dimensions of the project or refuses to comprehend because of an outdated and dogmatic philosophical attitude not supported by the facts anywhere else in the world.

In the short-term this Bill will do three basic things: it will allow the joint venturers to confidently press ahead with further feasibility studies of the Roxby Downs ore body, knowing they have the backing of the State Parliament; it will guarantee at least that the other \$50 000 000 will be spent mainly in South Australia in the next three years; and it will guarantee the jobs of more than 200 people at present involved directly on the project in this State. Most of these jobs will be lost if this Bill fails to win the approval of Parliament.

But in the longer term, of course, the Bill will do much more. Although the precise financial benefits to South Australia are difficult to define, and the estimates vary from time to time, the indenture agreement virtually guarantees that, if the Roxby Downs project proceeds, royalties equivalent to something like \$30 000 000 a year (possibly more) will flow directly into the South Australian Treasury. It goes without saying that this money can and will be used to improve community facilities, to lift the standard of State services, and more importantly, because I think this is what South Australians demand and expect, to hold down taxes and charges. It is money that can and will be passed on to every man, woman and child in this State.

Let me turn to another obvious medium-term benefit. The developing companies have themselves predicted that the project will provide between 10 000 and 15 000 new and permanent jobs. The Leader makes great play of the varying estimates made in the past, but the companies themselves say there will be between 10 000 and 15 000 new and permanent jobs, of which 75 per cent will be in South Australia. Taking the most conservative estimate, that is 7 500 extra jobs in South Australia. The most optimistic estimate is that it would mean 11 250 new jobs.

These are jobs which could be taken by children now at school—our own children, our grandchildren, children who at the present time in the light of the current economic situation are not in any way guaranteed of a job. Those jobs are possible; they are potentially there. This legislation does not guarantee that those jobs will be created, and certainly it will not be in the immediate future. There are more feasibility studies to be carried out. That is the whole point, the whole principle.

We must get over this period of getting a feasibility study completed. We must spend the additional \$50 000 000 and then see what can be done about getting the project moving to create that scale of employment. We are talking about a project which offers South Australians guaranteed employment in the years to come, employment that we will not otherwise get. As many as 11 250 new and permanent employment opportunities could in fact be lost forever if this Bill is defeated in the coming weeks, and at a time when unemployment is unacceptably high across Australia (and I do not think anyone in any way would dispute this)—

**Mr Langley:** South Australia is worse.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am afraid the member for Unley is, as usual, a little out of touch and he has demonstrated it quite clearly. What is relevant is that those jobs could be lost forever if the Bill is defeated, and I believe that where unemployment is unacceptably high, not only in this State but throughout Australia and indeed throughout the Western World, that loss would be irresponsible and totally tragic for future generations.

If we could draw another comparison: if the lowest employment estimate of 7 500 jobs were added to South Australia's work force now, our rate of unemployment would fall to just 7 per cent, the present national average. Not only would we move down from the top of the ladder to second highest as we have done in the last three months, but with those jobs we would move right down to the Australian average and we would be well down that unemployment ladder. If in the optimistic estimate these 11 250 jobs could be injected into the work force, South Australia's unemployment rate would drop to 6.4 per cent, the lowest in the nation.

I am speaking hypothetically, and we know that, but the huge employment potential of Roxby Downs, although it will not be felt for several years, could be lost forever if this Bill fails and how any political Party or any individual who claims to have a genuine concern about unemployment could possibly ignore this opportunity for development, stability and prosperity is totally beyond my comprehension. Anyone in this Parliament who is undecided about supporting this Bill obviously must think hard and carefully examine his conscience and his true motives before voting for its defeat. Chances like this do not occur very often.

I am now heartened indeed to see the degree of community support which is building up in favour of Roxby Downs not only on the general public opinion poll level where a majority of people in South Australia are being shown to support the mining and development of Roxby Downs: only last evening the Port Augusta council—and I very much hope that the member for Stuart catches up on this—in a vote in open council gave its unanimous backing to the Roxby Downs concept. They recognise, particularly in this area—the Iron Triangle, an area of this State which has been under considerable economic pressure—the value of this project and are prepared to put their support on the line. I think we can say, too, that the Mayor of Port Pirie and his council are very much in favour of the Roxby Downs project going ahead. That has been made clear to the Government, and again—

**Mr Langley:** What about the lead poisoning?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Is the member for Unley really serious?

**Mr Langley:** I am.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Where is the lead poisoning in Roxby Downs?

**Mr Langley:** You were talking about Port Pirie, weren't you, Mr Premier?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I don't think he is with us.

**Mr Langley:** I don't think you are, either.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** I am paying tribute to those responsible members of local government and the representatives of their communities in the Iron Triangle who put the welfare of their people in terms of jobs and prosperity before any ideological political motives. We all realise that Roxby Downs is not the only major development either under way or in the advanced planning stage. The future in other areas, largely, I may say, because of the tireless efforts of this Government (no thanks to the efforts of the former Government), is extremely encouraging. The Cooper Basin liquids scheme I have already mentioned, and just in the last few days there have been even more encouraging discoveries of oil, and we have had further discoveries of coal. I notice the member for Mitchell suggested that the new Meekathara coal deposit could be developed as a project to match Roxby Downs. I sincerely trust that the honourable member will back his enthusiasm for both projects with a reasonable and positive vote on this issue, because if he supports the exploitation of coal deposits and the use of coal for the generation of electricity he will know that the use of coal to generate electricity has far greater

hazards and dangers to the people working on those projects and indeed to the general community in terms of sulphur dioxide, other fumes and radio-activity coming out of that smokestack than does the mining and processing of uranium.

Before the Roxby Downs indenture was introduced in this House, a number of unfortunate and ill-informed statements were made about its likely contents. I am rather surprised, now that the Leader of the Opposition has had an opportunity to examine the indenture, that he has perpetuated some of those ill-conceived and inaccurate statements even again this afternoon. It was said by members opposite that the infrastructure costs to the State would negate the royalty payments. This is total and absolute nonsense. The infrastructure programme has been clearly spelt out. The cost in 1981 dollars has been quite carefully set down in the indenture. The total of that infrastructure cost is \$50 000 000, and for the Leader of the Opposition and indeed any other member opposite to talk about an open-ended agreement on the infrastructure just proves that they do not understand the Bill.

It was said by the Labor Party that electricity would be supplied to the joint venturers at such cheap rates that domestic tariffs would be increased to compensate. Again, that is total nonsense. There is no question whatever of ordinary consumers in any way subsidising electricity supplies to the Roxby Downs project. It has been said that stamp duty exemptions would deprive the State of revenue paid by most other companies. Again, that is nonsense. Let me expand on that point as an illustration of the type of agreement which has been negotiated by this Government and is now being considered by this Parliament. The Western Australian Government granted a nine-year stamp duty exemption on normal commercial transactions to encourage development of the North West Shelf project. For eight other projects, including Ashton, Collie Coal, Yeelirrie, Agnew, Worsley, Mount Newman, Mount Goldsworthy, and Hamersley, the Western Australian Government granted seven-year exemptions from stamp duty on normal commercial transactions. In Queensland the State Government has gone one step further and granted open-ended stamp duty exemptions on normal commercial transactions. The loss of revenue to those two States because of those exemptions runs to millions of dollars. Presumably they thought it was worth it. No such exemption has had to be made by the South Australian Government to conclude this indenture agreement. If the Roxby Downs project goes ahead, and I am confident that it will, the additional revenue generated by this clause of the agreement alone will be considerable.

So far in the public and Parliamentary debate on the indenture Bill there has been no constructive criticism of the agreement that my colleague the Deputy Premier and officers of his department and other departments negotiated. The fact is that the agreement before the House has a massive potential for the State. It is an extraordinary agreement with enormous long-term advantages for every man, woman and child. It has the capacity to bring to South Australians jobs and prosperity which cannot be provided by any other development at present being considered.

The impact on South Australia if this legislation is defeated goes far beyond the mere Roxby Downs project. If the Bill is defeated South Australia would become a laughing stock in the eyes of interstate and international investors. They would find it almost incomprehensible that any Parliament, any State, or any community could cast aside a project which the *Financial Review* said could equal the Zambian copper belt.

Unfortunately, the Labor Party, both in this State and at a national level, has made equally misguided decisions on resource development in the past. In South Australia during the dark decade of the 1970s, Labor failed to attract

investment for one major new resource development. This, at a period in Australia's advancement when all other mainland States, particularly Queensland and Western Australia, were attracting hundreds of millions of dollars in investment capital. Indeed, when the whole investment scene in resource development in Australia was bounding ahead, South Australia lagged behind and did absolutely nothing. The record during those 10 years was absolutely appalling. The Labor Government sold off huge quantities of natural gas to New South Wales without taking the elementary step of ensuring long-term supplies for industrial and domestic consumers in this State. The Labor Party promised a petrochemical plant at Redcliff. It even wavered in about this position now in this House something called a letter of intent which we subsequently find never existed. Labor produced glossy reports in promising a uranium enrichment plant, and it failed to materialise. Of course, in mid-stream the A.L.P. suddenly did a complete policy about-face, and it is that decision which has led to today's ridiculous and unnecessary confusion and uncertainty about the passage of this Bill. It was a decision that was taken because of the perception and anticipation of the enormous thrashing that the Labor Party was to get at the 1975 Federal election. Something was thought necessary to pull the election out of the hat. A sudden stand and turn around on uranium! Let us bring the emotive issue into the 1975 election! That was the only reason that the former Premier did his turn-about. He saw the error of that turn-about when he came back from overseas determined to change the policy of the Australian Labor Party, and in a matter of a week or so he was no longer Premier of this State.

Between 1975 and 1977 Labor welcomed and encouraged the exploration and development of the Roxby Downs ore deposit. The Dunstan Government, and later the Corcoran Government, knew there were large quantities of uranium in the ore body. Predominantly, let us remember, it is made up of copper with some uranium, gold and rare earths. They raised no objection to the fact that uranium was in the ore body.

In 1977, Labor switched its policy. What had been white was suddenly black. What had been good was suddenly bad. In the intensity of the moment the policy was changed, banning uranium in almost all its forms. That policy remains. I suspect, of course, that there may be some change in that attitude when the Party meets again in June. Hopefully, that change will not be very long in being resolved. Yet, across this Chamber there are members who, I know, oppose that policy of a total ban on uranium. Members there are trapped by a political policy that they dare not defy. There are members who understand that Roxby Downs will be of immense economic value to this State.

There are members who know that it must go ahead but who would rebuff their own electorates and constituents rather than rebuff the Party. There are members who would fly in the face of their unions—the people who put them into Parliament—rather than reject what is clearly now an outmoded Party policy.

The Leader of the Opposition made a few points this afternoon, although nothing very much that was new. He said that much needed to be done, that this was really defining the extent of the feasibility study and that we should get on and allow the feasibility to go ahead. But he has totally ignored the quite clear condition that the developers are not going to spend that money unless they have some guarantee that they can make up their minds at the end of it, that they can use the findings, get on with the job and develop the mine. Why should they do anything else? He says that the Party will not stand against a proper investigation of the prospect. Again, he does not address himself to the fundamental stumbling block to that argument

that the developers will not spend money unless they know they have a reasonable chance of going on with the job.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** It's only natural.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Of course it is only natural. How on earth he expects them to go ahead with the feasibility study without spending more money and without an indenture, I just do not know. He alleges that the indenture is premature. He has criticised the extent to which statements have been made when a final commitment to mine has not been made.

I remind him of some of the extravagant statements made by a predecessor of his, Premier Dunstan, about the Redcliff project. He promised that it would be a world-class development. He promised that it would create thousands of jobs. As I said, he quoted a letter of intent. At least the Roxby Downs project has got to the indenture stage where we can sew up an agreement which will be binding on the developers and on the Government. We have got pieces of paper, an agreement and a contract, which is more than we ever had at Redcliff over a petro-chemical plant. Yet, from all the public statements that were made you would not realise it.

What has happened? The mangroves of Redcliff remain barren. There is no petro-chemical project coming at Redcliff. The Redcliff exercise at when the project was announced during the 1973 election campaign was a totally dishonest attempt by the Labor Party to suggest to the people of South Australia that it would attract major resource developments. There is far more commitment to Roxby Downs than there ever was to Redcliff. So much for the Leader's statements in relation to that matter.

The Leader has spoken today without authority or conviction. He has been put in a position of trying to placate both sides of a divided Party on this issue. He has brought up every stalling suggestion he can think of. His stance today is the latest in a series of conflicting and at times baffling attitudes that he has adopted on this crucial issue. He asks why did we change our minds. Both the Deputy Premier and I when overseas examined these matters and looked at the nuclear power industry and waste disposal in great detail. Did he, when he was overseas, go to one nuclear establishment to examine it for himself? No, he did not. He did not want to know about it.

There has been an alarming lack of consistency, direction and leadership in his approach to the Bill, both before and after it was introduced in this House. When its contents and the full benefit to South Australia were first revealed, the Leader said in a television debate that the A.L.P. would oppose the measure within hours of it being brought into this House. Within 24 hours he had reneged on that statement, saying instead that a decision on the Party's attitude would be made in due course. That pattern of indecision has persisted right up until today, and we have heard a very weak and blustery attempt to cover it up. With that background it is reasonable to assume that what the Leader says today will not necessarily apply tomorrow, next week, next month or at the time of the Party's annual meeting or when the final vote is taken in this House. There is equally no guarantee that the way the Leader votes will automatically be followed to the man or woman in another place. I am hopeful that common sense and responsibility will prevail, because this project is one of a series now emerging which can help South Australia ride out the world-wide economic difficulties.

By itself, Roxby Downs would not mean boundless wealth or instant prosperity, but in harness with other projects, particularly the Cooper Basin Development, it would give this State an enormous advantage over most regions in the world. It would bring in enormous additional revenue, create

new and permanent jobs, assist existing industries, and attract new firms and investment to South Australia.

Opportunities like this occur only once in a lifetime. To turn our backs on the change now would have a detrimental impact on this State which would be felt into the next century. We must seize our chance now. I commend this Bill to the House.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I take it that the honourable member for Mitchell is the lead speaker for the Opposition?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. We have just been subjected to an amazing speech by the Premier of this State, which was read, word for word (and that is his prerogative if he so wishes), and which was delivered in a monotone—for almost all of the time except towards the end—talking about a project that he says is the most exciting thing to happen in South Australia's history, something that we dare not let go and something that is so vital. That was the best effort that the Premier was able to offer. However, despite the difficulty of listening to his delivery, I made a note of a number of points that the Premier believes he made.

One of the things to which the Premier referred was infrastructure cost that will be met by the State. The Premier said that my Leader, in his speech earlier, had not understood the indenture and was wrong in suggesting that the figure of \$50 000 000, which is the sum that the items listed add up to, is not the end figure. The Premier said, 'Of course it is; it is there, and obviously the Leader does not understand the indenture.' I do not know whether you, Mr Deputy Speaker, have had the opportunity to read the document which was circulated by the Minister of Mines and Energy and which has been made available for study and to assist in the understanding of this fairly complex indenture. Under the heading 'infrastructure costs', the Government's own document states:

The State shall pay the cost of providing certain specified facilities, services and infrastructure up to a level appropriate to provide for the needs of 9 000 persons connected directly with the project or the provision of any public or other services to such persons and their dependants. For a town of 9 000 people, these costs are estimated to be about \$50 000 000.

It refers not to the total of \$50 000 000 but to an estimate of \$50 000 000. That was the point made by the Leader when he spoke in the debate earlier. There is a danger that those costs will escalate. From my reading of the indenture, I cannot ascertain a statement that the costs will not increase. There are provisions in the indenture for interchanging those items, for disagreements between the State and the joint venturers as to whether they will accept a particular item, and for either party to suggest changes. This is not subject to arbitration, and if it is limited to \$50 000 000 I wonder why the Minister of Mines and Energy did not include this information in the *aide-memoire* he so kindly provided for members.

The Premier, in his dismal effort, also referred to the use of coal and suggested that, because of a statement I made on radio at Port Pirie about Meekathara coal, if I supported that sort of development I should support this development, because the use of coal in generating electricity constitutes a greater risk than using uranium for the same purposes and involves a number of hazards. I do not quarrel with part of that statement: there are hazards associated with the generation of electricity from coal. As to which one is worse, however, we need to know a little more history before we could be quite sure about which will turn out more dangerous. What is important now is that the World Coal Organisation recognised these problems a long time ago, and over two years ago, after two years of study of the problems associated with the uses of coal, it produced

a document, blueprints, and rules on how to cut down and eliminate many of those hazards.

That material is available for anyone to read in a report called 'Wocol', which has been available for some time. I quoted from that document in this House on one occasion when the member for Newland ventured down the dangerous track in endeavouring to prove what a beautiful substance uranium is in relation to the generation of electricity. The honourable member went almost to the brink, and I pointed out that the very next step he would take would be to advocate the use of uranium in South Australia. Wisely, from his point of view, the honourable member recognised where he was going and did not proceed any further down that track.

Many of the problems associated with coal are now well known and methods to improve safeguards are in existence, feasible and proven. I would have thought that the Premier might be aware that measures in this respect are currently being upgraded in the power station at Port Augusta, which I visited only the other day in concert with other members of my Party. One of the projects in progress there is upgrading the chimney arrangements to eliminate some of the emissions that are presently discharged from those stacks. I do not wish to dwell for too long on what the Premier said, because much of his speech was not necessarily inaccurate. It was a statement of the economic scene world wide, if you like (I suppose we would call that macro-economics); it was a statement of the economic scene Australia-wide (mini-economics, if you like); and finally he got down to the situation in South Australia, which I suppose is micro-economics in today's jargon.

The Premier stated that today's economic situation world wide is not good, one can find out easily enough that that is so. The Premier also said that things do not look like improving very much in the near future, and that is also known on the world scene. It is certainly true in Australia. Statements made by bodies in this area in the first quarter of this year have been one long tale of gloom. It has been postulated that we will have a very bad year in regard to sales prospects. Car sales are down, and there are the figures in regard to employment prospects. The Premier was attempting in some way to link an activity that will take place, almost certainly, in the next decade to present problems in South Australia and to suggest—or, as my old friend the former member for Ross Smith would have said, infer—that therein lies the cure for the present economic ills of South Australia.

That is just not so, but that is not to suggest that there is not some palliative measure in an expenditure of \$50 000 000 over two, three, or four years, or whatever it turns out to be. Of course, there would be. But is that the only criterion we are supposed to adopt to work out whether, if someone wants to spend some money in this State, we should grab it? Are there no other factors to take into account, such as the well-being of citizens—of those mugs who might be paid some of that \$50 000 000 for doing work that may endanger their health for the rest of their time on this earth? Is that what the Premier was suggesting? I would like to believe that he was not suggesting that, that he was simply caught by the fact that he was reading from a prepared brief and did not have time to assimilate it. Let us be charitable and concede that.

The Premier then went on to speak of the indenture and the liquids scheme associated with it at Stony Point. By linking the two together, his aim was to show that, 'There you are, we have all agreed to that one, and it is under way: why not agree to this one, too?' What kind of logic is that? What type of expectation is that? Is the Premier saying that that is the way he thinks out these things, or is he suggesting that we ought to do that? I can tell the

Premier that we on this side of the House do not work that way. We are trying to give our best consideration to a matter in which we have a policy which my Leader has given to the House today and in which we firmly believe and support. Yet it is not a shut-gate policy, as is well demonstrated by the facts and as was shown to the House when the correspondence by the Minister of Mines and Energy was tabled, which indicated that during the previous Government's term certain arrangements were entered into in relation to exploration and further work at what was usually called Roxby Downs but which is sometimes called Olympic Dam and the Stuart Shelf area generally.

However, the Labor Party has a very justified caution in the area of uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle, a caution shared by a very large number of people throughout the world. It is not my purpose to outline those for and against it, but I am simply suggesting that we have a policy that states that we are entitled to be cautious and careful about a material which has had limited use in industry, in the production of electricity, and which has also been used for war purposes, in the form of nuclear weapons, with horrendous results.

The Labor Party is saying that everything on that scene is not as it should be, and that is the reason why we have the policy that was enunciated today. We know that that is a sensible and consistent policy. I do not understand what the Premier was on about today when he suggested that there was some kind of a split or division on this side. I do not know where he gets his mail from, because it is quite wrong. Certainly, there is discussion on our policy within our ranks; there is discussion on our policy within the whole of our Party. That is the way the show works, and it is democratic. We have conventions where delegates can put forward views in an endeavour to change any of our policies and, if they can get the necessary support, the policies are changed.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you supporting the Bill or not?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Minister of Agriculture has been out of the House, and the House seemed to prosper by that. I do not know whether he plans to leave again, because we have made some progress. I think that the Minister of Mines and Energy would also suggest that, if we had fewer interjections, he might be able to understand the gravamen of my argument. However, I will not be put off by the Minister of Agriculture, who, for a start, is speaking from out of his place. He has been here long enough to know that he ought not to be doing that.

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin):** Order! The Chair will decide those matters.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I was certain that you would, Sir. The Labor Party has arrived at a policy to which we have given full consideration: that policy has not prevented at least the early stages of the very sort of activity that the Minister and the Premier claim we are seeking to prevent. I refer to the correspondence file that the Minister tabled in this House, which begins on 7 May 1979. It shows quite clearly that at that time Western Mining had some concern about its future rights and its tenure in relation to a find. That is what it comes down to. If one reads the interchange of correspondence between the then Premier, Mr Corcoran, and the Western Mining principal, Mr Morgan, we see that there evolved a statement of intention on the part of both parties. It began in a letter dated 7 May 1979 to Mr H. M. Morgan, of Western Mining, sent and signed by the Premier of that time, Des Corcoran. It stated:

I am writing with regard to discussions you have had with the Minister of Mines and Energy concerning the Olympic Dam deposit and your concern to establish security of tenure over areas presently subject to exploration licence.

It went on in some detail to set out what that was. It then continued:

Specifically with regard to the Olympic Dam project area, which area has yet to be defined, the Government will recognise your company's prior right to acquire mining tenements. That the right to acquire mining tenements provided for in subparagraph (b) above will remain in force until such time as a viable mining operation is proven to the satisfaction of the Minister of Mines and Energy in consultation with W.M.C. Limited and any other participant in the project, taking into account normal commercial considerations and any conditions imposed in the light of Government policy with regard to uranium.

That was the statement in relation to a viable mining operation. Up to that point there were no worries in governmental and legal terms. That is a written statement.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Whom was that signed by?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Des Corcoran, and it was written to Mr Morgan. The letter of 28 May from Western Mining to the Hon J. D. Corcoran stated:

The references in paragraphs (a) through (d) of your letter to the acquisition by the company of mining tenements encompass the exclusive right of the company to apply for and be granted exploration licences—

and get this one—

mining leases or retention leases as is appropriate in the circumstances prevailing at the relevant time.

There we have recognition by Western Mining that at the time the Government made certain undertakings on which the company could rely. Western Mining went on to say:

After taking into consideration the South Australian Government's recognition of the prior right of the company referred to above . . .

So, there is no doubt about who has the rights in the matter—it has been flung backwards and forwards in letters as far back as 1979. We see prior right, tenure, mining leases—all the words that have the real meaning in this area. In speaking today my Leader has pointed out that later correspondence clearly indicated that the intention was for indenture discussions to take place at the time when the show was a viable mining operation. When is that time? When is it going to be a viable mining operation? To me, that time is clearly at the end of the study time. I use that term carefully, because there have been so many words coming into jargonistic use today that one needs to be careful. If we look at the words used by the Minister in his second reading speech it can be seen that he uses words such as prefeasibility. I take it that that is the stage that comes before feasibility, and presumably feasibility is the stage that comes before production, if we are talking about an operation where we are going to do something. I think one would be entitled to arrive at the conclusion that there is a time when it is sensible to talk about the sorts of things that are contained in this indenture.

That is not to say that Western Mining, the joint venturers, do not have a right to seek more and to seek it earlier. That is what they have done; I do not quarrel with that. I do not have to look after Western Mining's interests; I am here to look after the interests of the people of South Australia and I thought the Government was here to do that but apparently, because the Government is in difficulties in this State, we are looking at a political matter. We are not assessing the indenture because the Government was forced into this position by Western Mining: it is happening because the Government is so shaky and tottery, it is going so badly outside, that it knows it has not a hope in hell of staying in office unless it can come up with a gimmick.

That is what is going on, and I hope the people of South Australia can see that. Members will notice that I am not criticising the joint venturers. They are in business and it is their job to look after their shareholders. If they can see an opportunity and an avenue, quite rightly they have set out to take it. What is even worse, I feel, is that they will have got it, if we accept the indenture as it now stands,

because the indenture commits the State of South Australia to have to come to the party before the table is even set. The joint venturers are not required to do anything beyond 1984 other than continue the sort of work they have been doing. I am not belittling that. I refer to putting down a shaft, and so on, and the associated drilling programme. That has been quite an enterprise and they have done that.

The requirement for them is that by 1987 they get under way. It sounds reasonable, but if they do not want to get under way they get a two-year extension. There is nothing in there about a two-year extension for the State of South Australia. If they do not want to get under way then, they can get another two-year extension. I understand there are little curly bits tied up with it, but we cannot get away from the fact that that is the situation on one side of the bargain. I can understand Western Mining battling to get that in there. What are we talking about? We are talking about a metals project, which everyone agrees, from the metal markets of today can be a great project but not now at the prices which are available. I have not heard the Minister or the Premier suggest that the prices available at the present time for the commodities concerned are such that there is great pressure to get on with this project straight away.

We have not heard it from the joint venturers, either; I would not expect it from such wise business people as the principals in those companies to be putting forward that argument, because it would not be sustainable. We are talking about a project which may eventuate, which is likely to eventuate, but it is quite a way off. The question is how far the State should have to go and be tied up in order to ensure that the possibility may still be there in the future. Is it reasonable to give tenure and prior right to and recognise the special position of the joint venturers? Yes. The answer to that is obvious; there is nothing wrong with that. There is no quarrel. It began in 1979 anyway, before this Government dreamed it would be in office and fell in as it did—first past the post. That was a surprise to all, but that is another story.

I believe that the Government has been led into the position where, as far as I can determine from my study of the indenture, there is more committal on one side than on the other. I have not even picked up the indenture yet, except in one case to demonstrate how the Premier completely misunderstood information that ought to have been readily available to him from his own Minister. There are very many provisions in the indenture with which I do not think any member would quarrel.

Developers and entrepreneurs in major projects, where the funds we are talking about are extremely large, have rights in the matter, too; they cannot be expected to be doing all these things on spec, although they do a lot of it on spec. All of these organisations have to work that way quite often to go out into the exploration field. There are requirements on licences; they have to spend at a certain rate and carry out the requirements of Governments, and so on. That can be at a stage where they have not got a nickel in sight, not to make a pun, in terms of possible finds.

The company we have been speaking about today went out and did some of those things, and, I understand, went against all the geological knowledge that had been accepted up to that time, and the company made an important find. The size of the find is not defined even now. Here we are going to tie South Australia up for, as the Premier said in his litany earlier, 'your children and mine and their children' so he is quite willing to tie up the State for 50 years before the right phase is reached. That is the whole gravamen of my argument, and the Leader made that clear, too.

We are prepared to support the Bill and the indenture to the second reading stage, at which time, because of its nature, it goes to a Select Committee. I believe that would be acceptable to the joint venturers. They would understand the reasoning from our side that would be applied there. Certainly, we will be seeking to make amendments. I notice that statements were made in the press by a Mr Morgan, and I think on another occasion by another principal concerned, that there was no possibility of any alteration to the indenture as such. My understanding is that it is not common for that to occur. I also understood that the Parliamentary process took into account such changes could be made, albeit that they may be difficult. Of course, in the way that these things come before the House in company with the ratifying Bill, there are opportunities to amend the Bill. That will be in the hands of the Select Committee and certainly in the hands of this House at the time when the report of the Select Committee comes back here.

To me, the whole scene can only be politically inspired because I do not believe the joint venturers would have felt they would have been so fortunate as to get this degree of commitment from the State, considering the position the project is in at this time, unless the Government was so tottery and jittery that it was trying desperately to come up with something it could put to the people of this State to rescue it from the position it is in. However, as I said earlier, they are going down the tube and it takes a lot of stopping. I had some experience of that in 1979. If the Minister would suggest that I am not sticking to the facts, I can quote his own words. He did not hesitate to pick up the point I was making. He states in his second reading explanation:

The essence of the undertakings was the recognition of the joint venturer's right to secure their mining tenements until such time as a viable mining operation is proved.

He picked up the very same words to demonstrate, in his second reading explanation, the situation that applied. My understanding of what the company is going to do in the next two or three years is to continue further proving, evaluating, testing, horizontal and vertical shaft driving, more drilling, completion of the shaft itself, and so on.

That will take time and money, and of course the joint venturers want some security before spending additional money. The first \$50 000 000, I think, was paid over for use and the second \$50 000 000 has to be borrowed by Western Mining, with the assistance of B.P. It is not easy to get hold of \$50 000 000, even in the resources boom, so they were looking for further security. As my Leader has pointed out, if an indenture or an agreement came before the House to provide for that tenure, we think that that would have been far more sensible at this time. The tenure could have been given for the long period without trying to negotiate arrangements to the extent of those contained in the indenture.

How can that be justified? The Minister has not justified it in his second reading explanation. He may think that he has, but I can assure him that he has not. I have read it many times and I have discussed it with others. Saying that it is wanted does not demonstrate that fact, and I wonder whether the Minister is aware of that. I believe, as does the Opposition, that the indenture is up too early. If we look at the indenture, we see that it shows evidence of some haste in itself. Once again, I am indebted to the Minister for providing this excellent resume of the provisions of the indenture, and the explanation that he has made available suggests that it is the explanation of the clauses of the indenture. Page 4 of the Minister's explanatory document contains a reference to codes. Clause 10 of the indenture is referred to as follows:



Compliance with radiation protection codes: The joint venturers are to observe specified radiation codes, standards and recommendations and any laws of the State or the Commonwealth that may be introduced in relation to any matter contained in any such codes, standards or recommendations. These codes include codes both present and to be promulgated by nationally and internationally recognised scientific authorities.

If that is so, I am surprised that we see no reference in the indenture to the NIOSH Report and the codes contained therein which specify far more stringent requirements in relation to radiation exposure than are contained in the Australian codes quoted in the indenture. I understand that the National Institute of Occupation Safety and Health, in the United States of America, has an excellent standing in this area, and the information and research that has gone into the production of the standards it suggests is such that to date few people have questioned those standards. One would have thought that there might have been provision in that respect.

My reading of the indenture suggests that whatever is contained in the indenture and the updating amendments in relation to radiation protection is the be-all and end-all of it. There is a provision elsewhere in the indenture specifically prohibiting the introduction of any other standards which may be more stringent than are those already specified. I have paraphrased to some extent—

**Mr Keneally:** There is no Minister of the House on a measure of this importance.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I suppose the Minister can be excused. Sometimes, when we have to go we have to go, and I would be the last to prevent him attending to those calls that occasionally arise.

**Mr Keneally:** A Minister in the House—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Wherever one looks in the indenture document, there are areas that do not appear totally satisfactory, on any reading. If we turn to page 5 of the instruction document, which is quite useful, and without having to dive into the indenture itself (and I have cross-referenced these so that they refer to the correct clauses of the indenture), we find the following statement:

If the joint venturers locate any underground water source the State shall grant a special water licence permitting the joint venturers to draw water to satisfy the minesite water requirements together with a quantity of water sufficient to meet the needs of the township appropriate to the base production.

I understand that we are referring to the artesian basin, and the Federal Bureau of Mineral Resources has published papers in the past 18 months drawing attention to the extreme importance of this vast area of fossil water, and pointing out how careful the country must be as a whole, let alone South Australia, in making any inroads of the volume concerned in a major development in the area. This is not a shot at Western Mining or at the joint venturers, but that is one area in which we have no indication of what consideration was given to such an important matter.

I suggest that the Minister, when he reads it (because he is not here to listen to it), could well look at what occurred in Phoenix, in the United States, where a large artesian basin was tapped and is now, I understand, beyond recovery in the foreseeable future. The Minister may care to give us more information on that. That is not derogatory to the involvement of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

It might be reasonable to point out to the Minister that, in the second reading explanation, he proudly referred to the long and arduous period of negotiation (about eight months) with officers from various departments and instrumentalities, as well as his own people, being involved in long and protracted negotiations, yet we are expected to understand and speak on this matter in a fortnight. I trust

that we can do it justice, from both sides of the House, when we consider such limitations. The Minister has requested clarification of points made by my Leader regarding areas where amendments can be made.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** I know what he said.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Very well. It is too soon, in the probable life span of this project, in fairness to both parties, for a total commitment to be entered into. As I have said, it is likely that there will be a project in that area, certainly in the next decade. In his second reading explanation, the Minister supported that. He said this:

This is a remarkable deposit in terms of size of contained metals and mineralogy, and it appears to be unique genetically. It is quite unlike any known ore body.

He went on to talk about the mineralisation generally, the strata, and so on, and what it is comprised of, and I do not quarrel with that. From what I have heard, I agree; that would support the need for a further period of work (and perhaps that is a better word than 'study', 'feasibility', or whatever) before a full evaluation is made. The next step in such a project could then be launched: that is, to look at the economics of production. That term would cover more words than I do not need to say in relation to prices, demand, and so on. When he sums up, the Minister will need to adduce facts that he has not yet put before us to support his argument that the indenture is needed.

I notice that this booklet is entitled *The Olympic Dam Project*. I saw the film which I thought suffered slightly because, while it was pointed out that the money would be spent in South Australia, I noticed that the film was produced in Sydney, if one would believe the credits that appeared at the end of it. Apparently all the money in association with this project is not being spent in South Australia. In that booklet a statement is made that Western Mining Corporation already has agreements of a similar type with the Government of Western Australia relating to mineral developments. I do not doubt that, but they are not entirely similar because when I checked the royalty proposals in this indenture I found that the royalty arrangements which apply are those contained in the Western Australia Mining Act. It appears as though some special arrangements have been entered into here.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** We got a better deal.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** That remains to be seen. The funny thing about royalties is that we can only find out what a good deal we have made when we start collecting them. They are still a long way off, I can assure the Minister about that. Even the Premier today—

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** They will be further off if you have your way.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** That may be the Minister's opinion but I would have thought that the Minister would have been reasonable and pleased at the news that he has had so far that we are prepared to support the Bill to the Select Committee stage. I would have thought also that it was reasonable of us to put forward in outline some amendments we might be seeking to move.

**Mr Keneally:** That is what the Parliamentary system is all about. The Deputy Premier seems to forget that.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** You fellows are thrashing around trying to find out where to jump.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The Minister has done his best and he is now being his usual charming self. He has told us before that he is Mr Nice Guy. We are still waiting for him to demonstrate that. I would suggest at this stage that, since the Bill will be going to the Select Committee, any further scanning of the clauses of the Bill and the indenture is not required. However, one clause of the indenture that concerns me is clause 52, which relates to derogating legislation. The explanation states:



If the State Parliament enacts legislation which derogates from the rights or increases the obligations of the joint venturers or reduces the obligations of the State the joint venturers shall have the right to terminate the indenture and to require any special tenements to be converted to a tenement under the Mining Act.

That is a strong provision which almost reminds one of a provision in the old Broken Hill Proprietary indenture which provided something like, 'Nothing in the Act can be changed without the consent of the company'. I understood that, now that we are living in a more enlightened age, the moguls of business and industry and mining would have had a different attitude towards the legislative process and some allowances would have been made for that. A first reading of that clause of the indenture seems to imply hands off, lay off, or else. That is probably not an unfair interpretation of what that clause means. Clause 33 of the indenture says that there will be no special taxes. The explanation states:

The joint venturers will not be subject to any discriminatory State "resources tax" or other special tax or levy in relation to the sale of product or the conduct of a project under the indenture.

What is discriminatory? I am trying to point out that the indenture could perhaps do with some tidying up, because from our experience in Parliament it is known that some words have led to problems with other legislation. There is a reference to the granting of exploration licences for the balance of the area. Would I be correct in assuming that this would be one of the greatest finder's fees ever offered? It is stated that:

Upon selection of the selected areas and grant of the special exploration licences, the State is to grant the Western Mining Corporation an exploration licence under the Mining Act for the balance of the Stuart Shelf for a period of six months.

It goes on to say that during that time Western Mining Corporation can nominate further areas up to 3 000 square kilometres, and so on, in which it will gain further benefits. The Minister may enlighten us on whether that this is a kind of finders fee that will be available to Western Mining. The Minister may also like to enlighten us on the sort of arrangements that apply in other Acts of this nature in other States.

As was indicated by my Leader, the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill to the second reading stage, which will be followed by the Select Committee. We do believe that amendments ought to be made on behalf of the people of South Australia. The types of amendments and the number of them have been outlined by the Leader and, when we get to the Select Committee stage, other information that comes forward to that committee may suggest further amendments. At this stage, in the terms I have indicated, I support the Bill.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am very pleased to take part in this particular debate and to make clear from the outset that not only do I support the second reading but that I intend to support the Bill through the total Parliamentary process. I believe the indenture agreements which the Minister has been able to produce is one for which the Government can take a great deal of credit.

We have listened this afternoon to a weak attempt by the Labor Party to get itself off the barbed wire fence, because for some time we have had the Leader of the Opposition making all sorts of irresponsible statements about there being no need for an indenture Bill. He claimed it was a political stunt and he thrashed around at great length endeavouring to extricate himself from the difficult position in which he found himself. He has had to placate the member for Elizabeth, who has been the real power behind the scenes in this particular exercise.

In coming to the conclusions I have reached in relation to the need to develop this project, I have watched this particular enterprise develop from its early stage. As hon-

ourable members will be aware, the project is situated within my district. It has already brought considerable benefits to the people in the northern part of my district, particularly to Andamooka and to a lesser extent to Woomera. Having had the opportunity on two occasions of looking at this particular question overseas, I find it difficult to understand why the Labor Party has adopted the stance that it has adopted. I had the opportunity to visit many of the places that Premier Dunstan visited in 1979. I had the opportunity to discuss with those people at those installations what Mr Dunstan had said. I took with me a copy of his speech and when I showed it to them they were absolutely amazed that he could come up with those conclusions, in view of the discussions and the comments that were made by Premier Dunstan at that particular time.

It is extraordinary to think that the Labor Party, which has for so long expressed so-called concern for the lack of employment opportunities in this State and throughout Australia, is now prepared to stand in the way of one of the most significant developments that has been put before the public and the Parliament in a long time. Now its members are claiming that this enterprise will not create many jobs.

**Mr Keneally:** Will supporting the Bill at the second reading stand in the way of this project?

**Mr GUNN:** I will be delighted if the member for Stuart and his colleagues here and in another place support the third reading. For a long time we have witnessed the Labor Party stepping from foot to foot. The Leader has attempted to follow Fred Astaire in that regard. Reality has now caught up with the Leader and his colleagues. The day is fast coming when they will have to clearly inform the people and the Parliament where they stand on this Bill and the indenture. It is interesting to examine their attitude in Opposition. But I think for a few moments one could reflect on the comments Labor members made while they were in Government in this State and in the Commonwealth. I have here some interesting information which I have previously quoted outside this place but which is worth while quoting to the House. In a statement made by then Premier Dunstan in the *News* on 24 October 1974 he said:

We will press for the establishment of the plant in South Australia if we have the conditions required. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

The following report appeared on 4 November 1974:

Talks between the Prime Minister, Mr Whitlam, and the Japanese Prime Minister are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Mines Minister Mr Hopgood said today he was more confident than ever South Australia would get the massive plant.

That is, the uranium enrichment plant. On 13 May 1974 the *News* reported:

Mr Connor announced a feasibility study into the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the Northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

In the *News* of 27 September 1974 we see the following:

The Premier Mr Dunstan said today he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium smelting plant in the Northern Territory would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia.

In the *Advertiser* on 17 October 1974 it was reported:

The Premier said yesterday that overseas interests had been told they could achieve significant economies in establishing a plant in South Australia.

Then on 5 November 1974 Mr Hopgood, then Minister of Mines and Development and now shadow Minister for Environment and Planning, said:

Mr Connor is awfully keen on letting us have Redcliff as well. He has made that pretty clear to most people I have talked to.

I felt I should bring those interesting statements to the House's attention. Then at the Federal level we have the distinguished member, normally the architect of gloom, the

current shadow Minister (Mr Hurford) saying on 14 April 1972:

Uranium exports in whatever form could be highly profitable for this country; with proper taxation policies there could be enormous benefits for everyone who lives here.

Mr Keating said on 2 June 1975:

Since we have taken over the administration of the policy of this area, particularly with respect to uranium, we have said that we intend to export as much of it as we can.

Other statements were made, particularly by Mr Hawke, which I do not think it necessary to quote. They are interesting, but we are all aware that it would appear from his comments that Mr Hawke is a strong supporter of the mining and export of uranium.

This Bill sets out to put beyond doubt to all concerned that this Government and the people of this State want to avail themselves of the benefits of this very large resource which is established in my electorate. It was clear to people observing Mr Dunstan when he went overseas in his final episode as Premier that he believed that the State should benefit from those resources. However, while he was away we had the interesting spectacle of at least two Ministers making comments which were obviously designed to undermine his authority.

We had the now member for Elizabeth and the former Chief Secretary, Mr Simmons, making public statements contrary to the views of the then Premier. The Leader of the Opposition has indicated from time to time that it is not necessary to have an indenture Bill. I find that a rather amazing attitude for a person who sets himself up as the alternative Premier of this State. If anyone is going to make a significant investment, he wants the most secure contract that he can enter into so that the funds invested can be protected. I would like to ask the member for Stuart, who appears to be the senior member of the Labor Party present in the House on this occasion, where he and his colleagues stand if the Government will not accept his Party's amendments.

**Mr Keneally:** It is a scandalous proposition you were suggesting that you would do that to development in South Australia, that you would oppose reasonable amendments. I am disgusted to hear it.

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Stuart is obviously—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Eyre would appreciate a little less audible comment.

**Mr GUNN:** I was posing the question of where does the Labor Party stand in relation to the passage of this legislation. The Leader, in endeavouring to explain his position, and the member for Mitchell talked about substantial amendment to the Bill. They know as well as members on this side know that it would be most unlikely that the Government would accept any amendment, particularly significant amendments. They know full well that this indenture agreement is one of the most significant agreements which has been reached for a long time with an organisation prepared to develop this State. If they had done their homework and read the agreement, if they were honest with themselves and the public, they would agree that the Government has come up with a document of which it can be proud. They should have done their homework and looked at all the issues, taking care of the problems that are likely to arise.

It is not the case, as the Leader was attempting to make out on a previous occasion, that we were having trouble. The Government was criticised when it said it would bring in an indenture. When there were delays in negotiations Labor Party members were saying we could not reach agreement. When they got the indenture they still were not satisfied. It is really a pathetic attempt by the Labor Party to endeavour to hide from the people of this State problems

they are having within their own ranks in relation to this project.

Why did not the Leader, as the alternative Premier, say to the people of this State, those who are unemployed and a little down, 'We are going to permit this project to go ahead; your jobs are secure; there is no need to worry'? Recently, I have been in that part of my electorate that is involved. The people at Andamooka, as I said earlier, have achieved considerable benefits from that project. Many of them have jobs there, and the numbers in the school have increased considerably. Although there were real problems, benefits are being felt in that community already and the project has hardly got off the ground. We all know that the benefits will be significant. In view of the contradictions the Labor Party has made from the time that it was in Government, when one compares the statements its members have made now no wonder the developers want a secure and lasting agreement to protect their investment, particularly when there was such divided opinion on the competence of the Leader of the Opposition to discharge his responsibilities. The Leader sets himself up as the alternative Premier, yet his own colleagues cast such reflections on him.

**Mr Keneally:** Speakers' notes, page 63.

**Mr GUNN:** Obviously, members opposite do not like what I am saying. They are trying to prevent me from continuing. I have 17 minutes left, and I am quite happy to proceed. A letter dated 11 August 1981 from Mr Norman Foster M.L.C., to the Leader of the Opposition stated:

For the second time in just two weeks, I write to you in an endeavour to persuade you to consult and convene a meeting of your Parliamentary colleagues on matters of concern and which must be the final decision of those elected to the Parliamentary Labor Party. You have once again demonstrated your weakness and gross misinterpretation of authority and understanding of leadership and its responsibilities bestowed upon you. Your manner of round-about politics and your misunderstanding of the 'authority' to which you gave priority is unforgiveable and it is divisive.

We know it is divisive. That letter was written by Mr Norman Foster, a spokesman for the Labor Party, a person who has a lot to say on a number of subjects. Then we have the spectacle of the member for Elizabeth as reported on 14 August 1981 when he accused the Leader of the Opposition of treachery and impropriety. He made his claims in a four-page statement that was read to a press conference at Parliament House yesterday morning. Mr Duncan told reporters he no longer regarded Mr Bannon as a suitable Leader for the A.L.P. and that Mr Bannon did not have his support.

No wonder the Labor Party is not in a position to state a definite policy on this matter. It is pretty obvious that the Leader's comments do not have the support of Mr Duncan and those members who are under his umbrella and who support him. It is fairly obvious that there is an official Leader of the Opposition and a *de facto* Leader—the member for Elizabeth. The question that should be asked is, 'Who is the spokesman on this matter?' A fortnight ago when this Bill was introduced and there was a great deal of press interest in the document, the Leader made a number of comments, and conflicting statements have been made from day to day since then.

It was interesting to note that the press sought the views of the member for Elizabeth to ascertain where he stood on this issue. It was also interesting to note that the press recognised that the member for Elizabeth had some influence in relation to these matters within the Labor Party. The honourable member opposite appears to have some pains in his stomach, from the expression on his face. However, I relapse that, because he sits next to the member for Elizabeth, at times he is placed in a difficult position in knowing just where his allegiance lies.

I want to return briefly to the project. The member for Elizabeth referred to an excellent publication which was put out by the Western Mining Corporation called *The Olympic Dam Project*.

**Mr Keneally:** You need your speaker's notes.

**Mr GUNN:** For the honourable member's benefit, I point out that I do not need speaker's notes. I could speak for a long time without speakers notes, and in the limited time available to me I have a lot to say. The member for Stuart should lift his efforts in this matter. I know that the honourable member is in conflict with the local government authorities in his area on this issue, as he is on a number of other issues. It is a pity that he does not represent the interests of his constituents. On page 22 of the document, under the heading 'The Indenture Agreement', it is stated:

This agreement, between the Government of South Australia and the joint venture is to be incorporated in a Bill for consideration by State Parliament. It permits the Olympic Dam joint venturers to carry out development of the project, commits them to pay for services provided by the State on an agreed basis, to pay royalties to the State on minerals produced and to bear certain costs related to public infrastructure in the area. It commits the State to allow the joint venturers to proceed with the construction and operation and to continue operation during the economic lifetime of the mineral resource.

Western Mining Corporation already has agreements of a similar type with the Government of Western Australia relating to mineral developments, and the South Australian Government already has similar agreements with other industries in the State. As earlier mentioned, to proceed with investment in a project of this size could not be contemplated without such an agreement. The agreement is also important as a reassurance to lenders, contractors and, later, to buyers of its products, that the project has the backing of government.

I believe that that brief explanation makes clear that no-one would be prepared to invest large sums of money in any project unless there was a water-tight agreement. From time to time the Leader of the Opposition has put forward the proposition that Western Mining Corporation will have difficulty selling the uranium from the project. I believe that the European energy authorities that I visited last August are looking to Australia as a reliable country, one which is politically stable and one to which they are looking to diversify their supplies of uranium. These authorities could purchase supplies from other countries, but they made very clear that, they believed that even with the conditions which we attach to the sale of uranium, which are by far the most stringent of any country, it would be in their long-term interests to enter into contracts with the State and Federal Governments to obtain and guarantee their supplies.

There is no doubt that, if those countries are to be able to meet the demand for electricity (particularly in Europe), they will have to develop their nuclear power generating capacity. France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan could not continue to meet the increasing demand for cheap electricity without having available long-term contracts for uranium. The United Kingdom has commenced building more nuclear power houses. We all know that by 1985 France will depend on nuclear power for 50 per cent of its electricity. One could go on. A city as large as Chicago depends on nuclear power for about 30 per cent of its electricity. I do not believe there can be any doubt that there will be a long-term demand.

The other matter that should be considered is that, if we want to have any influence over the nuclear fuel cycle, we must be part of it and involved in it, so that we can have responsible influence, which the current Commonwealth Government has clearly set out for all to see in its policy statements. It sets conditions on any export. If we are not part of it, the only people who will miss out will be the people of this country, because uranium will be supplied from Africa, and some of those countries do not attach any

real safeguards to the processing and the disposal of the fission products.

I find it rather hard to believe that the Labor Party can, in all sincerity, continue to put forward this farrago that because it is so concerned about the welfare of mankind in general it wants to block this proposal, because it will only be the people of South Australia who will miss out. It is absolute nonsense to say that we will cause a long-term effect upon the nuclear fuel cycle. There is nothing that we in this State or, in particular, there is nothing that this nation can do that will prevent nuclear power being used in the industrialised world. I challenge anyone who has had the opportunity to have a look at these things to deny what I am saying.

I was absolutely amazed at the lack of interest that the Leader of the Opposition showed in these industries when he made his trip overseas a few months ago. For the life of me, I cannot understand why he did not take the opportunities available, because there is a great deal to be seen. There have been tremendous improvements made in recent times in relation to the handling and the storage of nuclear waste. I would suggest that anyone who goes to France and has a look at the industry first hand could not help but be impressed. Of course, if the hypothetical situation arose and we did deny those countries the opportunity of getting their supplies of uranium, they would simply accelerate, taking that further step down the line to fast breeder reactors. Britain already has sufficient fuel to provide for the operations of fast breeder reactors for hundreds of years into the future. Opponents of this proposal who really believe that they will prevent the establishment of nuclear power houses really are living in a fool's paradise; they have lost touch with reality and are not addressing themselves to the facts in this situation.

I find it amazing that we are prepared even to argue about this proposition. The people at the European Economic Commission find it amazing that here we are in South Australia so fortunate to have an ore body so large, which could create such benefits for this State, arguing about whether we should go ahead and develop it. Some countries would do anything to have within their boundaries an ore body of this nature. France, for example, has virtually no raw materials for the production of energy. It would do anything to have such an ore body. When I was in France in 1979 it was explained to me that that country was maintaining large armies in Africa for the sole purpose of protecting their resources. Yet we have to put up with this farrago of nonsense which has been put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. From day to day we have watched them change their step.

I simply say that I look forward to the passage of this legislation through this House and through the Parliament because I know the benefits will accrue not only to the people of this State but to the nation as a whole. I look forward to the Select Committee, and I hope that its members will take a constructive view of what the committee is set up to do. I hope that attempts are not made to turn the Select Committee into a forum to examine the pros and cons of the nuclear fuel cycle, because that is certainly not what the Select Committee would be set up to do. It should be set up to examine the Bill and the indenture agreement. I look forward to those deliberations, because I believe that the indenture Bill can stand up to any scrutiny and that it is a document which will have far-reaching benefits to the people of this State.

As the member who represents the area, I look forward to seeing this development in that part of the State continue. It will be one of the larger developments that have taken place in South Australia. I know of the views and feelings of those people who are currently working in the area and

of the fine job that they are doing. They are setting out in a very harsh part of the world to establish a very large complex; I am sure that they will do it in a manner that will benefit everyone.

Last week when I was at Leigh Creek I found it interesting to talk to people who had been involved in the construction of the new town of Leigh Creek South. Their comments were to 'get things going'. They said that as they have just completed Leigh Creek they would like to be able to move across and begin to construct the township of Roxby Downs and that in that way they would maintain their employment. They are experienced people who have done a good job at Leigh Creek, and they could certainly do a first rate job at Roxby Downs. It will be interesting to watch the Opposition's antics in this matter as the debate proceeds. I commend the Minister and the Government for introducing the measure and look forward to its passage.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I wish to indicate my support for the sound and reasoned approach that was indicated by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon. I hope that this debate over its remaining hours in this House, and indeed over the months ahead while the Select Committee sits, will maintain the kind of reasoned approach and considered opinion that the Leader indicated this afternoon. That is to say that I hope we will not see the sort of response that we had to witness last night on *Nationwide* when Mr Drysdale of the Chamber of Mines was interviewed. His considered opinion and his in-depth analysis of those who hold views contrary to his own was such that he labelled them 'crass nits'.

I really do not know that that is going to get us very far, if that is as far as a person in such an important position as that which he holds can go in attempting to understand all the important issues raised by all sides in this debate. I was also particularly concerned about the way in which, to my mind, he almost cynically misled the public of South Australia when he sought to belittle the significance of price variation in the uranium market, indicating that the future supply problems were entirely overestimated, that they did not really exist because in fact price variation would vary widely and would correct the situation in due course. I will come back to that matter later in my speech, because I have some other evidence which I would like the House to consider.

It is in that sense of trying to establish a considered and reasonable debate on this matter that there are a number of matters I wish to raise this afternoon and I hope that they will receive the due attention that all opinions ought to receive. The Roxby Downs Bill before us seeks to cover two main areas. It has two important elements: one is the development factor—a proposal to develop the northern part of our State, with implications for the State at large; and secondly, inherent in the Bill is the uranium problem, that is, what is to be done with the uranium at the ore body, and what is to be done about solving some of the problems that, naturally, we would all agree are connected with uranium.

May I say on the matter of development that I, together with all my colleagues in the Australian Labor Party, am vitally concerned with the issue of development. We acknowledge the serious problems that face this State at present in terms of providing jobs, in terms of providing a sound infrastructure, and in terms of providing that well-being that we think we can achieve. Indeed, I would be very foolhardy if I did not acknowledge the very important problems raised by the present state of the economy and by the desperate need to look at development proposals.

I say 'foolhardy' because my own electorate contains one of the highest unemployment rates in the State. It is an

issue that is of vital concern to me and has been ever since, or long before, I was elected for the District of Salisbury. I am worried about the young people in my electorate who cannot find work. I am worried about the families whose breadwinner is now without work, or has been without work for some time. I am worried about the people who do not know exactly where their next meal is coming from because there is no stable income in the house. I am worried about the people who are losing their houses.

I am as eager as anyone else to see that sound development proceeds in this State. It was for that reason that I supported the Technology Park development. I followed that proposal with great interest and members will remember that I spoke in this House on that matter. When I inspected the Technology Park site I had been informed by one of the officers that it was possible that up to 15 000 jobs could be provided at that park within the next 15 years. Even if that is an over-estimate of the number that will be provided, certainly there are thousands of jobs to be had in that proposal. The nature of the development that is involved in that proposal and the way in which it will mesh in to the rest of the economy in South Australia, impressed me greatly. It seemed to me that that was the sort of development that we should be pursuing much more vigorously. Indeed, I would argue that there would be a case for greater Government support for such initiatives.

I take the point made by the Minister of Industrial Affairs when he acknowledged that Government had an obligation to commit itself in a resource sense beyond what could be expected to be profitable returns because of the contribution it would make to the development of the State at large. Development is important and any Party that seeks to govern this State must make sure that it has a sound policy that offers jobs and sound development that will last for decades into the future. The Australian Labor Party is conscious of that and has been working in those directions. I believe it has sound policies to offer to this State.

In looking at the development proposed for Roxby Downs, we need to analyse the efficacy of the proposal and the value for money, so to speak, that will be invested in the project by both Government and the developers themselves. In looking at that, certain questions must arise and I hope that these questions will be rigorously analysed by the Select Committee and by the community at large when it considers this whole issue. For example, on the question of jobs, how many jobs will actually be created in this project? How many of those jobs will be permanent and how many will only be temporary? How much will each job cost?

It is fine to talk about developments that may create a few jobs at a cost of millions of dollars each, and we may say those jobs were expensive, but that we have other jobs that are cheaper to create, but another implication is very important. A high cost job, a job that has cost a lot of money to create, is a job that has also deprived the capital market of funds that could be used for the provision of other jobs that cost less to create. A job created in certain high cost industries, indeed, is not an additional job to the economy; in fact, it may represent a net loss to the potential job gain of the economy.

Then there is the question of decentralisation and the development of a part of this State that until now perhaps has not received its fair share. It has been said that Roxby Downs will be of great benefit to the Iron Triangle, to the northern areas of the State. Certainly, I believe that we need to look at development strategies that will promote the northern areas of this State and areas such as the Iron Triangle. However, those proposals and plans must be sound and proposals that will last for decades upon decades ahead. We do not want that sort of transient development that mining often brings where a community will grow for some

decades and then fade away and become a ghost town in the desert. We want to make sure that any development that proceeds there results in on-going growth in that area and results in that area being able to sustain its own development in other directions long after mining has been finished.

Then there is the question of the resource inputs into the development. During the first session I asked in this House where exactly the water was going to come from for the Roxby Downs development. I believe that these issues are very important in a State such as ours where water supplies are at such a premium that these questions become vitally important. It is not simply a matter of turning on the tap and hoping that all the water comes out. Likewise, resource inputs go on to other areas such as electricity demand.

I come back to the other question that I touched upon a moment ago, namely, the capital demand for both the infrastructure that will be provided by the State and the development costs that will be provided by the developers. What will be the impact of that on the local economy and the local capital market? Does the Select Committee propose to undertake an analysis that that may have an effect of draining the funds from other potential users? Will it investigate whether there is a potential problem that funds will be denied to the industrial sector of the economy as they go to finance this sector? These questions have been important in other countries where there has been a rivalry between mining development and industrial development. I believe that economics has not paid enough attention to this in the past, but it is coming to realise the problems involved and I certainly hope the Select Committee appreciates that point. These are questions that I hope will be raised by the Select Committee and considered by the community at large concerning the issue of development.

We come now to another important part of the Roxby Downs proposal; that is, naturally, the uranium element of it. That is the one that has sorely tested many minds on all sides of politics for some time. A moment ago we heard the member for Eyre working himself up into an amazed farrago of a speech. It was hot air from the member for Eyre. He even made such statements as that, if we do not supply uranium, other countries will. There is a kind of philosophy inherent in that that would really deny to any Government the right to act socially and responsibly. For example, I have long held that there ought to be strict controls on the use of asbestos products and the mining of asbestos. When I was in local government I moved a resolution that my local council buy asbestos products only when no alternative was available. It was carried. Yet that attitude would say, 'Somebody else will provide asbestos, somebody else will do it. Why do not we go in for our take as well.' I do not think that is a considered approach. I accept that there are very important issues in the uranium debate and I accept that total wisdom is not the prerogative of any one individual in this matter. It is something we all should be investigating seriously and learning about.

The point I think that should be made is that we should be concerned that we do not proceed until we are assured that it is safe to do so. That is precisely what the Labor Party policy expresses. It is not something about which we can sit back and say, 'I do not want to even know about it, I do not want to investigate it. I will leave that to others'. This is such an important issue that I think it behoves each individual member of Parliament and people in the community at large to educate themselves as much as they can. To the best of my ability I have done this. Indeed, it was one of the important factors of my self-paid overseas trip in 1980. I must say I learnt a variety of things over there. My attitudes and opinions to uranium have in certain respects been modified.

It is true that I concede that certain of the safety problems that I previously believed existed I now accept have been solved. It is the case that I am prepared to accept that the state of technology and its development is such that I think we can reasonably assume that certain other areas may be resolved in the years ahead. That was not an opinion that I may have held some time ago, but it is something I have now arrived at from close study and attention to this matter.

I remain still very concerned about a number of other areas within the uranium question. I have not yet been convinced that they are safe, nor have I been convinced that we should proceed in those areas, but I am open to receiving information, considered opinion, and I am open to studying all the material available, and I do so whenever the opportunity arises.

If we go through the various processes of uranium—and I point out that these views are mine, based upon my findings in this area—I hold the opinion that the mining and milling of uranium is comparatively safe, provided that stringent guidelines are set and policed. That is important, because we know that in decades gone by there have been mines not subject to stringent safeguards and some mines that were so subject sometimes were not policed, and we have the hazard we are living with today, or the hazard that some people are dying with today. If we adhere to the standards and police them we can say that, as compared with other energy sources, the mining and milling of uranium are comparatively safe.

In my Address in Reply speech in the second session of Parliament on 20 August 1980, I quoted some figures in that regard, and I refer members to the data contained therein. I am prepared to believe that in many areas and for the most part the treatment of tailings and waste processing is not far short of being at that level of safety that could be considered acceptable. Certain of the tailing processes that have been tried clearly show that we can achieve a degree of certainty about their safety for years ahead. I am not saying that all waste processing is entirely adequate or safe, and indeed a great many question marks hang over some of the processes in which we are presently involved. Those question marks must be answered, and they can be answered only on the basis of long-term evaluation of some of the problems. Members will recall that I have quoted from the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation summary volume on a number of occasions in this House. On one occasion I said this:

INFCE states:

The complex issues that nuclear power raises in many countries include fears about the safety of nuclear installations and concern about radio-active waste disposal, on which the public is reluctant to leave technical options open to be decided in the future. These questions are highly emotive, but nevertheless they are real and in all countries they are necessarily taken very seriously.

It is quite correct that they should be taken seriously. INFCE also indicates that we do not yet know what may be the problems concerning the release of waste products from waste disposal sites over the long term. It also acknowledges that there is a security problem in the management of waste over the long term. They are areas of waste management and processing about which I am not convinced that we have guaranteed safe procedures. We need to take an on-going look to see what the state of the art can provide us with.

There are other areas about which I am still concerned, and I have not yet been convinced that we are even on the verge of safety measures that could be considered acceptable. These include the transport and interim storage of nuclear materials. I do not believe that we have yet achieved successful or adequate guidelines to prevent things such as accidents, in the random occurrence, spills, or, in the planned occurrence, terrorism and theft of materials. I put a Question

on Notice in the first session of this Parliament about materials stolen by a group known as CRANE, in France, and mailed to various Cabinet Ministers in that country to prove that these items could easily be stolen.

Then there is the question of the safeguards and the guarantees that may exist against proliferation, not just the written guarantees and the letter of the law, but the effectiveness of those guarantees. We can write down anything we wish and say that it is adequate, but, until it works in practice, we are just a hollow sounding shell. We need to know that the written international safeguards work, and that is not a question that should be taken too lightly. INFCE itself acknowledges that that is a very real issue, and it makes the following statement:

Effective international safeguards are an essential feature of the nuclear power industry. The additional effort involved in safeguards should be regarded as of similar importance to that for safety and physical protection.

It refers not to international safeguards, but to effective international safeguards. Then there is the matter of the economics of the whole thing. We need to think very carefully about that. I am worried about the impact of commitment to an industry that may not present this State with its soundest future. Western Mining and B.P. may well be able to afford to put the money into the feasibility study, knowing that they can mothball the project later and have an asset to use in the next century. They can depreciate that investment and take tax losses on it, cushion the effect, and still get the benefit of it later.

A State Government commitment to spend large sums of money on infra-structure cannot do the same. It could end up committing taxpayers' money, paid by the taxpayers of today, for something that will not show any benefit until well into the next century. Is that the wisest use of State resources? We need to look at that matter and examine it closely and ask whether we should be directing State resources in that area if we are not convinced that the project is viable.

That brings me to the question of the viability of the uranium part of the development. I am sure other members will have read the article from which I am going to quote. It is headed 'Nuclear power will grow in the 1980's but uranium oxide supplies remain excessive.' It is written by George White, Senior Vice-President of Nuexco, and it appeared in the *Energy News Journal*, which is known to most members. I am concerned about many of the points raised in it. The author speculates that there is a grave danger of excessive over-supply of uranium by the end of the 1980s. I put that comment against what Mr Drysdale was saying last night on television. He does not see that there will be any price recovery in the late 1980s. He makes the following comments:

During 1980, the United States produced about 42 000 000 pounds  $U_3O_8$ . However, US utilities only burned about 18 000 000 pounds to produce electricity. Before you brush this aside as a phenomenon unique to the US, you should recognize that the same approximate ratio also pertains to the world market.

He goes on:

Nearly 110 000 000 pounds  $U_3O_8$  were produced, but only about 40 000 000 were turned into electricity. I submit that this is not a situation conducive to price strength.

In a supply and demand situation, we need to look not just at the supply, because one could respond to that suggestion and say that demand will grow in the 1980s. He goes on to look at that, too. He says:

It is thus possible to say that in 1990, no more than 112 000 MWe nuclear will be in operation, and, therefore, uranium consumption will not exceed 41 000 000 pounds  $U_3O_8$  as Figure 2 shows.

He goes on to say:

It is practically inconceivable that consumption could exceed this amount. However, based on recent experience it is possible, even highly probable, that additional delays and cancellations will reduce this amount still further.

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

**The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:** Before the dinner adjournment, I was dealing with estimated supply: I now refer to estimated consumption, as analysed in the paper by George White. He states:

... worldwide production was about 110 million pounds  $U_3O_8$  during 1980. We anticipate that production will gradually approach 120 million pounds  $U_3O_8$  by 1987 before falling off slightly at the end of the decade.

That indicates a clear overproduction compared to the demand situation I noted before. However, there is a more worrying element contained in his paper. He analyses the changes in the American and non-American share of production, but adds the following:

These data include substantial cutbacks in the United States and take into account only those non-United States production centres that we judge to be firmly committed. Thus these data do not include any contribution, from such well known deposits as Mt Taylor, Nose Rock, Crownpoint, Immouraren and Roxby Downs.

Even without consideration of Roxby Downs, a grave over-supply situation will take place by the end of the 1980s. That situation is exacerbated by inventories that are presently on hand and, of course, the inventory growth that will take place in the 1980s. He spells out clearly that there must be growth in inventory at either the producer level or the consumer level, and concludes as follows:

This is not a picture to warm the hearts of existing and would-be uranium producers.

The matter is further complicated in his analysis by the difference in the supply options of low-cost versus high-cost producers. Naturally, he concludes that low-cost producers will be able to gain a bigger share of the market than high-cost producers. The impact of that is not only that there is no guarantee that the price of uranium oxide will be sufficient by the end of the 1980s to ensure the project: there is another more serious impact, which is the effect on the conditions of sale. Naturally, if the price is depressed and if there is over-supply, conditions of sale are more to the advantage of the buyer than the seller. Indeed, the INFCE Report, in particular, proposes that that should be the case and that the market should be competitive. The report states:

The ability of a user to protect himself is enhanced by his being able to take advantage of the diversity in the types and degrees of flexibility of the contractual conditions offered by the now various suppliers.

It further states:

The principle and preferred mechanism for the assurance of fuel supply should be a competitive market. Such a market protects consumers against interruptions of supply which can be caused by commercial, technical, social or governmental policies at the national level.

Clearly, there is a major danger there for any Government that seeks to establish conditions of control for the well-being of the community at points of sale if it seeks to say that it will not sell, for example, unless it has adequate guarantees about safeguards, or about the safety measures that will be used during the processing or production of energy from that uranium. Naturally, there will be a pressure on any producer to forgo such conditions of sale, and that is an important point that I would hope this House could not come to accept.

We need to analyse that very closely. It also brings into question the entire viability of the project. That brings to mind a very important point that we should be considering in regard to this project. A great many figures have been floated in regard to numbers of jobs, possible investment, and royalties that may be paid to the State, but we really



have not had any schematic analysis or any approach to that that takes account of the different actions that may take place. This afternoon and this evening I have posed the proposition that the uranium demand will not be present later in the decade. Other people have said that that is not correct. Surely there should be an analysis that takes account of all possible options. In that regard, I was interested in a paper that was printed in 1978 in the magazine *Modern Government—National Development*, which deals with taking into account all the probabilities that may apply to a project. It was stated:

Some of the most important decisions made by Government officials and industrial executives concern capital expenditures for new projects. These decisions have a significant impact upon their organisations' operations, yet the information that such decisions are based on often consists of assumptions filled with uncertainties.

This is a prime example of that. It further stated:

When uncertainties for individual elements of a project are combined, the result is compounded uncertainty for the total project.

There are two approaches for estimating the cost of major capital investments. The first, the traditional cost evaluation technique, involves making individual judgments as to the "expected" costs for each project element. The second technique for preparing realistic cost estimates utilises probability concepts. A comparison of the two techniques shows that there are many advantages to gain by using probability concepts.

I have not seen much evidence of that in the information presented to this House by the Minister or in the information presented by the company in its brochure and its supporting publicity material, yet we are dealing with something that we are told will be of fundamental good.

**Dr BILLARD (Newland):** We have heard this afternoon from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitchell what I believe was a great variety of argument about why the people of South Australia should not consider this indenture favourably, despite the fact that the member for Mitchell indicated that the Opposition would at least support the second reading. There was a great variety of argument, because the Opposition has tried to drag what I believe are red herrings across the face of the issue so that the public will be convinced that there are other reasons rather than the central reason for rejecting Roxby Downs as a venture in South Australia.

The central reason is that the South Australian Labor Party is opposed to any project that involves the mining and production of uranium. So, we should look in that light at all the other sorts of argument that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He who said that the Government, in the past, had alleged that commencement of this project was only a year or two away, whereas now it may be a few years further. He alleged that the provisions of the indenture fall far short of what the Government had led the people of South Australia to expect. He also alleged that the indenture agreement was vague. In fact, that is quite an incredible accusation to make, considering the great thickness of the documents that were signed as part of the indenture and the 121 pages of the legislation that is in front of us now, which embodies only those parts that require legislative action.

Certainly, the allegation that the indenture was vague flies in the face of other such indentures and agreements that have been reached and signed in regard to the developments of large mineral projects around Australia, such as the uranium project in Western Australia, Yeerilerie, and the North West Shelf development, which is a massive development in its own right. He further alleged that the company had exploited the weakness of the Government's position, and in his speech, as well as on a number of previous occasions, he detailed ways in which the company would exploit that weakness.

I believe that the lie has been given to those charges, both in statements that the Deputy Premier has made and, in particular, today in the Premier's speech, when he outlined specific areas which the Labor Opposition had criticised, and compared them with what had actually been achieved in the indenture. In fact, we see that the deal that has been secured for the people of South Australia goes way beyond what had been thought possible by the Opposition and what it is alleging would be achievable.

Regarding the indenture, in terms of the provision of electricity, it was alleged that the people of South Australia would have to subsidise the provision of power but, in fact, there will be no subsidy at all. It was alleged that the people of South Australia would have to subsidise other provision of services, such as water, whereas water will be supplied completely at the cost of the partners. In terms of the overall infrastructure cost of the order of \$200 000 000, the Government's commitment is very specifically limited to narrow areas, such as schools and hospitals, which would be required in any community that was being established anywhere in South Australia for any purpose.

It would normally be a requirement of Government to provide those services. Those services have been estimated fairly closely in terms of cost in 1981 dollars at \$50 000 000, which I think most fair-minded people would have to agree is a very small proportion of the overall infrastructure costs. Certainly there is the guarantee that, if at some subsequent point in time the venture does not proceed, then such money as has been expended will be refunded, so the risk as far as the people of South Australia are concerned is at an absolute minimum and the potential benefits to the people of this State are therefore free to flow, without any talk, as has been suggested by the Opposition, that the value for money may not be there.

I think the member for Salisbury referred to the value for money. He questioned the cost of creating those jobs in terms of the input on behalf of the State and I will allege in return that the value must be there because the provision of these jobs will come first. What will follow will be the provision of schools and hospitals in response to the creation of a work force on site and therefore the return to the people of South Australia is guaranteed before the investment on the part of the State is made. That is quite over and above any consideration of royalty payments.

Let me get back to what I believe is the real issue involved here. I believe that, if we were looking at a development that did not involve the mining of uranium, we would have the wholehearted support of the Opposition. There would be no question about charging that we have secured a bad deal, and that there is too much on the side of the company and too little on the side of the people of South Australia. In fact, this indenture breaks new ground in terms of guaranteeing royalties to flow into the Treasury coffers of South Australia. The super tax or the surplus profits tax, I believe, is a new step in indentures of this kind and I believe there are a great many areas where new ground has been broken in securing benefits for the people of South Australia. Let us, then, turn our attention to what really is the question of dispute as far as the Labor Party is concerned. That is the question of whether we ought to mine, develop and exploit a uranium deposit. The Labor Party itself has changed its mind on this issue in recent years.

As recently as 1976 it was in support of the development of uranium mines in Australia and there was in fact a report called the Jordan Report, which the Labor Party and the Premier at that time (Mr Dunstan) had endorsed. That report was presented in 1972 to the Dunstan Government and stated that uranium mining and production offered a potential source of radioactive pollution, but proper control



of mine tailings and the prevention of any radioactive wastes in either solid or solution form from entering watercourses should be possible. That report stated that any potential wastes from the mining operation were controllable, and again in a debate in 1976 the Premier at the time (Mr Dunstan) lauded the development of uranium mines in South Australia in the past, and the then Deputy Premier (Hugh Hudson) also endorsed uranium mining.

In fact, it was only in 1977 that the Labor Party changed its tune. It is ironic that that should have happened at that time, because as the years have gone by, more and more information has become available that has shown that the use of uranium for the production of electricity was in fact relatively safe, and much safer than the alternatives of coal power. I need only refer to the reports of international bodies such as the International Commission for Radiological Protection, the World Health Organisation, and the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, and the findings of the Council of Scientific Research of the American Medical Association (I have quoted the results of that in previous speeches). The latter body had no axe to grind on behalf of the nuclear industry and found that the use of nuclear power for the production of electricity had the least harmful effects on health of all the options for the production of electricity for at least the next 25 years.

There were also reports produced by the British Medical Research Council and other similar bodies in West Germany, France, Japan, Sweden and the U.S.S.R. So we then have a vast body of reports that have all come down with generally similar conclusions. They may have differed in emphasis but they all come down with generally similar conclusions that, as long as precautions were taken and as long as there were safeguards as to the way in which uranium was used and the way in which the nuclear fuel cycle was controlled, the use of uranium for the production of electricity was possible with a great degree of safety, and certainly with much greater safety than was available with the alternative methods of producing electricity. Figures which have been produced show that there are orders of magnitude of difference between the death rates that do occur with the production of electricity from coal, and the death rates that may occur with the production of electricity with nuclear power—and certainly with the death rates that have occurred with the production of electricity from nuclear power.

I believe that those bodies are all responsible bodies. The great majority of them have no axe to grind on the part of any vested interest. Several of them have only medical interests and the health of the public to protect and they have underlined what I believe must be fairly obvious to most objective viewers, namely, that the use of uranium for peaceful purposes, and in particular for the generation of electricity, is not only possible but also desirable so long as there are adequate safeguards.

We look more closely at some of the more recent inquiries. I can refer, for example, to some of the fears mentioned about the possibility of proliferation of nuclear weapons. I know that the supposed link between uranium mining and nuclear weapons is continually raised by those who seek to oppose uranium mining. I believe that that is a most tenuous and false link to make. I point, for example, to Japan, a country which has every reason to fear nuclear weapons but which nevertheless is pursuing vigorously a policy of utilising nuclear power, because it has the intelligence to distinguish between uranium that is used in nuclear weapons, which must undergo very sophisticated processing to concentrate it to sufficient extent for use in nuclear weapons, and the much less concentrated uranium that is used in nuclear power stations. Justice Fox, in his report to the Legislative Council inquiry, stated:

It would seem likely that no significant material, whilst safeguarded under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, has ever been stolen for any purpose that could in any way be related to military purpose.

That was his considered view. In fact, his attitude was that we ought to encourage the acceptance of international safeguards under the International Atomic Energy Agency, and he was encouraged by the number of countries now growing to accept these safeguards. I quote from his report again:

It has to me been a rather warming experience to see 20, 30 or 40 nations represented at some of these meetings dealing with the non-proliferation aspects and how those present seem to tackle the problem, with their sleeves rolled up and with a high degree of honest purpose.

He was encouraged by the measures of non-proliferation. With respect to the non-proliferation treaty itself, apparently a number of people do not realise that, whilst Australia is a signatory, to that treaty, under article 4, obliges Australia to co-operate in the production and usage of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. So, while on the one hand that treaty is designed to establish safeguards which would limit the possibility of nuclear fuels being diverted for the production of nuclear weapons, at the same time it obligates signatory countries to co-operate in the production and usage of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. That is what I believe we in Australia have a responsibility to do.

Finally, with respect to non-proliferation, the arguments that have been put alleging that it is possible for uranium to be diverted into the production of nuclear weapons can be applied in a different scene to produce quite different consequences. If we refrain from using a fuel because it can, under sophisticated processing, also be used to produce weapons, we could argue that we must also refrain from exploiting oil resources, because petrol can be used to make napalm, which I think most members will agree is a most terrible weapon of warfare. If on the one hand we can argue against the use of a fuel because it can be used to make a weapon, we can use that same argument in other areas to argue against the use of other fuels. I do not think members would suggest that we should not have passed in this House a few months ago the indenture allowing the development of the Cooper Basin liquid reserves, but yet that is the consequence of pursuing that same type of argument.

There has again been objection from the Opposition on the grounds of final disposal, that is, there have been allegations that it has not been proven that the waste products of nuclear power can be disposed of finally and safely. This is quite apart from the fact that the waste products from coal-fired power stations we simply pour out into the atmosphere. Radioactive impurities, which is mostly uranium, gets churned out into the atmosphere, and the radioactive fall-out from a coal-fired power station is much greater than from a nuclear power station. Nevertheless, there have been those who have objected on these grounds. In the late 1970s it was stated by the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, that that was the last area to be controlled. He in fact undertook a round-the-world trip with some Government experts to investigate that problem.

I was pleased to note that the member for Salisbury in his speech tonight admitted, and I do not think I do him a disservice in saying this, that that problem was either solved or almost solved. However, I submit that the Swedish results have shown that the problem is in fact solved, and allegations that it has not been used in any extensive way to date simply beg the question that there is no requirement to use it and there will not be any requirement to use it for many years hence, because we simply will not have accumulated enough waste products to justify going to that stage. The Swedish Stipulations Law, which was passed in recent years, states that no nuclear power station may be commissioned in Sweden until the developers of that power

station have proven to the satisfaction of Government experts that they can finally and safely dispose of all wastes of that operation.

Now the Swedish developers of nuclear power stations are proceeding with the commissioning of nuclear power stations, because they have demonstrated to their satisfaction that in fact that final disposal can be proven and, as I said before, I was pleased to note that the member for Salisbury, at least in an oblique way, was admitting that that final disposal had been demonstrated and proven. I think the figures showed that in the worst circumstances the radiation that would be attributed to any person from such a disposal would be 13 millirems per annum, which is about one-tenth of what we all receive on average, although the average that people receive can go up and down by several hundred per cent, in fact several thousand per cent. That was, over a period of 200 000 years, the worst that anyone would receive from that disposal method—13 millirems.

From memory, I think the quoted average annual exposure was .13 millirems, which was negligible in terms of an annual average exposure of 100 to 150 millirems per annum, which everyone has now. Therefore, I believe that there are no possible objections on the grounds of final disposal.

The final argument, which was pursued at great length by the member for Salisbury, is the argument that there would be no market for uranium. It is true that the spot market price of uranium has dropped dramatically since the mid-1970s. But it is also true that there are a large number of mines in the world currently producing uranium which are producing it only because they wrote long-term contracts at high prices in the mid-1970s, and that when those contracts expire such mines will go out of production. We know that there is a great deal of present world production which will cease when the contracts covering those mines expire, and that the lower cost producers (and Australian production would be in that category as well) will come into play when those contracts expire; and that will occur from about the mid-1980s onwards.

Regardless of any argument as to whether there is or is not a market for the product, I believe it must be self-evident that the responsibility for securing that market must lie with the developers and with the companies concerned, in this case, Western Mining and B.P., and that we cannot say, 'No, you cannot go ahead', or 'Yes, you should go ahead based on our assessment', because it is not our money that is going to be at risk in such a venture. The commitment of the State is limited and guaranteed refundable if the project does not proceed. Therefore, the responsibility for assessing whether or not there is a market must surely lie with companies concerned, which are having to put up the money for the development.

So, I believe that, whether or not there is a market for uranium (and I believe that there will be), certainly many large contracts for long-term supplies of uranium have been written over the last 18 months by companies developing uranium mines in other States. Those contracts would not have been written if the arguments produced by the Opposition tonight really did have some sway. However, I believe that the question whether or not there is a market is not a question that is our responsibility directly.

Finally, I point to one of the arguments that has been used in the allegations with respect to whether or not the project size is comparable to that of Mount Isa. It is perhaps ironic that that comparison should be drawn. As members would know, I was born and bred in Queensland, and I have been through a period in Queensland not dissimilar economically to the period that South Australia is facing now. In 1960 Queenslanders were saying that they were the Cinderella State, that they had no tourism industry because it was the tropics and no-one wanted to go there.

Queensland had no viable mining industry (Mount Isa Mines was struggling along) and the State was subsidising, in effect, the coal mines that it did have, in order that they stay open. It was the decision of the Queensland Government, which was a coalition government that had come into power in 1957, that it would support the upgrading of the railway line to Mount Isa. That effectively made the difference between whether or not Mount Isa would grow and develop as a mine and profit the State of Queensland, or whether it would continue to languish.

The question whether or not this State Government will encourage Roxby Downs to grow and develop as a mine is just as important to South Australia as the question of Mount Isa Mines was to Queensland in 1960. The comparison between the two States and the two mining developments is not simply on the level of saying that Roxby Downs could be another Mount Isa Mines: it also relates to the question whether or not the Government of this State has the determination to allow that mining development to proceed for the benefit of the people of South Australia. I believe that the Roxby Downs development is a good development and that the possibility of uranium development is sound.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I oppose this Bill. If I had my way I would defeat it on the second reading. I think it is about time we were definite about these things. I do not necessarily mean on the wider question of uranium, but on the question of a Bill like this. It is a pity that the Labor Party is prevaricating, as it is doing, on the uranium issue. I have often spoken in opposition to uranium, to the mining and export of uranium from this country. I must admit that on looking back on what I have said on other occasions in this House and elsewhere I may have been mistaken in some of the details of what I have said, but that only shows that like everyone else any individual does not know much about this enormous question. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that on balance I am right to oppose this Bill and of my general view of the subject.

**Mr Lewis:** That is a subjective view.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Of course it is a subjective view. The silly member for Mallee should know that everyone here is subjective. That is just what I have said, namely, that none of us is able, because of the enormity of the matter, to make a purely objective decision about it. The following is what I said in our policy speech at the last election:

We therefore cannot agree to mining at Roxby Downs if uranium be included in that mining. We would rather see all the minerals stay in the ground than that.

I have not changed my view.

**Mr Lewis:** What about—

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Perhaps the member for Mallee, who I do not think has spoken yet in this debate and who has not paid much attention to it until now, will be quiet for a minute and let me develop my argument, and then if he is not too late I may listen to his argument in turn. In the past I have pointed out four problems that I see in regard to uranium. First, there is the problem which, in spite of what was said by the member for Newland a moment ago, has not been solved, namely, the storage of waste products. Secondly, there is the proliferation of nuclear weapons; thirdly, the problem of nuclear blackmail of whole communities; and, fourthly, the loss of civil liberties because of stringent safeguards and controls that would be necessary if we had uranium mining and a uranium industry in this country.

Yet, I acknowledge gladly that it is not all black or all white. There are advantages to be had through the use of nuclear power. Anyone who denies that there are some such

advantages would be a fool. However, in my view the arguments in favour of the development of nuclear power are overwhelmingly defeated by the weight of arguments against it. I know realistically that what I say and what I do in this debate in this House will not make a scrap of difference and that this Bill will pass at the second reading; it will go to a Select Committee and the Select Committee will be an absolute whitewash and nothing more than that. Members of the Labor Party know that as well as I do. It will then go into Committee; it will come out of Committee, pass the third reading and then go to another place. It does not matter two hoots what I say; the Government has the numbers, and I am told they are firm and it will go through. So what I say does not matter.

**Mr Lewis:** You'll say it all the same.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I thought that the member for Mallee and other members on the Government side might be interested not so much in what I have to say but in what my colleague Lance Milne has to say on this matter, because I understand that there is a secret hope, which will remain unfulfilled I can assure members opposite, that he is going to change his mind on this subject, and that if the Labor Party sticks, and that is the big question mark—not whether we stick or not but whether the Labor Party sticks—to its policy, the Hon. Mr Milne will change his mind and the indenture Bill will go through. That is what I understand the Liberal Party is hoping will happen. Let me in a moment give a few quotes from some of his recent writings on this matter. I may say that he and other members of the Party have done a very great deal of work on this issue and given a lot of thought to it. As a Party I do not think there is any one measure which has taken so much time and to which we have given so much attention as the question of uranium mining, particularly in the last few weeks of this indenture Bill. A lot of members of the Party know far more about it than I do. As a Party we have a very strong consensus against the Bill and against the mining of uranium. Let me come to some of the things that the Hon. Mr Milne has said and written in the last few weeks, and I adopt these as my own sentiments.

**Mr Lewis:** What about your State council? When are you going to have that special quick meeting now that you have the Bill?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This is not Question Time.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The member for Mallee is a fool. He is the biggest fool in the House, I sometimes think. We have had two meetings on the matter since the Bill was introduced. Let me first of all start by quoting what Mr Milne said in his dissenting statement when he was a member of the Select Committee in another place. This is what he said:

No other mineral in the history of the world has attracted so much debate, controversy and criticism, nor so much need for attempts at national and international control. Apart from that, there is a vast difference between uranium and any other fuel. All other known fuels generate heat and burn away, leaving relatively harmless gases or ashes. Uranium does not. As uranium burns—

**Dr Billard:** That's rubbish.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Will the honourable member listen to me? I listened to him, with some impatience I may say, in silence, except at the end, when it got a bit much for me. Let him now listen to me and put up the member for Mallee if he wants to answer what I am saying. My colleague went on to say:

As uranium burns it releases enormous quantities of heat and it creates a terrible lethal radioactive residue referred to as 'waste'. This waste remains radioactive for hundreds, if not thousands, of years and no-one yet knows for certain how to store it safely for that length of time. It is a problem of a new dimension entirely.

He goes on to say in the last paragraph of his dissenting report:

It is my firm belief that exploitation of uranium resources should not proceed at this stage, because the hazards of reactor malfunction, misappropriation of fissile materials and temporary and permanent storage of the waste products of the nuclear fuel cycle are at present beyond the capacity of mankind to control.

I respectfully adopt that. Let me come to an article which he has prepared for the journal *Australian Democrats*, not yet published. This is in part what he has prepared. I will read out a couple of paragraphs showing what he thinks and what I think about this matter. This is Lance Milne talking:

My basic attitude to the mining, milling and exporting of uranium is that to use it, whether for making bombs or for generating electricity, has been a grave mistake. It is probably one of the greatest errors of judgment ever perpetrated by mankind. We believe that the whole process and programme should be wound down and stopped. Consequently, we, as Australian Democrats, are opposed to the further mining of uranium, since the mining of it inevitably leads into the entire fuel cycle, ending in the creation of highly radioactive waste products, most of which is already out of control. This is unacceptable to us because the problem of storing this dangerous material has yet to be solved. We have not said that we would never agree to uranium mining. What we have said is that we will not agree to it—

and here he quotes our national policy—

'until the problems of waste disposal, security (especially plutonium) and costing (which must include the cost of long-term waste disposal) are solved.' That statement, which is part of our national policy on nuclear power and uranium mining, was written some time ago and before we knew as much about the dangers of uranium and its fuel cycle as we do now. For example, we now refer to 'waste storage' not 'waste disposal', as the latter term conjures up the image in people's minds of a rubbish tip, covered over—and forgotten.

Let me come to a third quote, and this is dated this month, in an article that he has written on the matter. He says:

In Australia, the traditional two-party political system has encouraged polarisation over the question of mining and export of uranium.

If any detached person has been listening to the speech on one side or the other of the House today he would certainly see that. He goes on to say:

On one side, those with a vested interest in uranium try desperately hard to justify their stance, their investment and their livelihood. On the other side are those who instinctively hate big business, who are nervous and seem to frighten others by introducing confusion and exaggeration—that is roughly how the nation is divided.

**Mr Gunn interjecting:**

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I seem to detect a note of bigotry from the member for Eyre's interjection especially when it is as foolish as that one. My colleague goes on to say:

It has become very difficult to evaluate with absolute honesty and impartiality the evidence surrounding these extremely complicated issues. The problem is exacerbated locally because Cabinet Ministers and shadow Ministers frequently lack the fundamental background required to accurately comprehend the long-term consequences of their decisions, so often made with only the next election in mind.

How true that is, Mr Speaker. He goes on to say:

The attitude of the Australian Democrats is different—not a compromise, not 'in the middle' but, we believe, a more sensible, practical possibility, causing minimum and manageable losses to those involved in the industry, yet ridding the world of a self-inflicted menace. We believe that Australia, and in this case South Australia, can have a decisive effect on reversing the present trend and should attempt to do so.

Applied nuclear history has been written only during the past 40 to 50 years and we have all been witness to it. Yet it is well to glance back at it very briefly to remind ourselves what has actually happened over that comparatively short period.

He goes into the history of it since the 1940s. This is the last bit I will quote from him:

The development of nuclear power to replace the rapidly depleting fossil fuels may well be the greatest error of judgment perpetrated by mankind. Nevertheless, the inertia of this already colossal industry and the dependence by many industrial nations on this energy source creates the dilemma that the problem cannot be stopped dead in its tracks. Nuclear power can only be phased out over a period and that is where the Australian Democrats stand.

The South Australian involvement in the nuclear industrial fuel cycle is at its starting point, namely as a supplier of raw materials. Grave responsibilities lie in the honest management of this resource, taking into account the full consequence of the world's nuclear dilemma. By taking a responsible attitude with regard to the phasing out of nuclear power, Australia as a nation can exert a strong positive influence. But by withdrawing from this responsibility, by surrendering to the tempting pressures from the mining interests or by adopting an inflexible negative attitude, that opportunity will be lost.

Simply selling uranium at any cost for the sake of questionable economic benefits is as irresponsible as the sale of human beings into slavery or selling alcohol and cigarettes to children, or trafficking in drugs. Instantaneous wealth is a myth! This is most readily understood by looking at the wealth accumulated by the slave trade in southern United States of America. They did not care or realise the human misery, social injustice and racial friction that was to become rampant in the wake of the mindless and cruel activities.

Finally:

At the same time, the emotional instillation of fear and the consequent turning away from the problem is the attitude of a coward, incapable of facing his responsibilities. Fear causes irresponsible actions, panic, irrational debate, and, in the present case, wishful thinking about alternatives. Fear will never provide a solution. Yet serious and well-founded reservations about nuclear power in a realistic frame of responsibility leads inevitably to the conclusion that nuclear power must be phased out as rapidly as possible. There can be little doubt whatever about that.

That is my view, as it is Lance Milne's view, and if members opposite think they are going to change his mind and get this Bill through they had better think again, because it will not go through, I can assure them, on the vote of an Australian Democrat. It may go through because the Labor Party weakens, but not because we weaken.

Let me, having made those quotations—and I did it deliberately after what I had heard of the hoax of the Liberal Party—now come to a couple of other considerations. First of all, there is the question of the economics, and the economics in particular of Roxby Downs. One of the tragedies of this whole debate is that the arguments of those who are in favour of mining and exporting uranium and the arguments of those who are against it seldom meet. They are on two different planes. Those in favour base their arguments on what they say are the great benefits to this State. They say there will be more jobs, there will be prosperity, an economic revival, or, as the member for Newland said, we will be like Queensland and have an economic boom—if we want to be like Queensland, which God forbid. That is the sort of argument they are putting up: these things are just around the corner. It is like a cargo cult, and the arguments they put up are the arguments of greed. They say that we will be materially better off, and to hell with the rest of mankind and the consequences for them. That sums up all the arguments we have heard in favour of uranium mining.

Those opposed, as I am, to uranium mining say that we have to ignore that and look at the longer future of mankind. I was flattered to see that my old commander, Brigadier Greville, took me to task in the *Advertiser* last week for saying just that. On the night that this indenture Bill came in, I was asked on a television programme—not the *Nation-wide* one when I was with the Leader of the Opposition, but another one—about the 2 000 jobs, and I said that was bad luck. I am afraid that, since then, I have been scolded by members of my Party and others for putting it in that way, because it sounded apparently as though I was quite heartless about this. I am not, but let us look at the question of jobs and the investment that we are to make to get them. What did the Minister say in his second reading explanation? He said that the indenture contemplates a project of up to 150 000 tonnes of copper per annum. He said it is estimated by the joint venturers that commitment to such a project could involve (not necessarily will involve) expenditures well

in excess of a billion dollars. I do not know whether he meant a million million dollars or a thousand million dollars, but the figure is so great that it does not much matter. He said it could also involve the employment of 2 000 to 3 000 at the mine site and the establishment of a town of up to 9 000 people.

If that is the magnitude of the investment that has to be poured in to provide 2 000 or 3 000 jobs (the number of jobs fluctuates with the enthusiasm of the speaker, and I have heard it suggested that there could be up to 5 000 jobs), if we are to put in a thousand million dollars to make that, it is a heavy investment indeed to create not many jobs. We would be better off investing in some other way and creating jobs at a cheaper rate.

As I understand it, mining (not only uranium mining but any large-scale mining in any country) always has the effect of pushing up costs in that country. As minerals go out, so money comes in; as money comes into a community, costs go up in the exporting country, in the exporting community, and that means that the costs of primary and secondary industries go up as well. They become less competitive overseas, and therefore the jobs gained in mining are very much offset by jobs lost in primary and secondary industry.

There are two matters on this question of jobs. First, we are being invited by the Government to make, as a community (not the Government itself), a very heavy investment for a comparatively small return of jobs. Secondly, even though we do that, we will inevitably lose jobs in other sectors of the economy. Let that always be remembered. As for the question of royalties, the Minister said we would get up to \$40 000 000 a year, but if we look at the Bill and the indenture we might not get anything at all. That is not a guaranteed figure. We might not get anything by way of royalties.

Let me come finally to the Bill and to the indenture. We have only to look at it, as I said to the Leader of the Opposition when he was prevaricating on television the other night, for five minutes (I think I said 10 minutes, but with his quick mind he will probably do it in five minutes) to see that this is a Bill that contemplates the mining of uranium, and the joint venturers, as I understand it, have said that they will not go ahead unless they can mine and process uranium. They will not contemplate any amendment of the indenture. I accept that that is their position, and I do not blame them. They are business men, out for money, and in a ruthless industry, and they want to get the most they can. At this stage certainly they would hardly say anything else. That is written into the indenture, and that is the position. In my time in this House I have never known an indenture Bill to be amended, and I do not believe that an indenture Bill ever has been amended in this Parliament.

**Mr Bannon:** Let's make this the first.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Whom does the Leader think he is fooling? He is only prevaricating because his Party cannot make up its mind, and it is the fear of many people outside that the Labor Party is going soft on this issue. If its members had any guts they would have said that they are going to stick to their policy and oppose the Bill, but they have not got the guts to do that.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I got him to say that on the programme, but he resiled from it the next morning.

**An honourable member:** You did it well.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I thought I did a good job, but he has not stuck with it.

*Mr Bannon interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I cannot believe that the Leader of the Opposition thinks there is any chance of amending this Bill; there is none. I am dashed if I know how it could be

done. The indenture, which is most of the 66 pages we have here, is simply annexed to the Bill. Clause 6 of the Bill provides that the indenture is ratified and approved. That is all we could amend that I can see. I know that there are (2) and (3), but they do not make a jot of difference, and the Opposition knows it. How can we possibly amend that? If I thought there was any chance of amending it to bring it into line with our policy, to allow the mining of copper, gold and rare earth to go ahead, I would be the first to do it, but there is not the slightest chance of that happening.

**Mr Lewis:** Ecologically impossible.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** There you are—and I am prepared to concede that for once, the exception, the member for Mallee may be correct. I said in my policy speech that the thing to do was to mine the lot and then put the uranium back in the ground. I am now prepared to concede that that is very difficult to do, because of the expense: it is probably impossible. I do not believe there is any way in which this Bill can be amended, and I believe that the Labor Party knows that perfectly well and is only playing for time. Of course, it suits the Government. For once, the Government has been quite shrewd in its tactics. It is keeping the Labor Party on the hook for the maximum time until June, just to see what havoc it can play. It is interesting that the member for Elizabeth has not spoken in this debate. I would have liked to listen to him, but he is not on the list of speakers. Otherwise, I believe, he would be speaking now.

I am not taking part in the debate to try to score political points from one side or the other. So far as I am concerned, I am detached. They can all go to hell. I am merely saying there is no way in the world in which the indenture or the Bill can be altered or amended. One only has to look at it for a couple of minutes to see that the Bill will allow, facilitate, and encourage the mining, processing, and export of uranium. Because it is a Bill of that nature, I am opposed to it, and I would like to see it chucked out at this stage.

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** It is always difficult to follow good acts, but I will do my best to bring more conviction to the reasons why I support this Bill than did the honourable member in trying to reject it. I wish to concentrate my remarks on the economics of the matter. I do not believe the comments the member for Mitcham made when he was talking about economic revival: I believe that it is a matter of economic survival that this Bill must go through.

The Premier in his speech reiterated once again the importance of this Bill and the Roxby Downs indenture to this State. However, the Leader criticised several areas, particularly the spending of feasibility money and the mistaken belief that exploration can be done without assurances being given to those who are spending such vast sums of money. Anyone who is spending \$50 000 000 plus another \$50 000 000 to reach a stage of final analysis must be given some basic assurances that, once that resource is proven, the company can proceed to market the commodity. The Opposition seeks to block that opportunity and to deprive the company of a final stage of analysis that could be adjudged quite clearly.

As I said previously, no-one will spend such a vast sum without some guarantees of being able to proceed, particularly if the testing is affirmative in the respective aspects of the mining. I believe the economic future of this State and that of our children depend on the entrepreneurial skills of business, and, in part, on the mining of our valuable resources. The question often asked is in regard to the difference between the economic argument and the safety argument. I do not believe there is any question that can be raised against the economic argument and the fact that

this State needs the development of Roxby Downs. I would like to re-emphasise that point by bringing into the debate some facts and figures that people tend to forget.

Twenty years ago, this State owed the banks from its borrowings about \$300 000 000; 10 years ago, that figure had increased to \$1 500 000 000; three years ago, the figure escalated to \$2 500 000 000. Today we find that, from our income, we must expend about \$284 000 000 per annum to pay interest on money that the State has borrowed. When we consider that, in its entirety in regard to the State's expenditure, we find, as has been suggested in Budget debates, that the highest State expenditure is on education, at 31.3 per cent. The horrifying thing is that the second highest expenditure is interest on money borrowed, which takes up 17.5 per cent of the tax dollar.

When we look at that in relation to what else is expended from the tax dollar (that is, people's money), we find that the third highest expenditure is in the area of health, at 12.4 per cent. So it goes on. We find eventually that some 22 Government departments are working on 0.5 per cent. We find each year that, because of the increase in wages and in other areas of cost of living, commodity goods price rises, and so on, we cannot balance and we have to find money from other sources. People, quite rightly, say, 'We cannot afford much more in taxation.' I am always very intrigued when I hear members opposite say, 'We must reduce pay-roll tax or something else to get the boost going.' If one looks closely at the arguments, one suddenly realises that, in the pay-roll tax area, for instance, where we earn \$210 000 000 a year, if we were to reduce that to any degree, we would have to make it up from somewhere else.

*Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:*

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I will come back to that in a minute. Do we reduce other charges? Each year as the problem escalates and we borrow money for projects and for the development of the State, we find that the interest rate increases, just as people with homes are experiencing this problem. The State is no different. If we borrow more this year and repay loans that were at 4 per cent interest, the new loans will be at a higher interest. Next year, more than 17.5 per cent of our income may be expended on interest—perhaps up to 20 per cent. If it is, will we take money from education, health, welfare, or transport? If we start to take money from those areas, there will be screams, and quite rightly so. There will be more unemployment, because we will have to decrease the work force.

Where will we find the additional income to cover our many problem areas? We cannot keep turning to the public and say, 'We will double the taxation tomorrow because we must collect more in taxes to provide more to the people who are demanding more.' Communities do demand more. We have to look to areas where we can develop certain skills, or mining our resources, to create additional income. It is not just a question of what jobs will be provided, or what royalties will come in. It is a fact that, as money comes into the kitty, it can be distributed to areas of need. If the money is not there, there is only one other place to get it, and that is from the taxpayer. What sort of future do we leave for our children and our children's children when the debt becomes so large that it cannot possibly be paid, when we must tighten up and say to every department, 'We cannot afford to run that department because there is simply no money left.' People might ask how we have existed. I often ask the same question, because I have watched this State's debt getting bigger and bigger.

When I was looking at the figures for other States' capabilities of raising money, I looked at the question of royalties as shown in the accounts which were published last year in the different States, and I noticed that last year Queensland earned \$57 900 000 in royalties, Victoria

earned \$60 100 000, New South Wales earned \$35 600 000 and Western Australia earned \$51 200 000, so they had this buffer of income from royalties to cover some of the same problem areas that they as States are finding, the same as we are finding, but the difference between those States and this State is quite simply the fact that we earned only \$4 500 000.

What we are saying quite simply is that Roxby Downs and the indenture are essential to South Australia's economic stability and survival and can anyone tell me where on earth we will find the same sort of money, short of turning to the taxpayer and saying, "Listen, without Roxby we are going to have to tax you to raise additional income to cover the shortfall"? That is this year, next year and the year after, and so it goes on, and we are going to find an enormous problem because each year as the demands of the community grow and as the demands for resources within that community are requested and demanded, particularly in welfare, housing and a vast number of other areas, we are going to come to the point where we say, 'There is no money,' we cannot finance it unless the taxpayers are going to pay it.

We will become a parasitic State. We will be living off ourselves. We will not have any availability of resource funds, of income from royalties. How on earth does the Opposition ever expect to finance its schemes? It is a fact that in 10 years of Labor Government the State debt went from \$1 500 000 000 to \$2 500 000 000.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** That was less than the inflation over that period.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** It increased the State debt to finance its schemes. What we are saying is that, without some support from other areas, this State will go down and down because we cannot stop the problem of not being able to find the gap or the filling of the gap of the economic situation. If we are going to keep spending and our income is limited, we are going to be in trouble. If an ordinary citizen receiving \$200 a week spent \$300 a week—

**Mr Lewis:** Result, misery.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** The result would not only be misery: the person would probably end up in gaol. If a company was earning \$1 000 and spending \$2 000, where would that company end up? The company would be bankrupt and the owner will probably end up in gaol, where he should be, but if a Government keeps spending more and more without having the resources, what happens? No-one is held to be responsible in that area, so unless the Opposition members can say, 'We are not going to promise any other schemes. We are going to cut this and cut that. We are going to be responsible managers,' they should be supporting the Bill and making sure that the Roxby Downs indenture is a fact, because they cannot on one hand say the State does not need it. The State does need it. It is a fact.

Look in the account books. As I have said, each year that problem will get bigger. I want to introduce this as an argument to show why in economic terms Roxby Downs is essential. In 1979 in the housing area the Housing Trust had about 44 000 homes. I think 16 per cent of those 40 000 homes were occupied by tenants on rent subsidies, at a cost to the State of about \$1 400 000. In 1981 it had risen to I think 65 per cent of the tenants who were on rent subsidies and the cost to the State was between \$15 000 000 and \$20 000 000.

On projected figures, in five or six years time we may reach a position where the State has 70 to 80 per cent of its tenants in the Housing Trust area on rent subsidies and the cost to the State would be about \$100 000 000. Where on earth do we find that sort of money? Does the Opposition know? If it does not, it should be looking closely at the reasons why we need to ensure that this State receives the

full amount of royalties that it is possible to get from its resources.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** What year?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** We know that there is a lead time. No-one has denied that there is a lead time, but if we wait another 10 years and accept the Opposition's argument, there will be a 20 years lead time. If we accepted the Opposition's arguments and waited—

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** Ten years before the first cheque?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I am not arguing when the first cheque would come.

**Mr Lynn Arnold:** When do you want it to come?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I think there is possibly a considerable lead time. I am not arguing that point but I am saying that without that indenture going ahead, how on earth can we expect any company to invest money without some assurances at the end of it, because that would be absolutely ridiculous?

When we look at those royalty figures and see the difference between Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia and come back to South Australia, we see that we are lagging behind because we have not had the forethought in the 10 years previously to say that we needed to go ahead and get something done. This is what we are saying and we are looking to the future of our children and saying that we did our best.

I well remember that, on a visit to Roxby Downs last year, I had the opportunity to attend a lecture in the company of the member for Mitcham, his colleague Senator Haines, and also the member for Adelaide (Mr Hurford). During that tour of Roxby Downs I well remember the people there asking us whether there were any questions that we would like to ask. The member for Mitcham asked, 'Can the other stuff be left in the ground?' The answer that obviously came back was 'No'.

He asked the question again as to the economics of mining and separating the three bodies. When it was explained to him that it was essential to mine the three for the economic viability of the mine, he changed his line of questioning, but an interesting question was then raised by the member for Adelaide (Mr Hurford) and I well remember his comment, particularly when he said, 'Mining is essential to South Australia's growth: mining is essential to South Australia's economy.' He said that perhaps a future Federal Government would have to buy the uranium and stockpile it. On one hand he was accepting the fact as an economist that South Australia needed Roxby Downs and he accepted the fact that it needed to be mined to produce those royalties. He thought the one way around it was for a future Federal Labor Government to actually buy the uranium and stockpile it. I do not know how he would explain that cost to the taxpayers of Australia.

**Mr Lewis:** They would increase the taxes.

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** That is right. He would obviously put the taxes up to pay for it. It was a very informative trip. I do not know how many members of the Opposition have been to Roxby Downs to see what has been done to the area, to see how the people there think about it, and to ask pertinent questions, but I found it extremely interesting.

I am not going to take any further time to talk about the safeguards because there are people more qualified than I to talk about them. However, I well remember that one leading radiologist said to me the other day, 'Do you know there are more dangers in X-rays?' He said, 'Are you going to introduce a Bill in Parliament to ban X-rays?' He put up the argument that X-rays were far more dangerous than the mining and development of uranium.

I support the Bill and I hope that the public of South Australia will listen to the arguments, weigh them, and



realise the economic significance to this State of the development of Roxby Downs and what it really means to the future of our children in respect of the economic development and survival of this State, because from that springboard we can then show the rest of Australia that we, too, are rich in all our resources.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I did not originally intend to speak in this debate, because as the matter is to be referred to a Select Committee, the lively debating period will obviously be on the noting of the Select Committee report. However, I do wish to indicate my opinions at this stage. I do support the second reading to a Select Committee stage. I also indicate I have publicly stated in my own electorate that I fully support the development of the minerals in the Roxby Downs area.

South Australia desperately needs development. We must have it and I think this is a project that can give us the boost or the shot in the arm which we so desperately need. Unfortunately, this debate has departed from the subject of being a development for the State and moved to one that has become emotional, a pro-uranium or anti-uranium issue. To me, that is ridiculous, because the uranium component of this ore body is very small. It is not sufficient to be economic in its own right. That is the unique feature of this entire ore body.

There are ten or so minerals involved. Not one of those minerals is economic in its own right, so, therefore, whatever is extracted from the area has to be done with a combination of two or three more of the minerals. If it has to come from 1 000 feet below the surface, then such minerals will be stockpiled for later use. I am given to understand that this ore body contains about 52 per cent iron ore. Nobody has ever mentioned that. Because we have iron ore in such abundance in this State, why bring it down from such a distance in the North? I think that something we have not considered is the value of the resources we have now. In 50 years time we may be up there looking to bring down the iron ore component of that, as well as the components.

I was one of the fortunate people who did go to Roxby Downs, as did a few other members of the Parliament. If it were humanly possible, I would like to think that, if every person who had a doubt about this project could go up and see for himself just what is going on up there, the magnitude of the resource and the opportunities that do exist, then the attitude of the Opposition may be considerably different. I guess we could say this project is the baby of the Labor Party. The first hole that was test drilled there was in the term of the Labor Party. It was given that Party's blessing at that time.

The development from that stage on has really had the blessing of the Labor Party. For that Party to now turn around and cast doubts on the viability and the very future of the project is, to me, very sad. It has been said that \$50 000 000 has already been spent on the project and all we are asking now is for another \$50 000 000 to be spent. How far can we push these companies? How far can we rest on their gratitude or their enthusiasm for mining to allow them to commit themselves to such massive expenditure without at least giving them the nod or the okay that, should they be able to develop such a resource to an economic standard, they will be able to proceed with it?

I believe that the Western Mining Corporation and those associated with that company have every right to expect that they will be given that okay. The project is massive. We are talking of the employment of 2 000 to 3 000 people and ultimately the establishment of a town of 9 000 people. I can look at my own electorate and a city the size of Port Lincoln. An entire business community can develop and revolve around that particular project. I do not think anyone

in this State can sneeze at that prospect, because it is so worthy of support that it is almost so mind boggling that no-one should dare to venture against it.

I take up a couple of the points that have already been raised in this House. Some of those are from the member for Mitcham, who has taken the stance that, because we are dealing, even though it only be in a small part, with uranium, then we should leave the entire ore body where it is. To me that is—

**Mr Ashenden:** Shortsighted.

**Mr BLACKER:** Yes, shortsighted and a very grave mistake. It is resting on the assumption that, if we leave the uranium in the ground, all the nuclear problems throughout the world are going to disappear. That is far from the case. We only have about 15 per cent of the world's uranium resources in Australia anyway, so if we leave all our resources in the ground, what real significance is that going to have for the world power situation? The only significance it will have is that it is denying the world users that additional resource and, therefore, forcing up the price of uranium commodities from other countries, so leaving it in the ground is going to have a detrimental effect.

The other point that I think we should raise (and this has not been mentioned) is that I believe there are in the vicinity of 230 nuclear reactors in operation throughout the world and there are another 370-odd in various stages of construction, from the design board, the planning stage, through the various stages of construction, up to operation stage. That means there are about 600 nuclear power plants either in operation or about to come into operation throughout the world. I think it fair to say that, if we cut off nuclear power now, in approximately one-third of Europe the lights would go out. That is the crux of the situation. The world is so dependent on nuclear power that nuclear power generation is going to continue and all the problems people talk about and fear (and I am not saying those fears are well founded or otherwise; there may be genuine fears associated with it) will still exist regardless of what we do.

What can Australia do by making its resources available to the community? The real problem with nuclear power generation now is that we have a waste problem. We have nuclear reactors and the waste from those reactors is plutonium. The plutonium is the product that appears to cause some difficulties in storing. Some people say we are adequately holding it at the present time, but immediately uranium becomes scarce and countries that require power are desperate for that uranium, they are going to look to alternative means of power generation.

**Mr Lewis:** Breeder reactors.

**Mr BLACKER:** The member for Mallee has put his finger right on the pulse. The next step is the fast breeder reactor and that is the one where there are very real problems and dangers to the community, because the cycle goes from uranium into the nuclear reactor; the waste from that is plutonium, but the plutonium is the fuel product that goes into the fast breeder reactors. The waste from that is very, very dangerous. As long as we can farm out the uranium resources to the world users, the longer we are going to stave off the problem of fast breeder reactors and that is a subject which not one member has mentioned. It is a very good reason why the uranium resources of Australia and the world should be fed out as carefully and in as restrained a manner as possible to the world users, so that it delays for as long as is humanly possible the development of the fast breeder reactors.

We know there are already a couple of fast breeder reactors, I think, in operation. The last I heard was that they were certainly under construction, but I do understand they are almost in operation. We only need to imagine what would happen if we had a country with an unstable Gov-



ernment, where anything could happen, and if that country were in charge of the handling of a fast breeder reactor. The waste from that product is so near to a nuclear bomb that it does not really matter. In that case, the disposal of waste from those fast breeder reactors is nigh on impossible to control. That is where I believe the real problem is.

**Mr Keneally:** Put it down on Eyre Peninsula.

**Mr BLACKER:** The honourable member is getting away from the point quite considerably.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randall):** Order! Interjections are out of order.

**Mr BLACKER:** I want to finish by making a brief comment about the opening remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. If he reads his speech later he will realise that he has committed not only the Opposition to supporting the second reading: he stated quite specifically that he believed that these matters should be referred to a Select Committee, and this House should heed the advice of that Select Committee when it reports. That very comment has been inconsistent with some of the comments which have followed of late from some of his colleagues. However, I believe that if members follow the advice given by the Leader of the Opposition this Bill will receive the blessing of this House and pass all stages. I support the second reading to the Select Committee stage, because I believe that if any Government or any political Party were to stand in the way of this sort of development it would be nothing short of criminal as far as the people of South Australia are concerned.

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** This evening I would first like to address myself to the significance of Roxby Downs to South Australia. I think this is a point that has been seriously overlooked by members opposite. They are so hung up on their philosophical point of view that they are unable to see the damage that they will be doing to South Australia if they continue to oppose the indenture Bill presently before the House. I will be making some points as I go through concerning the importance of employment and also concerning the importance of the deposit, a matter which was touched on by the previous speaker. Members opposite have been concentrating only on the uranium that will be mined at Roxby Downs; they are completely overlooking the copper, gold and rare earths which make this ore body one of the biggest of its type in the world. If members opposite have their way we will find, of course, that that ore body simply will not be able to be worked with all the economic benefits that would flow to South Australia.

I think that the points outlined in a booklet released on the Olympic Dam project set out very clearly the reasons why this indenture agreement must pass. It will, of course, permit the Olympic Dam joint venturers to carry out the development of the project, and it commits them to a considerable expenditure of funds and development within South Australia. In return the contribution required by the South Australian Government can only be described as minimal. Virtually, the money that this Government will be spending is purely and simply in developing areas that would be developed in any new town, and I refer to such things as schools, roads, and so on. The agreement is so watertight that if the development should not go ahead it will not cost the State anything because the funds expended by the State will be refunded.

Surely, as a Government, we cannot expect to have a completely one-way street. The Western Mining Corporation has already spent in excess of \$50 000 000, and obviously what it requires from the Government is some form of assurance that if it spends another \$50 000 000 there will be a light at the end of the tunnel. One cannot expect any company to proceed with investment in a project the size

of Roxby Downs if it does not have an agreement that can be used by a company to ensure the protection of its investment. As a form of reassurance to a company an agreement is extremely important, as it is also to other areas.

Again, the Leader of the Opposition completely ignored the reason why this indenture Bill has been brought forward. It is to enable a final feasibility study to be undertaken. The financing of the feasibility study by the company, of course, cannot possibly proceed unless it has the protection that is offered by the indenture Bill before us.

The Leader again seems to be making great play of the fact that this indenture Bill will not guarantee construction. For goodness sake, no company is going to commit itself to thousands of millions of dollars if it is not as sure as it possibly can be that its investment will be well spent, and that is exactly what this indenture Bill is designed to do, that is, provide the security that the Western Mining Corporation requires to determine whether in fact it should go on with construction.

There is no doubt at all that the company is quite confident that it will be able to proceed to the stage of construction and, therefore, extraction of the minerals that are contained in the ore body. However, the company must be completely sure. What members opposite seem to fail to realise, which is obviously the case because of their complete lack of knowledge of financial matters or business management, is that no company will go ahead with investment unless it has the protection of such an indenture behind it. The benefits that will come to this State (if members opposite can overcome their hangups—or should I say overcome the split that has divided the Party into two camps: one for and one against, and it will be interesting to see which side wins—and look at this matter calmly and logically) will be the development that will occur. As the company itself says, and I quote directly from the company's own information:

Preliminary estimates show that 10 000, and possibly up to 15 000, jobs could be created by the Olympic Dam project, that is, directly and indirectly.

Members opposite want us to turn that down: they want that opportunity thrown right out the door, and if they do not allow the passage of the indenture Bill the final feasibility study cannot be proceeded with, which means that they regard the prospect of losing up to 15 000 jobs as not important and that that should simply be ignored. Then, of course, there is the question of the royalty payments. The coffers of this State were left in a disastrous situation, by the previous Government, as one of my colleagues showed earlier tonight. Therefore, I would imagine that members on the other side of the House would not be very concerned if the State loses some more money. Members opposite may not be concerned, but the Government is concerned and the people in the community are concerned. It is absolutely essential that the final feasibility study proceed in order that the future development of this mine can go ahead.

There is another point that seems to be overlooked by members opposite. For some time they have been out to play down South Australia as much as they can, to keep investment out. This ties up again with the procedure that they are obviously following here, that is, their overlooking the importance of future investment in South Australia. Companies will ignore this State totally if we are seen to be a State that will just reject out of hand a development of this type. Members opposite have rubbished Queensland and Western Australia, which at one time were Cinderella States, but because they have been progressive and because they have encouraged mining development and other industrial development those States are no longer in the Cinderella situation that they were in some years ago. There is no doubt at all that if the Roxby Downs project can proceed

that will place us in a position where we will have employment gains and financial gains that now exist in Western Australia and Queensland.

Let us not overlook the statements that have been made by Western Mining Corporation executives themselves. They have said straight out that if this indenture Bill is defeated they will have to look very seriously at whether they will continue any investment in South Australia. If they reach that stage how many other mining and development companies will have exactly the same outlook? Yet members opposite are quite content—they are nodding their heads in agreement that this should occur. So much for their interest in the welfare of the future of South Australia.

As pointed out in an article in the *Advertiser* late last year by Mr Parry from the Western Mining Corporation: who states:

It is a big country after all, and there is a lot of Western Australia, Queensland and the Northern Territory left to be explored. There is one thing you can be absolutely certain of: the world's demand for copper or uranium will be satisfied whether South Australia satisfies it or not.

He said that South Australia had tremendous mineral potential which could be developed if given the right climate. For goodness sake, let us be sensible and encourage the right climate here in South Australia. While we do not need the nuclear energy ourselves, as far as uranium mining is concerned, there are resource starved countries that have no alternative: they must have nuclear fuel, and if they do not get it from Australia they will certainly get it from elsewhere, because uranium is one of the best potential sources of new electrical energy supplies in the coming decades. We can see this only too clearly when we look at what is happening in some overseas countries: for example, France, which as members opposite would freely acknowledge now has socialist Government.

The French parliament has just voted 331 to 67 for the proposals of the new energy policy. The Prime Minister of that country said that France could not afford to make mistakes in energy planning. For that reason, a plan with a large reserve of nuclear capacity was necessary, and then the programme will give France 56 gigawatts of nuclear capacity in 1990 and there will be six new nuclear units ordered in the next financial year.

Are we going to ignore that type of development? We have seen where such leading persons as Sir MacFarlane Burnett a biological scientist, has stated:

I hold strongly that we should foster nuclear technology to provide a breaching source of power during the changeover from fossil fuel to solar energy.

When we look at the needs and energy requirements throughout the world, nothing can be more obvious. The Ottawa summit conference held last year with the seven major industrial western nations confirmed that their future reliance on nuclear power was absolutely essential. There will be a very great increase in the production of nuclear energy.

I now want to address myself to a point which appears to be very much overlooked by members opposite, particularly the member for Mitcham, that is, the mining of coal for an alternative source of energy is not without its hazards. The member for Mitchell even said that the safeguards for coal mining were well proven. I have in my hand a report on energy supply for the period of 1985 to the year 2020 which covers the world situation. There is no doubt, as the report states, that Europe, North America and Japan have no alternative but to use nuclear power. One of the main reasons for this is that it is much cheaper than any other form of power and also that the stage has been reached, particularly in Europe, where they cannot use more coal.

We in Australia just do not appreciate that there are severe environmental effects in north-eastern U.S.A. and north-western Europe from too much coal burning.

Even with a highly efficient scrubbing of sulphur gases from coal burning emissions, there is little room for further expansion because of the damage caused by acid rain. There is one final point I would like to make: most coals have radium in them and radon gas is released when the coal is burnt. Because of the huge amounts of coal burnt each year—approximately 5 000 000 to 6 000 000 tonnes, for 2 000 megawatts—the amount of radio-activity released is much greater than from a nuclear plant, not to mention the deaths that occur in the mining and transport of coal and the environmental damage caused by the depositing of 300 000 tonnes of fly ash, along with acid rain, each year. Is that what members opposite would like to see?

There are many other points I could make on this matter, but I think that they have been well covered by my colleagues on this side. There is no doubt that for the economic well-being of the future of South Australia and employment prospects we must allow this indenture to pass.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** Let me deal, first, with the material proffered to the House by the Leader of the Opposition. He has sought, as has been his wont during the last several months, to completely misrepresent the activities of the Government in relation to the Roxby Downs indenture. First, he suggested that the Government had sought to inflame unreal expectations and he quoted some figures in relation to employment which have been quoted from time to time. I utterly reject that accusation. The fact is that the Government has sought at various periods, starting from the time when we were in Opposition, to assign employment prospects to this venture, and none of those has in any way been grossly misleading. The indenture is written around an initial township size of 9 000 people, with a work force of the order of 3 000 or 4 000 at the mine.

If one is to give any precision to the infrastructure commitments of the Government and the joint venturers, one has to light upon some size of project, and the size of the project as defined in the indenture is a mine producing 450 000 tonnes of copper per year, which is a very large mine by any standards. That is an indicative figure. The point we have made over and over again is that this is a world-class ore body, and the Leader of the Opposition, somewhere or other in his rather halting address, acknowledged that fact. This is a world-class ore body and will in the fullness of time lead to a mining operation of world class.

So, when we talk about a large town of 9 000 people, as the indenture does, we are not talking about pie in the sky or some pipedream as he has described it from time to time; we are talking about an agreement between the Government and the joint venturing companies. He says that the royalties are inflated. Again, I utterly reject that statement. We have said all along that the royalty calculations are indicative. Nobody knows what the price of metal will be in any one year. Metal prices are traditionally historically cyclical. Metal prices at the moment are depressed.

Some sage from the *Financial Review* wrote an article last week. A character called Paul Maloney, urged I would think by friends in the Labor Party, wrote a nonsensical article making some of the points which have been echoed here today by the Labor Party. The interstate reports of this indenture have been invariably full of praise, and there have been several of them. It struck me as being coincidental that this character rang my office to get some information, and he quizzed one of my officers in relation to this indenture. He was given answers which would have satisfied most

normal inquirers; nonetheless, he sought to write an article in that journal, which earlier carried a very good article full of praise by Michael Jacobs. That journal chose to allow this correspondent to write this material, and it was completely misleading.

I have penned a reply to the *Review*, and it has not seen fit to publish it yet, but I have dissected in some detail the nonsense which he is promulgating. One of the points he was making related to royalties, echoed and mimicked here today by, I would think, a compatriot in the Labor Party, judging by the way that particular journalist behaved. He was quite out of character with all other journalists interstate. The Government has said all along that these royalty figures are indicative. This writer is suggesting that maybe the royalties will only be \$21 000 000 and not \$30 000 000.

What a nonsensical suggestion to make. Even with the conservative prices prevailing at the moment, who is sneering at royalties of \$21 000 000? At the rate of 3.5 per cent, which is guaranteed under the indenture, even if the profit related royalty does not cut in, who will sneeze at \$21 000 000 flowing into the State coffers when the total royalties at the moment are about \$8 000 000? Is the Leader suggesting that we have deliberately inflated the take from royalties? That is absurd. If he likes to join forces with this sage from the *Financial Review* and suggest that we turn our backs on this because the royalties may be \$21 000 000, \$30 000 000, or \$40 000 000, he is sillier than I think he is—and that is not saying a lot.

The Leader suggests that we have no regard to the circumstances at the time and that our hands are tied as to conditions. That is nonsense, because the Government's hands are not tied. This was repeated, I think by the member for Mitchell, in due course. There are onerous conditions required of the joint venturers in the terms of this indenture. The honourable member said it does not contain a commitment, and that is equally absurd. The first commitment is that the joint venturers are to spend \$50 000 000 in the next two years. I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition would spend \$50 000 000 if he did not know the ground rules. He keeps asserting that the Government offered this indenture to the joint venturers and sold the State out. That is completely untrue. The joint venturers have made public statements on this.

The Leader likes to close his ears to what is uncomfortable, but he should get a transcript of what Sir Arvi Parbo said on *Nationwide*. He said that the indenture is essential, that he had asked the Government for an indenture because, if the joint venturers did not know the ground rules, they would not spend another \$50 000 000—and I do not blame him for that.

Would the Leader of the Opposition buy a house for his new bride without knowing the ground rules? People would think he was stupid if he did, and the same applies to these companies. I would not spend \$50 000 000, if I were in that position, if I did not know the ground rules. It has been pointed out that, if the ground rules are not known, no real feasibility study is possible. One cannot proceed to a feasibility study until the conditions of development are known. Without that, there are no terms of reference for a feasibility study. A study without specific agreed terms is worthless, because it deals with an unreal situation. It would not be a feasibility study; it would be useless. The terms of the indenture allow a feasibility study to proceed. No indenture means that a feasibility study cannot be done.

The Opposition is being quite unrealistic in suggesting that it is not against a feasibility study, that we do not know the ground rules and we do not know what it will lead to. They do not mind that. They do not mind the shafts and drives, and the joint venturers spending \$50 000 000 in the next two years taking out ore, finding

the metallurgy and how the minerals can be separated, but they do not want the ground rules laid down. The money will not be spent unless there are ground rules, and they are laid in this indenture.

It is interesting that no-one from the Opposition has been able to give any coherent criticism of any single clause in the indenture. They have had to cloak the whole of their argument around trivia, because they know that this is a first-class indenture and that there is little if anything to criticise in it.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Rubbish!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We have heard a lot of hoo-hah from the member for Mitchell and the Leader about there being no limit to the infra-structure. How absurd that is when there are clauses in the indenture that detail the items of infra-structure that the State has agreed to provide, and precisely—

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Which ones?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I suggest that the honourable member get hold of the indenture, leaving aside the guide that I was good enough to give him.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:**

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** There was not much point in simply reproducing the indenture. If the honourable member had even thumbed through the indenture he would have found a list specifying clearly the items of infra-structure the Government has agreed to provide. If he were to thumb further, he would find a specific costing of each of those items as at 1 June 1981. If he is incapable of comprehending that and seeing that there is a complete definition of infra-structure items with a realistic and carefully computed costing, and that that cost is \$50 000 000, he is not capable of absorbing much. If he would like to go through the mechanics of how we achieve that, we agreed with the joint venturers that we would provide infra-structure to the value of \$50 000 000.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Estimated—those are your words.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Everything has to be estimated. Everything the Labor Government did in office started as an estimate. After the ravages of the Federal Labor Government, when inflation went through the roof, it cost much more than the estimate. That is only plain common sense. Let us remind them of the indenture written by my predecessor in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. There, in 1977 terms, it was agreed that South Australia, for a 25-year project, if it was lucky, would sell cheap gas, provide infra-structure to the cost of \$67 000 000 non-repayable, which would be in excess of \$100 000 000 in 1981 terms. That was in 1977 dollars, and that would have been the value of the money in 1981 if it had been spent in 1981.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Is your \$50 000 000 absolute?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I have made no secret of the fact that it is absolute in terms of 1981 dollars. The Labor Party contracted to borrow \$253 000 000 of Loan funds for the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, but members opposite have the gall to suggest that we have not done a first-class deal in relation to this enormous project, which has at least a 50-year life, or perhaps 100 years.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** A panic deal.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** How absurd! The man is more stupid than I gave him credit for. I do not know what sort of clause our friends opposite would have negotiated, but if the Government agreed to provide normal Government infra-structure—schools, hospitals, fire stations, and so on—up to \$50 000 000, there is no more logical way of going about it. It is absurd to suggest that the Government has not carefully costed those items and that they come to \$50 000 000 in 1981 prices. If they are built in 1983—

**The Hon. The Hon. R. G. Payne:** That is a minimum, and you know it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is not the minimum, but a realistic estimate after consultation with the departments concerned over a considerable period.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Come on, Roger.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. The figures are carefully calculated, and they add up to \$50 000 000.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It is absolute?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know what point the honourable member is making. We have agreed to provide infra-structure to the value of \$50 000 000 in 1 June 1981 dollars. The Opposition cannot criticise that in any shape or form, with any force or meaning.

So much for the Opposition's criticism of the infrastructure deal. The joint venturers are being asked to provide a lot of infrastructure that, in other circumstances, the State would supply, namely, water supply, head works, sewerage, electricity reticulation and so on, at no cost to the State. We hear a lot about what the Corcoran letter is and what it does. The Corcoran letter has no force in law. In fact, this Government had to put through an amendment to the Stamp Duties Act to give effect to it. I refer the member for Michell to the debates of 6 November 1980, when this Government had to enact legislation to give effect to statements in the Corcoran letter. So much for the Corcoran letter! It promised an indenture in due course in regard to this proposal.

If the indenture is not forthcoming, the feasibility study will not be forthcoming. Members opposite say on the one hand that they are against uranium mining, but on the other hand they do not mind the feasibility study going ahead. Let me press on with the comments made by the Leader. The Leader said that we will sell out the State with the indenture. How absurd! Are members opposite calling Sir Arvi Parbo a liar when he goes public and says, 'No indenture, no more money.'

**Mr Keneally:** What would you expect the Chairman to say?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I know the gentleman, and I recognise his integrity. If members opposite are calling him a liar, let them say so.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The use of the word 'liar', as used by the Deputy Premier, is quite unnecessary and unparliamentary according to precedent in this House.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I rise on a point of order. You, Mr Speaker, anticipated in some small measure the point I wished to raise. The Minister was imputing to this side of the House words that are unparliamentary in relation to a person who is not in the House. At no stage was that charge made by members on this side.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member did not raise a point of order: he sought to give an explanation.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I draw the Opposition's attention to the statements made by Sir Arvi Parbo publicly on *Nationwide* some months ago. If members opposite choose to disbelieve him, that is their business. His comments completely negate any allegation that the Government offered an indenture. That suggestion is absurd.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Panic.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member says 'panic'. The indenture has been negotiated for the best part of a year. The Labor Party knocked up something in five minutes—that is how smart it is. Members opposite give away all sorts of things. The honourable member wants a project that will erase the jobless in one swipe.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Who does?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Leader. He said that this project will not erase the jobless figures. Let the

Leader outline the project of his contemplation that would erase the jobless figures in South Australia. That is another absurd suggestion. The Leader knows perfectly well that jobs are created in tens, maybe twenties, if you are lucky in hundreds, but rarely in thousands. If employment is to be increased by thousands, there must be investments of millions of dollars or, if one is lucky, billions of dollars.

As one of the speakers on this side said (I think it was the Premier), projects of that sort do no bob up every day of the week. I do not believe that any such projects bobbed up during the life of the Labor Governments. This State has seen three billion dollar projects. One was the B.H.P. development at Whyalla. Look what that has led to. That was in an extremely good provincial city. Another such project was the Stony Point development, which this Government negotiated.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** You had nothing to do with it. It was in train.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** That is another absurd suggestion. There was no liquids project when this Government came to office. Within two years, we achieved such a project, and the Opposition said we were rushing things.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** When?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** When we brought in the Bill. We successfully negotiated an extremely good deal for South Australia.

**Mr Keneally:** We supported it; it was our project.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** There was no liquids project when this Government came to office. We now have that project in the bag.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** That was not in your policy, either.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member has not read our policy, which I quoted during the Stony Point debate.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** Quote it now—come on.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not happen to have the *Hansard* or the policy, but it was enunciated by me when I outlined our policy in relation to this liquids scheme in, I think, October 1979. I refer the honourable member to the *Hansard* of October 1979, where he can see that this Government stated that one of its priorities was to get a liquids scheme going.

The third billion dollar project this century is now before us and the Labor Party, because of some internal philosophical argument, is prepared to turn its back on it. The Leader talked about Mt Isa and said that it took quite a few years for Mt Isa to be up and running. If the Labor Party has its way, it will take Roxby Downs a lot longer to get up and running. Just what is the point the Leader is making? Is he saying that we should delay this project, because such projects take a while to get going? What an absurd argument! It is the height of stupidity to suggest that, because it takes a while for a billion dollar project to get up and running, we should delay. I have talked about the infrastructure, and the comments made by the Leader were absolute claptrap, as I pointed out previously.

The Leader went on to talk about seven points, and the comments he made were the height of absurdity. These are the seven king hits of the Labor Party's policy. This was the height of folly. The first point the Leader made was that the A.L.P. is prepared to allow the final pre-production assessment. Without the ground rules, there would be no pre-production assessment. The question of the mining, processing and export of uranium must wait until the conditions of the A.L.P.'s policy are satisfied, the Leader said. That means that we must wait until the Labor Party sorts itself out. It is preposterous for the Leader to suggest that the joint venturers would spend a further \$50 000 000, on top of the \$50 000 000 already committed, on the basis of

a chance that the A.L.P. may change its mind and its policy. The facts are that, if the Roxby project is to be viable, while it is large, complex, and unusual, we must be able to market all minerals, because of the immense cost involved, and members opposite know that.

The second king hit, which would be a completely disastrous proposal, was that we should give the company a 50-year lease, subject to periodic review. What does that mean? That is cold comfort. I draw the attention of the Opposition to the clauses in relation to tenure, which the Government negotiated in relation to the Roxby Downs and Olympic Dam deposit. The Government was not particularly interested in companies obtaining those leases and sitting on them. The Government was interested in accelerating activities, in ensuring that the site was explored and that the potential was developed as quickly as possible. The Labor Party is prepared to give it away for 50 years, and let a company sit there and do nothing. Is that what the Opposition means? Its saviour is the phrase 'subject to periodic review'. What does that mean?

That would be cold comfort to any company. I thought that was about the most loosely worded and ill conceived statement in relation to tenure that anybody could dream of. I would think that any Mines Department around the Commonwealth would die of fright if it saw that.

The third point was, 'We believe the indenture as it presently stands is totally one sided. It gives to the companies all rights of decision about the project. It can be commenced or deferred at their will.' That is plain nonsense. Obviously the Leader does not seek to be interested in the truth of what is in the indenture. He obviously has not read it. The whole point is that there are definite milestones and requirements of the companies in the indenture.

By 1984 they have to have spent \$50 000 and be at the stage where they are making an assessment of markets, raising finance so that they can commit to the project before 1987. That is the deadline. If the companies do not commit by 1987, there are two periods by which they can defer for two years, but the Government has the right to get independent advice, and, if that advice says that it is economic to go on, their leases can be terminated. The indenture will lapse. To suggest there are no constraints on the company is plainly absurd, as are all the points raised by the Leader.

In point 4, he is again suggesting a complete fabrication. He says, 'We do not believe the Bill contains adequate radiological safeguards.' It is only the most stringent of any legislation of this type in Australia. That statement was absolute nonsense. The companies have to adhere not only to existing codes, namely, the Australian codes which have been hammered out in recent years in relation to mining, milling and transport by all of the State in the Commonwealth, but also to the international codes, and they also have to comply with any changes which might occur in those codes from here on. What could be tougher than that? It is absurd to suggest that their radiological clauses are not most stringent. They are indeed. I utterly reject the suggestion in point 4.

Point 5 was, 'They would require special workers compensation provisions'. The fact is that the workers compensation provisions apply in this as in all other areas and the company is compelled in terms of the codes to examine the men medically initially and periodically. All of the health and safety requirements in the codes have to be complied with by law in terms of the indenture and all workers compensation laws apply. That is plainly a red herring.

Point 6 is completely erroneous. That point is, 'The question of tailings disposal is not addressed.' That is completely untrue. The Leader has not absorbed obviously the importance of clause 10 of the indenture. The Opposition may have thumbed through the guide where I sought to condense

major points in the indenture but if it took the trouble to read the indenture and had a good look at clause 10, it would see that tailings are covered. Tailings are covered in terms of what is required under the codes, and what was said is patently untrue. There is no other word for it. Point 6 is untrue.

We have not yet struck one point of the seven that is true, so we are down to the last. That was, 'In accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth e.i.s. we would require a public inquiry'. Not only does the indenture require that all the e.i.s. procedures be followed but it requires that an environmental study is completed every two years and is reported to the Government. That is another red herring with no substance of truth in it. All the e.i.s. procedures must be followed.

When we examine those seven points there is only one conclusion: the Opposition is not content to deal with the facts. It is seeking to misrepresent, plainly to make absurd suggestions in relation to tenure, and to deal in untruths. I can only conclude that, if they are not deliberately seeking to deal in untruths, they have not yet had the wit or taken the time to study the indenture. It is not an easy document to study; it is a comprehensive indenture. Members opposite charge us with a lack of detail. Obviously, most of the detail has eluded them.

The fact is that many indentures written interstate contain far less details than does this indenture; joint indentures require detail, because these indentures have to be backable documents in this day and age. They have to stand up to the scrutiny of international bankers who in the main will be providing finance for these projects. I would not wish to deprive the Opposition of a grievance debate tonight, so I shall truncate my remarks in relation to the other speakers.

I recall that a number of assertions made by one or two other members of the Opposition were equally ill informed. The member for Mitchell reiterated a number of points made by his Leader. He talked about the limited use of electricity. Nuclear provides a very large component, and a growing component, of the Western world's electricity generation. If he is not aware of that, he should read more widely and, if he is able, travel overseas and look. That is advice I give to anyone, because at least the honourable member for Salisbury did not have quite the hard line I would have thought he would have in relation to the mining and milling. He has been overseas and had a look.

His Leader went to Canada a year or so ago and did not even have a look at the uranium operations there. He did not want to hear, because he knew what he would see and hear would be damaging to the stance he was forced to adopt, but at least I will give the member for Salisbury credit for having a look and not having a completely closed mind on the matter. I will conclude by dealing with one or two of the matters he raised, because he was off the beam.

The member for Mitchell talked about the NIOSH occupational health codes. I took the trouble to find out what that was about. That was in relation to occupational health. They deal with asbestos and the like and they are strict. In the United States they adopt the N.R.C. codes in relation to radiological matters and they are based on the international codes, which are precisely those that we specify in the indenture, along with the Australian codes, so there was no substance in that point. The member for Salisbury has taken the trouble to listen to what I say. We certainly have not misled the public. As to price, I would refer him to what Sir Arvi Parbo had to say. If you made a decision at any given time in relation to price of metal commodities you would never do anything. As he said, prices are cyclical, always have been and will continue to be so. If you base your planning on prices at any given time, you can bet your

bottom dollar that that situation will change one way or the other.

That area has a feeling for development, he tells us, and he has a feeling for the unemployed and hungry and he supports Technology Park. One thing that will get Technology Park going will be if we get Roxby Downs going, because it will be mining companies along with others like oil companies that will be attracted to invest in Technology Park and companies like Western Mining Corporation and others will be just the people we hope to attract there, but if this State turns its back on Roxby Downs, we will be the laughing stock of the nation. I would think that would be a body blow to Technology Park.

The member talked about decentralisation. He talks about jobs and how many it would create. I know the Labor Party's RED scheme created not one permanent job and that cost \$50 000 000. I do not know what the member is on about when he refers to how many jobs it will create. It would create thousands of jobs over a period of time. I suggest the member read the brochure that the company puts out, where the number of jobs quoted is rather higher than what the Government has been saying.

Regarding capital demand, most of the capital will come from overseas. There is not likely to be competition for capital in Australia in relation to this. In relation to safeguards, I suggest the member go overseas and look at the developments in relation to storage of wastes safeguards. If Australia is to have any influence at all in relation to safeguards, it well behoves us to be part of the world of nuclear affairs.

Time precludes me from dealing with the member for Mitcham. He is going to oppose the second reading. I do not know whether he is in his room, but he mentioned a number of matters that I would like to deal with, but out of courtesy to the Opposition, I shall not carry on. He is not here to listen anyway. He talked about storage, proliferation, nuclear blackmail, loss of civil liberties, all of which were canvassed at length. All in all, I was disappointed with the Opposition's contribution to this debate. There was nothing of substance. There was a series of either misrepresentations or plain lack of knowledge. Either members opposite have not read the indenture and absorbed its contents, or they are seeking to deliberately mislead the public. As I have said, the radiological protection clauses, for instance, are the most stringent that anybody in his right mind could believe are suitable. All in all, at least the Opposition had the good sense to vote for the second reading so it can proceed to a Select Committee.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs Ashenden, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hopgood, and Payne; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on 1 June; the committee to have power to invite any specially qualified persons whom it may desire to attend any of its meetings in an advisory capacity.

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I want to raise a topic that concerns a considerable number of people in my electorate and it is one that I am sure will affect many others in other electorates. The problem I refer to concerns trees. For at least the past two decades planting of trees in our community has been encouraged to a greater degree than ever before.

In itself that is a good thing, but with that comes a responsibility on some individual or individuals concerning who carries the blame if a tree falls on to a neighbour's property, either causing damage to a home or perhaps even maiming or killing a person on a neighbouring property. If people choose to have trees on their own block around their own home, that is a risk they take. While within our community until recent times the vast majority of trees planted were exotics, there was not as great a risk of trees falling as there is with Australian natives. Some people would argue that that is a contradiction, because surely our natives would be safer trees to plant within our environment than exotics.

However, unfortunately, when we plant natives they are well cared for and watered in most home gardens all the year round, so they do not suffer the intense dry spells that they would suffer under natural conditions, particularly on, say, the Adelaide Plains during the summer months. Under natural conditions when there is not reticulated water it is a harsh time for most plants and trees which seek water in gravel beds or aquifers down to a depth of anything from 40 feet to 80 feet. Under these conditions trees develop a root structure with major roots to a considerable depth together with spina roots in order to find a supply of moisture during summer months. Now that we water gardens, giving the trees a good supply of water all the year round, they do not have to fight for a water supply, so the root structures are located nearer the surface.

During late autumn, winter and spring, when we get high winds, our native trees, once they have risen to a height above the roofs of houses, collect a massive amount of wind and so have a great force pushing them towards the earth, and we now find that many of them are actually falling. The exotic trees, the deciduous trees, do not give the same problem, because during autumn and winter they lose their leaf structure and so the wind resistance is less and they are more able to withstand the windy conditions.

Therefore, if a person has a large tree growing near the boundary of his property, such a tree can cause real mental trauma to a neighbour. That is apart from the root structure, and the problem of surface damage to lawns, plumbing, drainage pipes or concrete paths and such things. If there is a large tree on a boundary that tends to lean towards one's home all one can do at law at the moment is remove the limbs of the tree and stack them on the owner's property without doing damage to any part of his property, which, in itself, is sometimes rather difficult if he has a complete garden developed within his grounds, when it might be difficult to find a place to stack the material. A person is not allowed to sell or dispose of such material, but it must be left on the neighbour's property. That provision may be all right in English law where that particular facet of law originated, but I am sorry to say that it does not work here.

Even if overhanging parts of the tree are removed the tree is then put out of balance and a tree is more likely, in a prevailing wind, to fall on to an owner's home. However, that does not eliminate the risk of a tree falling on to one's home from a neighbour's property. It could be said that one can insure one's home against such damage, but that is not much comfort to a person who is lying in bed on a windy night and knows that there is a 100 ft tree which is tilted towards his home and which could fall on to his home, taking the garage and part of the house. There was a case like that in my electorate. On this particular property there are six similar trees; the person concerned has taken off all the limbs, but now on windy nights he changes the room in which he sleeps because of the risk that exists.

Many of us probably have not thought of what this problem is likely to mean in the future. For the benefit of local council I believe that the law needs to be changed



whereby if a person points out to the local council that he is concerned about a tree overhanging a home and endangering the house and its occupants, the council could take out insurance on such property to cover that home and the owner, including risk to life and limb, or, alternatively, could remove the tree. At the moment a council can maintain that such an occurrence is an act of God, but it is no good telling an individual that it is an act of God if he has known for five, six, seven or more years that a tree has been endangering his life and when he has pointed the danger out to the owner of the tree and to the council.

I believe that once a person has pointed out his concern about the danger, there should then be an opportunity for a person with botanical experience to inspect the tree and, if such a person believes that there is a risk, the owner should then be obliged to remove it. If, in the opinion of the botanical expert, there is not a risk, at least the owner of the tree should take out some form of policy to cover that situation as a public risk policy. This should not be treated simply as an act of God, because many of the trees were planted not by God but by human beings in an attempt to beautify an area, and in many cases they were planted in unnatural positions.

In regard to pines, we are now just reaching the stage where they may become a problem, because conifers were brought to this State in small quantities until about the turn of the century. Radiata pine is most prevalent in the wetter parts of the State. Radiata pine reaches its maturity in this State at around the 100 year mark and from that point on they are likely to blow down at any time. We have a major problem concerning this because many of the radiata pines have reached maturity and have started to deteriorate. In such cases surely a neighbour has a right to say to an owner of such trees that the trees are near the end of their life span and should be removed. At the moment the law does not allow that. It will be found (and I say this quite confidently) within the next decade that a large number of homes will be damaged, a lot of property damaged and many people's lives put at risk because of this issue. I am not saying that we should not go on planting trees; however, what we can do is remove trees once they have reached the limit of their life or have started to endanger a neighbour's property and plant a similar type of tree, or, in fact, young trees could be planted at some time before the old ones are removed, so that there is a chance for them to begin to develop.

If we do not do this and do not take action as a Parliament to amend the law in that area, I believe we are being unfair to many citizens in the community who enjoy the benefit of trees but who also want to live a peaceful life without risk to their home or the lives or limbs of members of the family through a neighbour's determination not to remove a danger from within a section of his property. This matter has never been raised here before. I hope that members of Parliament will think about this matter seriously because there is a real risk to many people in this community now that people have changed to watering gardens all year round.

**Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury):** I wish to raise a matter on behalf of the constituents of the Salisbury Downs and Parafield Gardens area of my electorate. It concerns the opportunity that now appears to have been missed for the provision of community facilities in that area. I refer to the Angas Home, which was until a few weeks ago owned by the South Australian Housing Trust and which has now been lost to the community in a way that I find quite despicable. I will in a moment explain why I find that to be so. First, I wish to outline some details about the Angas Home. It was a home and property given by John Howard

Angas in the last part of last century to the South Australian Deaf Society to be used as a home for the aged and infirm deaf. In 1979, when that society had no further use for the facility, it was bought by the Housing Trust, which proposed to use part of the allotment for much-needed residential development.

The house itself became somewhat of a problem for the trust. At the time, in 1979, it had been suggested that the local council could accept the land on which the home stood as part of the 12½ per cent reserve allocation and that thence they could use the home for community purposes. That suggestion met with some support in the local community. Any efforts since that time to see that facility used as a community facility have been stymied time after time by somebody somewhere in either the Minister's office or in the Housing Trust.

First, the home was offered for an aged care facility. I do not object to that; indeed, there is a very important need for aged care within my electorate. The Uniting Church was doing some serious work in this regard. I contend that part of the facility could still have been a community facility. Then Barkuma was considering it, but it was unable to proceed with it because of financial troubles.

In March 1981, it was offered by advertisement for community use. Community groups were advised to register their interest. Quite in the middle of that process, that was held in abeyance by the Minister's own admission, and suddenly another negotiation took place to sell it to somebody else—the Italian Evangelical Church. Those negotiations fell through and so the community became useful again, and they were invited once more to register their interest for community use. Five cases of possible community use were registered.

The Minister advised us in a letter dated 28 October 1981 that 'Due consideration was given to all of the interests received.' That is not true. As a person who has some contact with at least one of the registrations lodged, I know for a fact that it was never even acknowledged, let alone replied to. So much for 'due consideration'. There might have been some consideration, but there was certainly no courtesy.

I raised this matter some weeks ago when I, along with other members of the Labor Party, had a meeting with the Minister of Housing, the General Manager of the trust and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the trust. I raised this as one of the issues that concerned me. Following that, I wrote to the Minister to outline my opinions on this matter, following the comments made on that day. I wrote:

At the meeting held last Friday where members of the Opposition had the opportunity to meet with the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust, the Chairman of the board and yourself, I was advised that, in the opinion of the trust, there had been a desultory response from the local community concerning future community use of the Angas Home. I was further advised that the only option being considered at the moment was the home's possible conversion to a nursing home facility as a result of a private approach.

Indeed, that is what we were told. I went on to say:

I indicated at the time that the trust's impression of the community response was not, to my knowledge, accurate, and I now write formally to confirm that opinion. There have been a number of people in the local area who have approached me since I have been the member, concerning the great advantages that would be offered by conversion of the Angas Home to a community facility. Suggestions as to its possible development have included its use as a home base for many of the smaller local clubs and societies that are individually unable to meet the costs of building their own premises; such a suggestion would see a management committee administering the Angas Home (possibly under section 666 of the Local Government Act), with individual societies taking out leases on rooms as required and sharing such facilities as ablutions and the dining hall (which could be used as an activities hall).

I cannot make the point too strongly, that the Salisbury West area of my electorate is grossly under-provided for in terms of

community facilities. A number of demographic characteristics combined with the new funding climate make it unlikely that the type of facilities that were provided in Salisbury North and Ingle Farm could be replicated in the Salisbury West area at least in the foreseeable future. The Angas Home represents the only real alternative for the provision of such facilities, and to let such a facility go, would be, in my mind, doing a great disservice to the Parafield Gardens/Salisbury Downs area.

I ask that you give earnest consideration to preventing Angas Home being lost as a community resource to that area. Should you desire confirmation of community opinion in this regard, I would be more than happy to arrange for a deputation of local residents to meet with you to discuss this matter. In any event, I ask that you keep me posted of all developments regarding the Angas Home.

That letter was addressed shortly after the day of the meeting at which I was advised that there had been a desultory community response and negotiations were under way for the sale of the home as a nursing home.

The letter was acknowledged by the Minister on 26 February. Yet this week I found out that the home was sold about six weeks ago—in other words, before the time of the meeting and before the time of the advice I received from the Minister—to the Pentecostal Church for use as a home for drug addicts and alcoholic rehabilitation. I do not query the vital needs of those people for a centre for rehabilitation—it is very important. I would be quite happy to see such a centre in my electorate and would work for its success. I argue against the way in which I, as the local member, and constituents of mine, who have been pressing for more community facilities, have been treated by the Minister of Housing. He could not even have the decency to give us the right answer on the day and, if that was too much to expect, surely in his acknowledgement he could have indicated that there was no point in proceeding with the matter because it was all a *fait accompli*.

The other point is this. I have argued that the best use of the Angas Home would be as a mixed residential facility cum community use facility. I repeat the point about the value the centre would have for small groups who cannot of themselves raise the finance to build clubrooms. They could have rented one or two rooms in one block for their office and for their committee meetings. They could share on an occasional basis or on a roster system the communal facilities, such as the dining hall, for meetings, functions, cabarets or whatever. That would provide an avenue for community facilities presently not available to small groups, such as the local netball club, which has been trying for a long time for such things.

The grounds would have met parking requirements for all the groups and would have provided a parking capacity, again beyond the scope of small groups. The grounds could have been developed progressively for a mix of uses, including such structured uses, as tennis courts and playing fields, and unstructured ones, such as barbecue areas, picnic areas and commons where families could walk and enjoy the resource. That could have been mixed with a residential use, such as a shelter for the homeless youth, as I have suggested on a previous occasion. That would have been quite an ideal use to have mixed with the type of community use I have proposed previously. Similarly, an aged care facility could have mixed in very well.

I do not think necessarily that the present use to which it is being put would permit that kind of non-residential community use on the same premises, but it is too late. The community has not been given an opportunity for that to take place. It has been sold from under them, and nothing has been done to prevent a valuable resource for the community being lost to the area, meaning that the area will not have other adequate opportunities for the development of community facilities, because where is the funding for that to happen? That funding is not around in the present

climate. The Parafield Gardens and Salisbury West residents have been done, in my opinion, a very poor deal, and some reasonable explanation of that—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

**Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton):** Two or three weeks ago I asked a question in the House about the situation regarding letting agencies. After I raised the question, and following ensuing publicity in one of the newspapers, I received several representations from users of the system of letting agencies, and also from owners of properties who had had dealings with people from letting agency sources. Some of the things that came out of those interviews proved interesting.

One point made was that one agency appeared to have as many as 40 contracts a day in the letting business. On the basis of \$40 per letting contracts per day, this represented \$1 600 a day over a six-day week (because the agency advertised that it was open and available for service six days a week), a yield of about \$10 200 a week is produced. It has been suggested that that agency, which is Canadian based and which has offices throughout Australia, makes about \$2 000 000 a year, which money seems to be sent overseas. When one considers the service offered by that agency and some of the complaints I have received, one wonders what is going on within that business.

I have been informed that the advertising of properties as shown in newspapers is sometimes several days old when it appears, so that if a person follows the matter through with the letting agency he may well find that the property advertised had been let several days previously. In other cases, he may find that the property advertised did not in fact exist, and was a thought-up address. On approaching this agency, Homelocators, a person might ask for property in a certain area and receive some indication that there are ample places available, provided of course that that person joins the agency's listing and takes out a policy.

Apparently, according to the people who have gone through this type of transaction, it has been found in some instances that there were no properties available in the category they had previously sought to find on the telephone. One could imagine the reaction of a consumer in that situation. Some people have told me that they have asked whether pets were allowed at certain properties, and have been told by the letting agency that they were, only to find, on applying to rent the property, that pets were not allowed. The complaint comes back to the person's having wasted time and effort in going to the property, only to be told that the conditions being sought did not exist.

From talking to the owners of some properties it seems that some of the advertisements one might find in the press under 'Flats and Rooms Wanted' are as follows, and I quote from last Saturday's issue:

Nurses require unit handy to Q.E.H.—

And a telephone number is given. A bit further down the following appeared:

Bachelor requests clean unit any beach area—

And a telephone number is given. Another advertisement appeared as follows:

Unit or flat, southern suburbs, required by elderly couple—

And a telephone number is given again. When one looks up those telephone numbers, they are all for the one agency, Ashford Agency, in that case.

According to some flat owners and unit owners they respond to those advertisements but the people at the other end never identify the fact that they are from an agency. Then, having got the address from the person over the telephone that person finds later that he is suddenly unin-

dated with people turning up looking for the particular flat. It seems that this method is used to elicit numbers of units for listings, so we find that some of the listings later shown by some of the letting agencies have actually been taken without asking the property owner's permission. Therefore, there is a doubling up of a whole realm of problems and difficulties of people all converging on one spot for the same flat. Therefore, it is not surprising that later, if the flat has been let, there are a lot of people applying for it because the list is not kept current.

**Mr Slater:** What is the Minister of Consumer Affairs doing about all this?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** I will come to that a bit later. Having asked a question in the House several weeks ago about this matter, I received a visit from a member of another agency, Centalet, who spoke to me at great length and told me the system under which they work. That person invited me to go through their books at any time and offered me the opportunity of seeing exactly how they work.

**Mr Mathwin:** Did they offer you a house?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** They did not. I do not need one. It struck me then that, if a letting service like this were operated legitimately, and if such a service offered a counselling service so that when people came in and paid a fee they were able to ring immediately a number of homes, flats or units that might be suitable for their requirements and then organise a time with the owner for them to visit the particular unit, that would be offering a service. However, to give a person a list which may not necessarily be correct and may not necessarily be updated on a worthwhile frequency rate, seems to me to be not a service at all, but rather seems to be a method of getting quick cash. Having

raised these matters of concern, I think that the first agency that starts to look properly at the question of service to the consumer in this area will be offering a service to a wide range of people.

The thing that concerns me about this matter more than anything else is the difficulty of people in limited financial circumstances who are forced to go from one agency to another probably paying several lots of \$40, because the same people then have difficulty in finding sufficient money for their bond. That means that they later have to go, perhaps, to the emergency housing people, cap in hand, asking for help with the bond money.

**Mr Trainer:** Isn't there an offshoot of emergency housing called 'Whereabouts' which does exactly what you are talking about?

**Mr GLAZBROOK:** There is indeed. It should be given more predominance. That type of agency does not charge a fee at all. I think people should be made more aware of that. I believe that the crux of the problem is that, in people's desperation to look for a home, they will grasp at any straws. When we look in the newspaper and find that the majority of homes and properties offered for rental seem to be monopolised by a few agencies, which are then able to make money from other people's desperate needs, in many cases, it is something that should be addressed by the Minister. If one of those agencies were to offer a full counselling type of service, it would find that its reputation would grow.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 March at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 March 1982

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

## FLORA

201. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Which countries have sought to buy South Australian plants, trees and shrubs?
2. What was the value of this export trade during the 1980-81 financial year?
3. What surveys have been conducted by the Government to increase this market?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The following countries have purchased plants, trees and shrubs from South Australia during the 1980-81 financial year:

New Zealand  
Portugal  
Reunion  
South Africa  
United Kingdom  
United States of America

It is also known that a number of Middle East countries are interested in buying Australian native plants.

2. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, the value of this export trade during the 1980-81 financial year was \$109 219.

3. To date, the Government has not undertaken any surveys to increase this export market; however, the Woods and Forests Department has held discussions with the S.A. Nurserymen's Association concerning that association's proposed involvement in export markets. The Commonwealth Department of Trade and Resources has reported on the market potential in several individual countries and the Commonwealth Department of Science and Technology has commissioned a major report on the export potential of nursery products and potted plants. It is intended that the Department of Trade and Industry will act on the report when it is published.

## BAROSSA VALLEY

339. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Was there any cost to the Government in regard to the Barossa Valley promotional campaign in Sydney and, if so, how much, and on what aspects of the campaign was the money expended?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:**

(a) Yes.

(b) The total cost to the Government was \$110 000. Cost to the private sector exceeded \$200 000, i.e., a ratio of almost \$2 for every Government \$1 spent. Of the amount of \$110 000, some \$20 000 was spent on preparatory work in the 1980-81 financial year so that the cost in the 1981-82 year will be \$90 000 against an amount of \$35 000 provided. The additional costs were incurred because:

- (1) It was decided to support the organisers in expanding the promotion from a strictly Barossa wine display to an all-embracing promotion for the State of South Australia.

The expanded activities included:

Trade train to Sydney;  
Engagement of media and trade co-ordinator in Sydney;

Special reception for 200 print and electronic media representatives given by the Deputy Premier at the Argyle Tavern;

Special reception for 200 New South Wales travel consultants given by the Minister of Tourism at the Argyle Tavern;

Special reception to 150 senior Sydney businessmen given by the Minister of Trade & Industry at the Argyle Tavern;

Special reception given by Australian National for business community leaders at the Argyle Tavern;

Major wine and tourism promotion in Hyde Park for four days;

Special suburban shopping centre wine and tourism promotions at Roselands, Bankstown and Warringah Mall for three days;

A major Kellerfest promotion attended by the Premier, civic leaders and 1 800 guests at Birkenhead Point;

Production and staging on four occasions of an investment oriented audio visual;

An intense programme of media events attracting major coverage in the print and electronic media.

- (2) The Sydney city council directed that the promotion be moved from Martin Place to Hyde Park.
- (3) Four days before the event the Sydney city council health department insisted that the entire Hyde Park promotion be transferred from individual open units to a huge central marquee with special furnishings.

## S.A. FROZEN FOOD OPERATORS

345. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the value of the frozen food in the freezers at Dudley Park or elsewhere owned by S.A. Frozen Food Operators Pty Ltd at the date of the sale of that company to General Jones Pty Ltd?

2. What was the value of other stock held and owned by S.A. Frozen Food Operators Pty Ltd at the date of the sale?

3. Was all such frozen food and stock sold to General Jones Pty Ltd and, if not, what was sold to General Jones Pty Ltd and what was the value thereof and what has happened to the remainder of the frozen food and stock and what was the value thereof?

4. Was there any frozen food or stock in the control of S.A. Frozen Food Operators Pty Ltd at the date of sale which belonged to any other person or organisation and, if so, what were the details and value of this food and stock and who owned it?

5. How were the values of the frozen food and stock referred to above reached?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The value of frozen food in the freezers at Dudley Park and elsewhere, owned by S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd at the date of the sale of that company to Henry Jones Limited was \$643 676.

2. Raw materials to the value of \$115 692, packaging materials to the value of \$52 482, and liquid nitrogen to the value of \$3 938.

3. Nothing was sold to General Jones Pty Ltd. The shares in S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd were sold to Henry Jones Limited. All frozen food and stock held and owned by S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd at the date of sale of the shares, remained the property of S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd, which then became a wholly owned subsidiary of Henry Jones Limited.

4. There were packaging materials stored at the factory on behalf of the South Australian Health Commission and General Jones Pty Ltd owned by those organisations which were and still are customers of S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd. As this stock belonged to other organisations, the value of those items is not known. In addition, frozen food to the value of \$25 771 which had been sold to Chinese Frozen Foods Pty Ltd was in the control of S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd at the date of the sale of the shares in S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd.

5. Frozen food and stock owned by S.A. Frozen Food Operations Pty Ltd at the date of the sale of the shares, was valued at net realisable value in the case of frozen food, and cost in the case of raw materials, packaging, and liquid nitrogen.

The value shown above for frozen food held on behalf of Chinese Frozen Foods Pty Ltd is invoice value.

#### ADLER TYPEWRITERS

375. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: Have any Government departments or statutory authorities purchased Adler electronic typewriters and, if so, has any Government employee had the benefit of free airline tickets which are being offered as an inducement to buy these machines?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:**

1. Yes.
2. No.

#### INTERSTATE RAIL PASSENGERS

380. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: Does the Government intend to promote and encourage the use of interstate passenger rail services following the comments of the Chairman of the Australian National Railways Commission, Mr L. E. Marks, of surprise and disappointment at the level of support and sponsorship in South Australia and, if so, what action does the Government intend to take in the interests of tourism?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** While rail was not mentioned specifically as a mode of travel in either the intrastate or interstate advertising campaigns, there is considerable potential to include rail services in future campaigns. Making markets aware of the many holiday opportunities in South Australia requires a concerted marketing effort over a number of years. The campaigns of the last two years are only the beginning.

Although rail travel has not been specifically promoted through the Department of Tourism's advertising campaigns, there is an obvious indirect spin-off to rail travel to South Australia as a result of increasing awareness of the State as a destination. In addition, the department has assisted promotion of rail travel through the following means:

the Director, as a member of a national task force representing the Tourist Ministers' Council, has been involved in discussions with Australian National on promoting the Indian Pacific and the Trans-Australian as major national tourist attractions;

the department has participated with Australian National in promoting day trips to Victor Harbor using rail;

rail trips are included in both the department's day tour programme and the day tour section of the 1982 Beaut Tours programme;

the department's travel centres distribute promotional literature produced by rail organisations.

The department recognises the importance of rail services to the tourist industry and is keen to establish an ongoing working relationship with Australian National. The Director has invited Mr Marks to meet with him to discuss potential areas where the department and Australian National could co-ordinate their efforts.

#### MURRAY RIVER MUSEUM

383. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism: What action, if any, does the Minister intend to take to assist in the establishment of a Maritime Museum on the Murray River to maintain and preserve the heritage of the paddle steamers in South Australia?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Department of Tourism has given a great deal of consideration to the presentation and interpretation of the Murray River system as a visitor attraction and the preservation of South Australian paddle steamers as a part of that presentation.

Two organisations, the River Murray Paddle Steamer Preservation Society and the River Murray Steamboat Navigation Company Inc., have recently been formed, each having as part of their objectives the retention of Murray River paddle steamers in South Australia. Whilst there are no current plans to hand, the department is confident that these objectives will lead to a proposal for some type of Murray River maritime museum.

Officers of the department are in constant contact with both organisations and will give whatever assistance is possible to assist them achieve their aims.

#### S.T.A. VEHICLES

389. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many State Transport Authority vehicles were involved in collisions during 1980-81 and since 1 July 1981, respectively, and for each period—

- (a) what was the total cost of damages;
- (b) how many passengers were injured; and
- (c) what were the major causes of those accidents?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

	year 1980-81	1.7.81 to 31.12.81
State Transport Authority vehicles involved in collisions	1 126	629
	\$	\$
(a) State Transport Authority vehicles	146 000	97 650
Other vehicles	283 500	140 550
	429 500	238 200
(b)	733	373
(c) Overtaking and turning movements		

**S.T.A. PASSENGER INJURIES**

390. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the result of the investigation into the injury of four State Transport Authority bus passengers at Evandale on 1 December 1981?

2. Was there any malfunctioning of the bus involved?

3. What was the cost of repairs to the bus?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. From the evidence available the operator swerved towards the near side of the roadway to avoid collision with a vehicle which had stopped in front of the bus.

2. There was no malfunctioning of the bus involved.

3. The estimated cost of repairs to the bus is \$5 000.

**SWIMMING INJURIES**

395. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: How many persons were crippled or seriously injured during aquatic activities, including swimming, in 1980 and 1981 and what were the numbers and categories of injuries sustained, respectively?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Complete and accurate statistics of persons seriously injured during aquatic activities are not available.

**BUS ARRIVALS**

401. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the definition used by the State Transport Authority for late arrival of buses, trams and train services?

2. What instructions are given to the S.T.A. for registering late arrivals of all modes of S.T.A. services?

3. How many reports of late arrivals were received during 1980-81 and since 1 July 1981 for all S.T.A. bus, tram and rail services, respectively?

4. How many public complaints were received on account of such late arrivals and which services were consistently late?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Any bus, tram or train which departs a location later than the time shown in a time table is considered to be late. However, it is recognised that operating conditions sometimes result in services running behind time for reasons beyond the control of State Transport Authority employees.

2. No instructions are given to the State Transport Authority on registering late arrivals; however, bus movements are recorded at time clocks by bus operators at locations along the route, while late train movements are recorded by Train Control and at signal cabins.

3. Presuming late arrival refers to arrival time at the destination of the vehicles, records indicate that approximately 99 per cent of trains arrive within five minutes of the time-tabled arrival time and it is predicted that similar levels of time table adherence are achieved by buses and trams.

4. Forty-seven public complaints of late running on all modes were received in 1981. Although there was no discernible pattern of public complaint concerning late running, authority officers monitor timetable adherence regularly and adjust time tables from time to time to allow for changed traffic flows and other operating conditions.

**S.T.A. TIME TABLES**

403. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What alterations of State Transport Authority time tables will take place or are being considered for all S.T.A. services during the remainder of 1982 and for 1983, respectively?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The State Transport Authority is regularly monitoring services on all routes. It is expected that time table alterations will be either made or considered on all routes during 1982 and again in 1983.

**DISABLED PERSONS**

404. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many disabled persons were employed as at 30 June 1981 within the Minister's departments and what has been done to improve their level of employment in departments or statutory instrumentalities under his control?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows: Department of Transport, seven; Highways Department, four; State Transport Authority, three. Disabled employees are offered the same opportunities for personal development and promotion as all other employees.

**CARAVANS**

407. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Housing:

1. How many persons are long term occupants in caravan parks in:

(a) metropolitan Adelaide; and

(b) country areas?

2. Will the Government ascertain from such occupants:

(a) the period of their occupancy; and

(b) the reasons why they live in caravan parks?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) It is estimated by the Caravan Parks Association that there are approximately 400 caravans in metropolitan caravan parks which are housing long term occupants, with an average of 2-3 people per caravan.

(b) No information is available.

2. The Government does not intend to ascertain this information, due to the high cost of researching these details.

408. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. Has the Government conducted a survey into the long term residency in caravans and, if so, when and is that report available for Members and, if not, will the Government instigate such a survey and, if so, when will it commence?

2. What are the regulations pertaining to long term occupancy in caravan parks?

3. What percentage of caravan park occupants live there on a long term basis?

4. What considerations/recommendations have been made regarding the care and welfare of children of long term caravan park dwellers?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has not conducted a survey into the



long term residency in caravans and does not intend to instigate such a survey at this stage.

2. There are no regulations pertaining to long term occupancy in caravan parks. The Department of Tourism recommends that no caravan (except on-site caravans) or camps should be permitted in the same park for more than six months in any one year, but this is not binding.

3. It is not possible to estimate the percentage of caravan park occupants who live there on a long term basis because the total number of occupants in parks fluctuates widely over time.

4. The Department of Tourism recommends minimum standards for the health, safety and amenity of all children and adults in caravan parks whether short term or long term dwellers, although these are not binding. The Health Act also applies to caravan parks.

### INSTITUTION PATIENTS

412. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many inmates of Hillcrest and similar institutions have wandered off unnoticed during 1980-81?

2. Have instructions in relation to the tightening of security for the safety of patients been issued by the Health Commission and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Hillcrest Hospital: 12 patients left hospital in the period 1980-81 when such departure might jeopardise their health. In each case the appropriate authorities, and at times relatives, were advised shortly after the event.

Glenside Hospital: In the six-month period July to December 1981 there were 466 admissions under detention. Of these 466, 70 absconded. Most absconders were noticed within an hour and some attempt was made to return them. All absconders would have been noticed within 24 hours of the act.

2. The policy of the Mental Health Hospitals has moved a long way from the custodial, prison-like attitude of treating people as inmates, to become more closely aligned to the general hospital model where people are largely admitted on a voluntary basis to seek help. Patients who are admitted for assessment need to have a relative amount of freedom to enable judgment as to whether the patient has improved or whether he or she is being driven by delusions. Much of the therapy is based on mutual trust. The spirit of the Mental Health Act is such that it does not blame the patient for his/her illness, nor does the Act brand a person as a criminal just because he or she suffers from a mental illness.

It is inevitable from time to time that patients will wander off unless the Mental Health Hospitals are run as a maximum security establishment with all the loss of privacy, dignity and humanity that this entails.

### MILK BANK

414. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Which public hospitals have a 'breast milk bank' to assist prematurely born babies and if some do not have a 'bank', will the Government introduce them in all public hospitals and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. If such a scheme exists, when it was introduced, how successful is it, and on how many occasions was it used in 1981?

3. How and for what periods of time can 'breast expressed milk' be stored?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are no breast milk banks in South Australia. As there are satisfactory proprietary milk formulations available in South Australia, there is no plan or requirement to develop milk banks.

2. See above.

3. Expressed breast milk is stored under refrigeration until used within 12 hours of expression. The only freezing of expressed breast milk which occurs is either when a mother at home (usually living in the country) cannot visit her premature infant each day, or if the staff of the premature nursery find there is a small amount of expressed breast milk available within the hospital which is surplus to the daily requirements. Frozen milk is usually used within one to two weeks of storage.

### CHLORINE LEVELS

415. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Minister aware that a Public Health Department survey of private swimming pools in Western Australia has shown that more than 75 per cent had chlorine levels too low to control water borne infections?

2. Was any such survey conducted in South Australia in 1979, 1980 or 1981 and, if so, what were the results?

3. Will the Minister conduct a public awareness programme pointing out the dangers?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No. Contact has been made with the Western Australian Department of Health requesting a copy of the report of the telephone survey conducted during the 1980-81 swimming season by the Health Education Branch of that department. It is understood that the conclusion from that survey was that many private pool operators were not fully aware of the standards required to maintain proper water quality.

2. No. However, a sampling survey of swimming pools and spas is proposed which will include some private pools. The Port Augusta and Munno Para local boards of health have conducted surveys in their respective areas, but collation of the information has not yet been completed.

3. The Health Promotion Services of the S.A. Health Commission has conducted a public awareness programme pointing out the dangers of unsatisfactory water quality to private pool owners, with particular emphasis in the Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie local board of health areas. An exhibit with the theme 'Swim In Clean Water' has been displayed at shopping centres in Whyalla, Gawler, Elizabeth, Salisbury, Munno Para, Port Noarlunga and Marion. This display has been manned by health surveyors from the local boards of health and representatives of the Swimming Pool and Spa Association, Australian Institute of Swimming and Recreation Centre Management, and the Royal Life Saving Society, who have produced relevant information to interested parties. The Minister of Health, in a press release on 22 January 1982, urged people with swimming and wading pools to take great care in ensuring that their pools were properly disinfected and cleaned, especially in conditions of extremely high temperatures.

### LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS

416. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many cases of Lupus Erythematosus were reported during 1979-80 and 1980-81, respectively?

2. How many people have contracted and/or died from this disease in the last two years?

3. Is the incidence of this disease on the increase and, if so, by how much in the last five years?

4. What are the mild and severe symptoms of this disease and what treatment, if any, is available?

5. Are more women than men affected by this disease and, if so, what is the ratio?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Lupus Erythematosus is not a notifiable disease. Therefore the number of cases in South Australia in 1979-80 and 1980-81 are not known.

2. Hospital morbidity statistics indicate that for the last two years for which statistics are available the following hospitalisations and deaths in hospitals occurred:

	No. of Hospitalisations		No. of Deaths	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
1980				
Lupus Erythematosus	3	6	—	1
Systemic Lupus Erythematosus	7	30	—	2
1978-79				
Lupus Erythematosus	—	7	—	—
Systemic Lupus Erythematosus	14	35	—	1

The period of reporting of hospital morbidity statistics was altered from the financial to the calendar year at the beginning of 1980 for consistency with other States.

These figures may be an understatement since not all hospitals are included in the surveillance system. Hospitalisations can also exceed the number of patients where an individual is admitted to hospital more than once in a year.

3. Since the disease incidence is not known, the trend in the incidence is not known. Reported hospitalisations for Lupus Erythematosus and Systemic Lupus Erythematosus for the last four years for which figures are available were:

1980 .....	46
1978-79 .....	56
1977-78 .....	49
1976-77 .....	36

4. The symptoms of the disease vary considerably with the case but may include fever, malaise, erythema, discoid lesions of the skin, and articular plaques. Cutaneous ulceration may appear, as may joint symptoms, recurrent pneumonitis, myocarditis, and spleen and kidney involvement. Treatment varies with the case but commonly includes corticosteroids.

5. The hospital morbidity statistics, as set out in 1. suggest that three times as many women as men may be affected.

### RADIOTHERAPY

417. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many radiotherapists were there as at September 1981 and at which hospital were they located?

2. How many radiotherapists left South Australia during 1980-81?

3. Is there a shortage of radiotherapists and, if so, by how many and at which hospitals?

4. How many persons received radiotherapy during 1980-81?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

The question relates to radiotherapists. This has been taken to mean the qualified radiotherapy radiologists who are in charge of the course of treatment.

1. Seven radiotherapy radiologists (Radiation Oncologists) at the Royal Adelaide Hospital (three full-time and four sessional or visiting physicians). These staff also undertake sessions or consultations at Modbury Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre. However, radiotherapy treatment as such is based only at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

2. None identified.

3. There is little evidence of a shortage of radiotherapy radiologists and all the positions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital are filled.

4. Information available suggests that between 1 600 and 1 800 people received radiotherapy treatment in 1981.

### OYSTERS

419. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What tests are carried out by the Department of Health on oyster growing areas?

2. What are the limits for micro-organisms in oysters?

3. What are the major oyster growing beds in South Australia?

4. What was the upper limit of micro-organisms found in oysters, during the past 12 months, at each locality?

5. Are artificially bred oysters grown and, if so, where?

6. What regulations apply to facilitate tracing the areas from which oysters are taken?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. None. It has been estimated that approximately 95 per cent of the oysters sold in South Australia are from interstate. The remainder are cultivated locally and are generally sold in the area in which they are produced. The Food and Drugs Regulations prohibit the packing and sale of oysters that have been procured from an area prohibited under any Act.

2. Food and Drugs Regulation 43 (6) (c) provides the following microbiological standard for oysters:

‘(c) Microbiological standard: fresh, frozen and packaged fresh oysters when examined by the prescribed method shall have an *Escherichia coli* count not exceeding 2.3 *Escherichia coli* per gram and an aerobic plate count not exceeding 100 000 micro-organisms per gram.’

3. There are four leases issued for oyster culture in South Australia.

Bird Island Oysters .....	Bird Island
Dalrymple Oyster Company .....	Stansbury
Oyster Farmers .....	Coffin Bay
T. O. Wilkins .....	Port Vincent

Oysters are also grown in the general fish culture lease held by ICI Australia Ltd at Dry Creek.

4. Microbiological testing of oysters was not carried out over the last 12 months.

5. ICI operates an oyster hatchery at Dry Creek. Juvenile oysters (spat) from this hatchery are growing at Dry Creek and at Coffin Bay. At the hatchery adult oysters are conditioned to spawn; the eggs are hatched and larvae raised to a suitable settling stage. The oyster most commonly grown in South Australia is an exotic species which does not breed naturally in local waters.

6. Food and Drugs Regulation 43 (6) (b) provides labelling requirements as follows:

‘(b) Labelling: Oysters in containers shall not be sold or offered for sale unless there is attached thereto a label in which is written in standard type with a letter height of not less than 1.5 mm the following particulars:

- (i) name and address of vendor;
- (ii) trade description of contents;
- (iii) the date of packing or bottling;
- (iv) particulars of source of supply; and
- (v) from whom and where obtained.

Provided that clause (b) shall not apply to oysters sold in the shell, or served for a meal, or processed and packed in hermetically sealed containers, or frozen in bulk as raw material for further processing.'

### REAL ESTATE

420. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Treasurer: What is the total sum realised, to date, from the sale of Government real estate and other property since this Government came to office, and did the proceeds of such sales go to the departments which previously controlled the property or did they go into consolidated revenue?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The proceeds from the disposal of Government land and other property, since this Government came to office, are about \$22 000 000 (i.e. \$5 200 000 for 1979-80, \$9 300 000 for 1980-81 and \$7 200 000 up to 31 January 1982). The amounts exclude those agencies which are, in the main, funded outside the Consolidated Account as proceeds from disposal were retained by these bodies, for example Highways Department and statutory authorities, etc.

Proceeds from the sale of land and property are paid into the Consolidated Account. However, in December 1980, the Premier and Treasurer requested all departments and authorities to identify land and property surplus to Government requirements. In so doing, he stated that disposing departments would be given the first bid for the proceeds of the land and property they disposed of where that departments could demonstrate a specific and essential need for those funds. The money would be made available by way of an additional appropriation to that department. This procedure has been implemented in those cases where disposing departments have been able to demonstrate specific and essential needs of high priority.

### RETIRED PERSONS

421. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How many persons past retiring age still occupy offices in Government and semi-government boards, tribunals, committees, etc., and what is the estimated cost by way of salaries, allowances and other benefits?

2. How many such persons are in receipt of State superannuation payments?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The amount of time and expense which would be involved in obtaining the information required to answer the honourable member's question is not warranted.

### EDUCATION

422. **Mr HAMILTON** asked the Minister of Education:

1. What research has been conducted by the Education Department into educational factors affecting children living under long-term caravan park residency?

2. How many of these children attend local schools and how many are involved in correspondence courses?

3. What forms of public and other transport are available to such children?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. There has been no research specific to caravan dwellers. Work has been done on the education problems of children

of itinerant workers who need to transfer from school to school frequently. In 1979, the Australian Education Council Working Party examined the problem of transfers from State to State, especially for children near primary/secondary transition. The Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia recommended a greater uniformity of curricula from school to school—one of the reasons was to ease the transfer of itinerant children.

2. There are approximately 250 children living in caravans. Most attend local primary or high schools. Two are involved in correspondence courses.

3. The children use either local or State Transport Authority buses, private cars or walk to school.

### FISHERIES ACT

424. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Fisheries:

1. Is the Fisheries Act currently under review and, if so, when will it be completed?

2. Is it intended that penalties for breaches of the Fisheries Act will be increased and, if so, when will amending legislation be introduced?

3. How many breaches of the Act occurred between 1 July and 31 December 1981, what was the highest penalty imposed and what was the total amount of fines received?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. A Draft Bill has been prepared.

2. Yes. This session of Parliament.

3. The excessive administrative work to determine these breaches is not considered warranted.

### ARMED HOLDUPS

425. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many armed holdups occurred during 1980-81 in:

- (a) service stations in the metropolitan area;
- (b) service stations in country areas;
- (c) small business premises; and
- (d) chemist shops,

and what were the respective amounts of money stolen?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

	Number of Armed Holdups	Amounts stolen \$
(a)	16	16 257.00
(b)	Nil	Nil
(c)	23	5 386.00
(d)	10	2 574.00

### CONJUGAL RIGHTS

427. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Is it intended to introduce a scheme giving prisoners conjugal rights and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Has the Minister received a report on a scheme giving such rights to prisoners in Victoria and, if so, what were the recommendations of that report and will it be released and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. No, on the advice of the First Report of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia.

2. No.

**STOLEN FARM PRODUCE**

428. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What quantity of farming produce, including fruit, was reported stolen during 1980-81?

2. What was the overall cost of these losses and what were the largest quantities and type of produce stolen?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The time and effort involved in obtaining this information is not justified.

2. See answer to 1.

**OPERATION CRIME ALERT**

430. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: When will the Operation Crime Alert programme be conducted in the suburbs of Seaton, Royal Park, Hendon, Findon, Woodville South, Woodville West, Tennyson, and West Lakes, respectively?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** There are no immediate plans to stage crime alert campaigns in the suburban districts mentioned.

**HITCH-HIKERS**

431. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many male and female hitch-hikers were attacked during 1980 and 1981, respectively, and what were the major categories of such attacks on each group?

2. In which areas did the majority of these attacks occur?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. This information is not collated on an on-going basis. To extract the data from source documents would be a time-consuming and costly exercise.

2. See answer to 1.

**OFFENCES**

434. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How much in fines was received during 1980-81 for traffic offences?

2. How many charges have been made against people under 18 years of age for attending R-rated movies in 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The time and expense required to ascertain this information is not considered warranted.

2. 1979—15

1980—15

1981—21.

**MINORS**

435. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Are minors charged with offences only able to be detained in youth centres for a maximum period of two years?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The honourable member's attention is drawn to sections 45, 47 and 51 (1) of the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

**EMPLOYMENT**

436. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: How many disabled persons were employed as at 30 June 1981 within the Minister's departments and what has been done to improve their level of employment in departments or statutory instrumentalities under his control?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** Seven. Disabled persons are afforded the same opportunities for career development as are other employees.

**OPERATION CRIME ALERT**

438. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How effective was Operation Crime Alert during 1980 and 1981?

2. What was the cost of that programme in 1980 and 1981, respectively?

3. What is the programme for Operation Crime Alert in 1982 for each area, respectively?

4. Has there been a noticeable reduction of crime in areas where Operation Crime Alert has been carried out and, if so, to what extent in respect of metropolitan areas and categories of crime?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. There are no immediate means of testing the effectiveness of prevention programmes such as crime alert. The primary objective of such campaigns is to promote a greater community awareness of the need to be more security conscious and of the risk of becoming a victim of crime. The immediate effect of this type of programme may be an increased reporting of offences to police, thus leading to a higher statistical crime record. In the longer term, however, it would be hoped that the general community response would have the effect of preventing crime.

2. The main staff support for these campaigns has so far been drawn from graduates from the Training Academy as part of their initial exposure to the practical aspects of public contact. For this reason, no meaningful costing of the Crime Alert programme can be made.

3. The only presently scheduled campaign in 1982 is the Tea Tree Gully area. Further commitment to the programme in 1982 hinges on the availability of academy graduates, as well as other factors.

4. No.

**PETROL**

439. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs: How may increases occurred in the retail price of petrol in 1980 and 1981 and what were the respective amounts?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** There is no one fixed retail petrol price in South Australia. Maximum wholesale prices for the oil industry are approved by the Petroleum Products Pricing Authority. Different wholesale prices apply to different companies and retail margins also vary between resellers.

**BIRD SCARING DEVICES**

443. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Does the Government have power under the Machine Noise Control Regulations, 1978, to ban the use of bird scaring devices?

2. Does the Government regard such a banning as desirable?

3. Will the Government, if appropriate, secure the necessary amendments to the Act or regulations to allow such banning, where warranted, to come into effect?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. If, pursuant to regulation 5 (1) of the Machine Noise Control Regulations, 1978, the noise from a bird scaring device exceeds the maximum permissible noise level of 45 dB (A), then its use may be restricted on any day to the period between 7.00 a.m. and 8.00 p.m.

2. Bird scaring devices are used by orchardists and viticulturalists to provide protection for crops which could otherwise be severely damaged. Hence, banning their use could have an undesirable effect on some areas of primary production and result in heavy economic loss. However, in consideration of people residing adjacent to properties where these devices are used, restrictions referred to in 1. above may be imposed.

3. In the light of the answers to 1. and 2. above, the provisions of the Noise Control Act are considered appropriate.

#### TAPANAPPA PASTORAL PROPERTY

444. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Is the Tapanappa pastoral property on the South Coast a portion of the Deep Creek Conservation Park?

2. Has it been leased for continuing pastoral purposes and, if so, to whom, and under what conditions?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The land has been leased to a Mr A. J. Biddle for a period of five years with a further five-year option over three of the four sections. The option will not apply to the fourth section if the land is considered to be at a suitable stage for scrub regeneration.

Other significant conditions are:

The lessee, or his agent, must reside in the residence provided.

The rental will be adjusted annually in accordance with the general cost of living increase, but will not exceed 15 per cent in any one year.

Lessee to pay all rates and taxes.

Current Department of Agriculture stocking rates to apply.

No agistment to be carried out without prior consent.

Superphosphate can be applied on selected areas within the lease, except on section 379, and not within 20 metres of any natural vegetation.

Cropping, on restricted areas, will be permitted by prior arrangement.

Lessee will have first option to carry out specific development works, under contract, on the property for which an appropriate payment will be made.

The termination of the lease will be by either party giving not less than six months notice, in writing, of their intention to do so.

#### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FUND

445. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. Exactly how was the \$2 092 944 referred to on page 2653 of this session's *Hansard* expended?

2. Which parcels of land were sold to generate the \$268 218 referred to on the same page, to whom were they sold, for what amount and why were they regarded as surplus to departmental requirements?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Payments made from the Planning and Development Fund in the 1980-81 financial year:

	\$	\$
Term borrowings—		
Repayments of debentures and Treasury loan funds .....	177 506	
Interest on loans .....	624 538	
		802 044
Land improvements—		
Purchase of land (Para Paddocks, Moana Sands) .....	525 379	
Development of Bashams Beach .....	303 000	
Port Adelaide redevelopment .....	93 563	
Development of other reserves (fencing, tree planting) .....	145 689	
		1 067 631
General expenses—		
Maintenance and management of properties—		
General .....	177 596	
Regency Park recreation reserve .....	1 551	
Port Adelaide redevelopment .....	31 067	
Refunds, miscellaneous, etc. ....	13 055	
		233 269
Total payments .....		2 092 944

Sale of land and improvements—

(a) Sale of improvents at Regency recreation park to Enfield council .....

190 000

(b) Sale of part of Hackney redevelopment area to Adelaide Caravan Park (.0594 ha) .....

44 037

(c) Exchange of part of Hackney redevelopment area between S.A. Housing Trust and the State Planning Authority .....

34 181

2. (a) The State Planning Authority developed the Regency recreation park as a regional park, with the objective of transferring the care, control and management to local government. In return, the Enfield council agreed to the payment of \$570 000 (in three instalments) for the improvements developed on the park, e.g. tavern, plant and machines.

(b) In the original Hackney redevelopment plan this land was envisaged for extension of the caravan park.

(c) The exchange of land provided for the rationalisation and consolidation of land parcels to the benefit of both parties.

#### TRAFFIC INFRINGEMENT NOTICES

446. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many expiation traffic infringement notices were issued in each of the first four weeks of the system?

2. Now that the expiation system is in operation, is it the policy of the Government to book people with offences such as not complying with rear vision mirror requirements rather than simply defecting the vehicle as was previously the practice?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 12 119 for January 1982.

2. Reporting members have always had a discretionary authority whether to report offenders or to issue a vehicle defect notice. This discretion has been emphasised in written and oral instructions relating to the introduction of the system. Preference is given to the defect notice except in circumstances of aggravation.

**HONEYMOON URANIUM**

447. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Mines and Energy:

1. How many employees are working on any aspects of the Honeymoon uranium mine?

2. How many of these employees are employed by the Government and in which departments do they work?

3. What trade unions have coverage for these workers, how many hold current union membership and what special agreements specific to the Honeymoon project have been negotiated between unions and the employers, private or public?

4. What is the latest information the Government has on the environmental impact of the Honeymoon project while it is still in the pilot stage?

5. When does the Government expect the mine to go into full production?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The replies are as follows:

1. Approximately 40 employees.

2. None of these employees are public servants.

3. As this is an industrial matter, it does not lie within the bounds of my portfolio.

4. Environmental investigations by the Government and others show there will be no significant environmental impact generated by the Honeymoon project during the pilot plant stage.

5. Commitment to a full commercial production stage will be dependent upon results of pilot plant evaluation and the ability to secure markets for the yellowcake produced. A decision on this is expected during 1983.

**NORTHFIELD RAILWAY LINE**

448. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What is the future of the Northfield passenger service after standardisation of the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway line is completed in November?

2. Will services on the Northfield line run to the same timetable and, if so, can the Minister assure the public these services will not be adversely affected by standardisation and, if not, why not?

3. What alterations to services on the Northfield line are envisaged?

4. What moves are to be made to extend the Northfield passenger service to the eastern suburbs?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The standardisation of the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway will have little influence on the future of the Northfield passenger service.

2. See 1. above.

3. The State Transport Authority continuously reviews the level of service on all rail lines.

4. There are no moves to extend the Northfield passenger service to the eastern suburbs. The NEAPTR Study recommended a short extension into the Ingle Farm area as a viable long-term possibility.

**CARAVAN PARKS**

450. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. What surveys have been carried out on the quality of caravans and caravan accommodation within caravan parks within the last three years and, if any, what did these surveys reveal and what are the titles of the reports?

2. How many persons were estimated to be living permanently in caravan parks in 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively?

3. What surveys have been carried out on the fire proofing aspect of caravans?

4. What is the stipulated distance between caravans in caravan parks?

5. What is the stipulated ratio of toilets to caravan sites?

6. How often are caravan parks inspected, on what basis and by whom?

7. How many complaints and in what categories were brought to the Government's attention regarding the operation of caravan parks in 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. No surveys have been carried out on the quality of caravans and caravan accommodation within caravan parks within the last three years.

2. This information is not available.

3. The S.A. Metropolitan Fire Service is currently examining the fire safety aspect of both caravans and caravan parks.

4. The Department of Tourism recommends that a three metre clear space is to be left between caravans, although this is not binding.

5. The Department of Tourism recommends that toilets should be provided on the following basis:

Van and Camp Sites	Number of Toilets for each Sex
Up to 10	1 + 1 extra toilet
11-20	2
21-30	3
31-50	4
51-70	5
71-90	6
91-115	7
116-145	8
146-175	9
176-205	10

Except that one-third of men's toilet accommodation shall be provided in the form of urinals on the basis 600 mm of urinal equals one toilet.

6. The Royal Automobile Association conducts a programme of annual inspections of all metropolitan and country caravan parks and reports any complaints to the Department of Tourism. These are referred to the Health Commission or the relevant local council.

7. The Department of Tourism received only a small number of complaints in 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively. The complaints related mainly to a lack of adequate facilities.

**ASSAULTS ON POLICE**

451. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. How many police officers were assaulted whilst on duty between 1 July and 31 December 1981?

2. How much time was lost from work as a result in that period?

3. How many officers are still off work as a result of these assaults?

4. How many officers were permanently injured?

5. What has been the cost of sick leave to the Police Department as a result of these assaults?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 60.

2. 219 man-days.

3. Nil.

4. Nil.

5. Approximately \$16 000.



**DISABLED PERSONS**

453. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: Which areas within national parks, public caves and other public tourist sites have been modified for access for disabled persons and what modification has been carried out at each site?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The Public Buildings Department has completed the following work:

Fort Glanville Caravan Park, alterations to male and female showers.

Kingston Park Caravan Reserve, ramps to toilet and laundry. Alterations to male and female toilets. Ramp to kiosk.

Loftia Park, rails to toilet and signage.

Morialta Park, ramp to kiosk. Alterations to male and female toilets.

Mount Lofty Kiosk, Unisex toilet constructed.

Waterfall Gully, Unisex toilet constructed.

However, this list is not complete as some works on access have been carried out by other departments.

**BREAST CANCER**

455. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. How many and which Government hospitals have 'mammagram' breast cancer detection units?

2. What are the benefits of this type of detection equipment as against X-ray detection for breast cancer?

3. Has the incidence of breast cancer increased or decreased in the last five years and what is the increase or decrease attributed to?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Mammagram equipment is available at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital and Royal Adelaide Hospital.

2. This equipment is used for the screening of breast cancer patients, not the screening of the general population. This is the general practice in Australia because of the potential risks of radiation exposure, and the cost. Mammography is the only X-ray means used to detect breast cancer.

3. Cancer incidence data has been available in South Australia since 1977. Since that time there is some suggestion of an increase in incidence of breast cancer, but the increase is within the statistical range which may be attributed to chance variation. The aetiology of breast cancer is not well understood and the relative effects of possible risk factors have not been able to be defined.

**HOSPITAL CHARGES**

457. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Does the Government intend to increase public hospital charges and, if so, when, in what specific areas and what are the proposed charges for each service?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The Government reviews all State charges annually and hospital charges will be part of the automatic annual review process.

**RECREATION FACILITIES**

459. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: How much money was allocated for recreation facilities in the Woodville council district during 1980-81 and 1981-82 and what are the names of the organisations receiving assistance and the respective amounts?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:**

1. 1980-81—Nil.

2. 1981-82—\$36 000—Woodville District Sports Club.

**TRAFFIC OFFENCES**

460. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How many traffic infringement notices were issued during January 1982?

2. What number of traffic fines were imposed during January 1981?

3. Does the Minister attribute any variation to the new system and, if not, why not?

4. What was the total of fines in each period?

5. What were the categories of offences, the number of offences in each category and the amount of fines collected in each category in each period?

6. How many verbal cautions were issued to motorists in January 1981 and 1982, respectively?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 12 119.

2. Information not recorded.

3. A positive answer cannot be given because of a number of variable factors. One logical explanation is that the traffic infringement notice system, which is designed to reduce police patrol involvement with "paper work", has allowed greater patrol mobility and time on the road.

4. The total fines imposed by the courts in January 1981 are not recorded by the Police Department. The total expiation fees incurred under the Traffic Infringement Notice system for January 1982 were \$514 220. This figure will not, of course, correspond with the fees ultimately collected since recipients of notices are entitled to contest the actions in the courts.

5. Categories of offences, the numbers of offences in each category and the amount of fines collected are not recorded in respect of January 1981. This detail is being collected under the Traffic Infringement Notice system but the computer programme has been designed to produce information regarding offences on a quarterly basis and revenue figures annually.

6. Information not recorded.

**TRAFFIC LIGHTS**

462. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: When was the phasing altered for the traffic lights at the intersection of Anzac Highway and Beckman Street, why was it altered, and when will it revert to the cycle which applied prior to the alteration?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The phasing was altered on 5 February 1982 because roadworks on Anzac Highway necessitated removal of the vehicle detectors from the pavement.

On 1 March 1982 the traffic signals were linked with those at South Road and Marion Road to improve traffic flow during times of peak traffic flow, and in approximately 2 weeks time new traffic signal detectors will be installed to effect a further improvement in traffic flow at off peak periods.

**LAND SALES**

463. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What land has been sold or disposed of by the South Australian Land Commission since September 1979 other than in individual private lots?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** Excluding land sold in private lots a total of 159 hectares comprising 44 parcels was sold between 1 October 1979 and 22 February 1982.

### HISTORY EDUCATION

465. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the Minister seen the allegation in the current newsletter of the Australian Bicentennial Authority that 'In 1988, slightly less than half of the students at present in N.S.W. junior secondary schools will have studied any Australian history. In South Australia only a quarter of such students will be in this position' and, if so, how does the South Australian situation compare with other States in the teaching of Australian history at secondary level and what are the reasons for the Education Department having adopted a policy leading to such a situation?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes. It is not possible to make direct comparison with other States. In relation to Australian history courses, South Australia has a high degree of school initiated curriculum. However, the Education Department has recognised there is insufficient study of Australia in the school curriculum and has taken action to rectify this. This is shown in the recently published document 'Into the 80s' and also in the department's involvement in the Constitutional Museum, the 'Come Out Festival' and the 'Jubilee 150 Committee'. Soon to be published are two papers on curriculum with units relating to Australian history and heritage.

### LAND BROKERS

467. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General: Is it the Government's intention to embark on a programme of deregulation of land brokers and, if so, with which interest groups has there been discussion on this matter?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows: 'The regulation of land brokers falls within the responsibilities of the Minister of Consumer Affairs. The Government is examining the feasibility of relaxing some controls in this area. However, land brokers would still be regulated within the context of system of negative licensing. Initial discussions have been held with the Land Brokers Society and the Real Estate Institute.

### RIVER TORRENS (LINEAR PARK) ACT

469. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. How many properties in whole or part have been acquired pursuant to the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act?
2. How many properties in whole or part is it intended will be acquired pursuant to the River Torrens (Linear Park) Act?
3. Do any of these properties include land to be used for the construction of the O'Bahn busway?
4. How many of these properties are further than 60 metres from the River Torrens?
5. What is the estimated cost of these acquisitions?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. None.
2. Not known at this time.
3. Land for the North-East public transport facilities is acquired under the State Transport Authority Act.
4. See (2) above.
5. See (2) above.

### LANDS DEPARTMENT

470. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands:

1. How much has been paid to private surveyors for services to the Lands Department in each of the last five years?
2. What is the estimated saving to the department of having this work done by other than public servants?
3. What criteria is used in allocating which work will be done by private surveyors and which by public servants.

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1977-78, Nil.  
1978-79, \$6 331  
1979-80, \$43 557  
1980-81, \$126 709  
1981-82, \$177 573 to date.

2. Work is contracted to licenced surveyors in times of peak demand, thereby avoiding the expense of placing approximately six additional survey parties on the permanent staff which would remain idle for many months of the year. The savings which accrue are difficult to assess accurately, as many variables must be accounted for, suffice it to say that manpower savings are considerable. This action allows Government surveys to be completed in the required time-frame.

3. All survey work in which private surveyors have competence for which there is a suitable fund source and which can be adequately supervised is allocated to private surveyors with the exception of:

- (a) an amount required for training departmental officers;
- (b) projects of a confidential nature.

### NORTHFIELD RAILWAY

471. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What detailed studies have been carried out on the feasibility and costing of the Northfield railway extension since September 1979 and, if none, why not?
2. How was the cost of \$96 000 000 as at 20 October 1981 calculated and in what year money terms is that amount expressed?

3. What factors influenced the Government to abandon the Northfield railway extension in favour of the O'Bahn system?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The studies which were undertaken during the North-East Area Public Transport Review were adequate for the feasibility and cost comparisons with alternative schemes which did occur after September 1979.

2. The cost of \$96 000 000 was based on the NEAPTR estimates with adjustments to reflect inflationary effects since the original estimate was prepared. The cost represented 1981 money values.

3. The factors which influenced the Government to prefer the busway scheme were similar to those which influenced the previous Government to prefer a route in the Modbury corridor. These were:

- (a) Overall travel time, when allowance is made for walking time and necessary transfers, would not be significantly improved over the existing situation.
- (b) The system does not provide adequate penetration of the city core because of its termination at the Adelaide railway station.

- (c) The location of the route would prevent it servicing a significant area of the North-east suburbs south of Tea Tree Plaza due to circuitous route which would be involved.
- (d) Patronage projections were significantly below those of systems in the direct route to the city via the Modbury corridor.
- (e) Energy use would be higher than the direct route.
- (f) The cost of implementation would be higher.

#### ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

472. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many students have graduated from the natural resources course at Roseworthy C.A.E. since 1979?
2. Of those graduates how many are—
  - (a) employed;
  - (b) employed in natural resources related fields; and
  - (c) employed by the Government?
3. What liaison is the Department of Education having with other Government departments to maximise employment of graduates from the natural resources course?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Graduate Diploma 14 (and one pending); Diploma 40.
2. (a) Graduate Diploma 10; Diploma 23.  
(b) Graduate Diploma 2; Diploma 19.  
(c) Graduate Diploma 8; Diploma 14.
3. The Education Department officer responsible for arranging teacher training in this field is a member of the Roseworthy Agricultural College Council and another senior officer was in 1981 a member of the College's advisory committee.

The usual path to a teaching career for natural resources graduates is via a graduate diploma in teaching offered by the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Qualified teachers would be able to contribute to the teaching of the secondary school certificate year 12 subject natural resources management presently offered in 14 schools. Career advice for graduates from the natural resources courses intending to enter careers other than teaching in schools would normally be provided by Roseworthy Agricultural College.

#### O'BAHN BUSWAY

473. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. In what locations will the \$4 000 000 be expended on minimising the harmful effects of the O'Bahn busway on the environment of the River Torrens?
2. Who will administer the expenditure of the \$4 000 000?
3. What funds were expended in the year 1980-81 on this project and what funds are to be expended in 1981-82?
4. Are these funds being expended pursuant to a report or plan and, if so, is that document available for public perusal and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. \$4 000 000 was allocated for the implementation of the River Torrens Linear Park scheme between Hackney Bridge and O.G. Road, Klemzig.
2. The expenditure is being administered by the North-East busway project team with the assistance of the design consultants, Land Systems.
3. Funds expended in 1980-81 were \$52 400 and anticipated expenditure in 1981-82 is \$343 000.

4. These funds are being expended pursuant to the concept contained in the River Torrens Study prepared for the Government by the River Torrens Committee with the assistance of consultants.

The study report is available for public perusal. Detail design drawings are discussed with the relevant local government body, which may place drawings on public display prior to endorsement of the proposals.

#### PAYNEHAM BIKEWAY

476. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport:

1. Has the Department of Recreation and Sport refused to cover costs of printing a publicity brochure on the Payneham bikeway and if, not, why not?
2. What advertising programmes have been undertaken to publicise the Payneham bikeway?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. None by the State Government. Local Councils are responsible for publicising completed tracks.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

477. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works:

1. Is the Public Buildings Department aware of the development of water-saving double-flush cisterns?
2. Will the department install such water-saving cisterns in all new Government buildings and, if not, why not?
3. Will the Government consider giving incentives to encourage private owners to install such cisterns and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No. It is understood that double flush cisterns are presently manufactured by only one company as a standard unit and installation in all Government buildings would necessitate the specifying of an exclusive brand, thereby eliminating the Government tendering policy of fair competition. It is noted that double flush units are more costly than standard cisterns.

However, Government buildings with a number of toilet facilities are often provided with a flushometer service as an alternative to cisterns. Flushometers are comparable in cost, provide controlled flushing, are subject to less vandalism and are easier to maintain.

3. Incentive already exists in that the installation of such cisterns will reduce water consumption with the possibility of reducing additional water rate charges.

#### STATE LIBRARY

478. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. When did the State Library begin closing on Monday nights?
2. What savings have been made by such closure?
3. What advertising programmes were undertaken to inform the public of the changed hours?
4. What was the total cost of such advertising programmes?

5. What were the amounts of consultancy fees and associated costs relating to the decision to reduce services at the library?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 23 November 1981.
2. Estimated \$10 000 in a full year.
3. Leaflets distributed to readers, several large notices placed in library, paid advertising in the *Advertiser*, and *Sunday Mail*. Four insertions were placed during the month prior to implementation.
4. \$1 600.
5. Nil.

### COMMUNITY SCHEMES

479. **Mr CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. What moneys were expended on the home handyman scheme in each of the last three financial years?

2. Did the Minister advise the Kensington and Norwood Council that assistance previously given to pensioners in the repair of their homes under the scheme will continue to be available in the future under the community service order scheme?

3. Is the Minister aware that this repair service will not be available for pensioners in the Kensington and Norwood council district as advised?

4. What steps is the Government taking to continue this service to pensioners until the community service order scheme is established?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1978-79—\$259 215.  
1979-80—\$278 741.  
1980-81—\$286 045.
2. On a modified basis, once the Community Service Order Scheme is operating.
3. The scheme is still being finalised.
4. None.

### POLICE MEDICAL OFFICER

480. **Mr LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Has a police medical officer been appointed and if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. W. OLSEN:** Dr E. L. Flock was appointed full-time police medical officer from 30 November 1981.

### WARDANG ISLAND

483. **Mr ABBOTT** (on notice) asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

1. What negotiations are taking place with the Point Pearce Community Council over the closure of the Wardang Island project?

2. Will suitable alternatives be established for the Island?

3. Are the views of the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Aboriginal Lands Trust being canvassed?

4. What attention is being given to suitable training schemes for the Point Pearce Aboriginal community?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Government officers (Mr B. Grear, Office of the Ministry of Education, Mr D. Seidel, Department of Technical and Further Education, and Mr L. Nayda, Office of Aboriginal Affairs) met with representatives of the Point Pearce Community Council on 11 February to discuss details of the Government's decision to discontinue its involvement in

the Outdoor Education Centre project on Wardang Island. The Point Pearce Community Council has undertaken to respond in writing to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs as to its concerns over the decision. To date, no reply has been received from the council.

2. The Government will await the response from the Point Pearce Community Council before giving further consideration to alternatives.

3. The Point Pearce Community Council and the Aboriginal Development Commission are negotiating for a study to examine possible future uses for Wardang Island, and that study will involve extensive discussions with a range of authorities. The Government will await the findings of that study to avoid duplicating existing inquiries.

4. In the light of the response from the Point Pearce Community Council, the Government will be able to determine the desires of the Point Pearce Aboriginal community on several aspects including the provision of suitable training schemes for community members.

### BELAIR GOLF COURSE

487. **Hon. J. D. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning: Is the Belair golf course now managed by an individual or company under a contract arrangement with the Minister's department and if so:

- (a) who is the individual or company;
- (b) when was the contract signed;
- (c) what are the terms of the contract; and
- (d) were tenders called and, if so, how many tenderers were there?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:  
Yes.

(a) The Belair golf course is leased to Howard Murton and Jennifer Murton.

(b) 4 January 1982.

(c) Significant conditions include:

- (1) The lessee to fully maintain the course as a public course;
- (2) The lessee to accommodate Belair Golf Club by providing exclusive tee off times on weekends, and by providing them with clubroom facilities;
- (3) The lessee to provide at his expense good standard facilities including showers, toilets, change rooms and recreation areas;
- (4) The term of the lease is 35 years.

(d) Expressions of interest were sought by advertising in principal Australian newspapers. There were 21 expressions of interest which resulted in the submission of four proposals.

### NEUROLOGICAL SOCIETY

498. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport—

1. Has the Government considered increasing the minimum age for drivers licences from 16 to 18 years?

2. Does the Minister support the Neurological Society of Australia's view that the minimum drivers age 'should be at least 18 years of age' and, if so, why and, if not, why not?

3. Does the Minister agree with Mr Ahern (State Coroner) and the Neurological Society doctor's views 'that learners should have to prove their competence before being granted a licence' and, if so, what actions does the Government intend to take and, if not, why not?

4. Does the Government intend to introduce more stringent testing before drivers licences are issued and, if so, when and what form will this take and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has decided against any further changes to the minimum driving age.

Drivers can obtain a class 1 and or a class 4a licence at 16 years of age. However, a driver must be 18 years of age before obtaining a class 2, 3 or 5 licence with the exception that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles may in such circumstances as he sees fit issue a class 2 licence to a person aged 17 years.

2. Australian authorities involved in the licensing of drivers of motor vehicles are involved in a continuous debate as to what is the proper age for the issuance of a licence.

Recently the Commonwealth Department of Transport conducted an investigation into driver licensing and driver improvement practices throughout Australia. Findings of the investigation included a recommendation which supports the present minimum age of holders of driver's licences in South Australia.

3. Learner drivers are already required to prove their competence by passing an examination on the road rules in force and a practical driving test.

4. The present standard of testing is considered acceptable and is comparable with that of other States of Australia.

### GAMBLERS

**500. Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health—

1. What services are provided to assist compulsive gamblers with their problems?

2. What services are available to the families of such compulsive gamblers?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Particularly when other emotional problems are present, services are available for people with compulsive gambling problems through the normal agencies of general practitioners, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists and other health professionals in both the private and public sector. Counselling services and advice are also available through a wide range of community based voluntary bodies in the health/welfare area. In the self help area the services of Gamblers Anonymous have been particularly useful. The South Australian Branch of Gamblers Anonymous holds regular weekly meetings.

2. Families of compulsive gamblers are also welcomed by Gamblers Anonymous through Gam-Anon which has been formed as a sub-group of Gamblers Anonymous with the specific purpose of helping family members. More general support is available through other established services such as the Marriage Guidance Council.

### BUS SHELTERS

**501. Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What was the amount allocated for the erection of bus shelters for 1981 and 1982, respectively?

2. What is the average cost of installing a bus shelter?

3. Does the Government intend to increase the current allocation for bus shelters?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 1981—\$40 000.

1982—\$40 000.

2. \$720. This cost is shared by the authority and the respective local council on a 50/50 basis.

3. No.

### TECHNOLOGY PARK

**502. Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. Does the Government have a commitment from any high technology organisations to establish at Technology Park Adelaide and, if so, which such organisations and, if not, what action, if any, is the Government taking to attract such organisations to establish there?

2. How many such organisations must establish there for the project to be:

(a) worthwhile; and

(b) economic?

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The Government does not have a firm commitment from any organisation to establish at Technology Park at this early stage, although a number of companies are undertaking feasibility studies. As is normal practice, the names of companies are regarded as confidential during the course of negotiations. A consultant has been commissioned to undertake a detailed marketing strategy, for implementation by the Manager of the T.P.A. Corporation, whose appointment is imminent.

2. The worth of the project cannot be judged on the basis of the number of organisations that establish in the Park. The benefits of the Park are related to new employment opportunities, new technology, the impact on the S.A. Institute of Technology, etc. which depends on the nature of individual companies, both those within the Park and those enticed to establish in South Australia because of the Park and the organisations within it. The Park is not intended to be necessarily 'economic' or commercially viable. The Government anticipates that the revenue generated from land sales will enable the project to break even, but the project is an infrastructure investment designed to attract economic development to the surrounding region. The real benefits are not revenue from land sales, but new and more secure employment opportunities resulting from an expanded and more diversified industrial base.

### S.A. TROTTERING CLUB

**512. The Hon. P. DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: What would be the detailed impact on the State Budget of the proposals set out in the submission recently put before the Minister by the South Australian Trotting Club Inc.:

(a) if the proposals were implemented in relation to harness racing only; and

(b) if they were implemented across the three codes?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** Based on 1980-81 revenue, and applying the proposal submitted by the S.A. Trotting Club regarding the distribution of T.A.B. surplus (60 per cent to galloping, 30 per cent to trotting and 10 per cent to greyhound racing), the following amounts would not be available to the Government:

(a) \$1 291 015.

(b) \$4 303 385.

### AUTISTIC CHILDREN

**515. Mr L. M. F. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Is the Minister aware of the details of a questionnaire that is being circulated to parents of autistic children that among other things asks detailed questions concerning the performance of professionals involved in the treatment of individual cases of autism?

2. Does this questionnaire have the endorsement of the Minister and is any funding from the Education Department involved in its promotion and, if so, in what way and what amount?

3. Will the Minister ensure that the professional integrity of those professionals employed by the Education Department who may be the subject of the questionnaire will be protected to the extent within the capacity of the Minister?

4. Will the Minister also ensure that no deterioration in the relationship between parent and professional will occur as a result of the questionnaire with regard to employees of the Education Department?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The questionnaire does not have my endorsement and no funding is provided by the Education Department for its promotion.

3. The Director of Programmes for the association has been advised of my department's concern about the propriety of some of the questions asked in the questionnaire. She has stated that the matter will be raised in an executive meeting of the association.

4. Consultative discussions have taken place between appropriate officers in my department and with the Director of Programmes of the association to assist in the maintenance of sound working relationships between officers of my department and employees of the association.

#### SEMI-TRAILERS

521. **Mr L. M. F. ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What protection is available to suburban residents who are consistently faced with the problems of semi-trailers parked outside their houses?

2. Will the Minister consider legislation setting a maximum number of times that an offender in this regard can take advantage of the relatively low-cost expiation method to avoid prosecution and, if not, what alternative action does he propose in this matter?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The Minister of Local Government has provided the following information relating to powers that are available to both police and local government in relation to illegal parking of heavy vehicles in suburban streets. Regulation 11 of the parking regulations, 1981, makes it clear that the owner or driver of a vehicle over 6 metres, parking longer than one hour or contrary to a resolution of the council, shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of up to \$200. Furthermore, regulation 12 sets out clearly that if a vehicle has been so reported for an offence and has not been removed from a position in which it has been so reported, the owner or driver shall be guilty of a further offence for each hour after which the vehicle remains in the reported position, and liable to a penalty not exceeding \$50 for each such offence.

A council may proceed in one of two ways. First, it can issue notices 'reporting' the vehicle which is in breach of the regulation and the notices can be issued hourly for a continuing offence, thus accumulating expiation fees of \$8 per hour. If this is not sufficient, as the honourable member suggests, a council may prosecute directly without the option of expiation by the owner or driver, and argue before the court that given the circumstances the maximum penalty for the first offence (\$200) and subsequent hourly offences (\$50 per hourly offence) should apply. Either of these courses would require some inspectorial effort on the part of a council to establish the continuing offences, but if the problem is a serious one, and it seems that it is, then it appears that there is no reason why a council could not pursue this course.