

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 30, 1977

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

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

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

PETITION: MAIN ROAD 323

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 1998 residents of South Australia, praying that the House support the upgrading and sealing of Main Road 323 between White Flat and Koppio.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER TRAIN

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 75 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government immediately to restore a sleeper car to the Adelaide to Mount Gambier train.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNIONISM

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 97 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House reject any legislation which would deprive employees of the right to choose whether or not they wished to join a trade union or to provide for compulsory unionism.

Petition received.

PETITION: CAPITAL TAXATION

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 68 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would pass legislation to ease the burden of capital taxation and to make it apply equitably.

Petition received.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: CHILD
PORNOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable Leader of the Opposition the following letter, dated March 30, 1977:

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move—

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely—

That in the opinion of this House—

(a) the exploitation of children in the production of pornographic material constitutes an extreme form of child abuse; and

(b) the Government by its deplorable failure to take all possible steps to prevent this abuse and the distribution of such pornographic material is not discharging its responsibilities to the people of South Australia.

I call on those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

Several members having risen:

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to state that in future I intend to look more closely at subject matters of requests by honourable members for urgency motions to be debated, as to whether or not they are truly matters of urgency. If in my considered opinion they are not, I intend to decline to accept them as urgency motions. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I am quite certain that it is appropriate that I move this motion now for the purpose of discussing what I believe is a matter of extreme urgency. It is a matter which has concerned the entire community. It is a matter upon which the Premier saw fit to make a Ministerial statement yesterday in this House, at the first opportunity that he could find. It was the first subject that he ventilated. The fact that it was a complete whitewash of his own activities and did not hold water is another matter altogether.

The whole issue of child pornography which has come to the fore in the last few weeks is one that sickens every South Australian parent, indeed, every South Australian. The Premier's attitude and that of his Government throughout has been reprehensible in spite of the publicity-grabbing headlines which he has been able to generate. During the last few weeks, following the early reports, the Premier has extracted every possible ounce of publicity from the subject, and he has tried to paint himself as the defender of South Australia's morals, but what in fact have he himself and his Government achieved on the subject? Has he or his Government shown that they really care, by leading the way in actions against child pornography? The clear answer is "No".

On no occasion has the Premier taken the lead in any of these matters. Whatever he has done he has done after someone else has taken action. On all occasions he has taken the credit for something decided by someone else. He has acted as a Thespian, as an actor, and not as a responsible Leader of a Government concerned with the real welfare of the people. In fact, his activities have been motivated by political gain, and he has shown himself to be a very competent opportunist. He asked the Federal Government to act on child pornography the day after the Federal Attorney-General (Mr. Ellicott) announced that he would act. The Premier refused, following a challenge in a press statement that I made, to approach the Classification of Publications Board, and asked why the Leader of the Opposition did not do it; he was not going to—it was not his place. He finally wrote to the board the day after the Chairman of the board had announced that it probably would take action to refuse to classify such material.

Finally, the Premier has consistently refused to agree to suggestions that the Police Offences Act be amended to cover the present totally inadequate situation. If we go through the history of the entire affair it is quite clear that he has been following along the trends set in New South Wales and in Australia in general. He has been following along public opinion; he has been following along the decisions that have been made for him.

This matter first came to the fore with newspaper reports on February 21. I do not intend to go into the details at length, but they involved members of the Vice Squad

raiding a Flagstaff Hill house and seizing several hundred pornographic photographs of Adelaide primary school children. The report stated:

The photographs are the most indecent involving children to come before the notice of the Vice Squad.

The Assistant Commissioner of Police Operations (Mr. Tobin) said:

Anyone who is prepared to involve children in this is a menace to society.

The report continued:

Police allege that the pornographic sessions had been going on for at least a year.

On March 11, 1977, there was the comment made by the mother involved in one of these cases. Following the hearing of the case against the offender, she said:

If we had realised the man would get off so easily we wouldn't have gone through all that terrible heartbreak in court.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you saying that this is the same offender as the one in the case you just cited?

Dr. TONKIN: I am saying no such thing. I am simply saying that the mother of two children who had been involved in a similar case made those comments. A report on March 10 stated:

The Attorney-General, Mr. Ellicott, will call for a nationwide crack-down on pornography featuring children. Mr. Ellicott is understood to believe only the States can effectively defeat the sale of child pornography because they administer laws on the sale of indecent material.

He went on to say that there would be a meeting of State department officials during the next fortnight to arrange a full meeting on the matter. I must say I was pleasantly surprised when I came into town the following morning, on March 11, to see the *Advertiser* banner headlines, stating "Dunstan Warns on Porn". I then looked at the heading in the *Advertiser* which read, "Tighter South Australian control on child porn". I thought perhaps the Government was finally sitting up and doing something, but what did I find when I read this world-shattering statement that the Premier had made? He simply said:

Strong police action would be taken in any case where South Australian children were used for pornographic purposes.

I would hope that strong police action would be taken. I have the utmost faith in our Police Department. The only thing that is really hampering the department at present is a very serious deficiency in the Police Offences Act on this matter, but there was no mention of that. The Premier also called for increased Federal Government help in controlling and classifying pornographic material involving children. I have made the point that the Federal Attorney-General had made arrangements already for discussions to see about obtaining increased help. I could go through this statement of the Premier but, frankly, it said *nothing* positive, particularly when it dealt with the South Australian position regarding the Police Offences Act. It is obvious that section 33 of that Act is not strictly applicable to the offences prescribed.

On March 11, the same attitude to which I have already referred was ventilated when the Premier said that the whole question was one for the Classification of Publications Board and that I could make a submission to the board if I wished to do so. Obviously the Premier was not willing to make such a submission to the board. The Archbishop of Adelaide said at that time that the Government needed to consider again its *laissez faire* attitude towards pornography. On March 15 a report appeared in the *News* stating that the Chairperson of the board, Miss Robyn Layton, had said that the board was likely to refuse classification of publications involving children in explicit pornography. The report continues:

This would leave vendors of the material open to prosecution as it was an offence to sell any unclassified publication.

The Premier is quoted in the same report as saying that the board took action of its own volition before the recent spate of publicity. The report continues:

Mr. Dunstan said that, as a result of the board's being troubled by cases of paedophilia, particularly those relating to cruelty or sadomasochism, he had already raised at a conference of Ministers responsible for publication, the question of the Commonwealth giving the States better information on the kind of material which was being imported.

That was the basis of the statement that the Premier made to the House yesterday when he told us all about it. Now we hear that he wrote a letter on March 16, the day after that report appeared in the newspaper and the day after he had already made the statement that the board had taken action of its own volition. He is now trying to take credit for having persuaded the board to take action which it had already said it would take. Again his attitude has been extremely weak. He has followed along—has not taken a positive lead in the matter. His letter was covered fairly well by the statement that he made in the House yesterday.

I agree with the Premier that it is evident that community standards are such that material depicting hard core paedophilia should be refused classification. However, the Premier should have gone to the board and put that point of view to it. The Premier should have led the way if he really cared about child pornography. He should have taken positive action rather than quietly going along with decisions made by other people until he could pick up the credit for going along with them. The situation is compounded by his absolute refusal to comment about the need to amend the Police Offences Act. The Opposition has already taken action in another place to introduce legislation that will provide a specific offence and upgrade penalties for this offence. Such action has the wide support of everyone in the community, yet the Premier has, in response to all the suggestions, denied that any need exists for change.

It is extremely difficult for our Police Force to deal with these offences under section 33 of the Police Offences Act because the force must charge a person with a technical assault, as I understood the law. The entire situation is far from satisfactory, the penalties are far from satisfactory, and the people of this State want action—they want something done. The Premier has been unwilling to commit himself at any stage. Where is the tough stand about which we read all over the front page of the *Advertiser*? Where is the tough warning that we have been lead to expect? Where is the Government's tough attitude? As far as I can see, they do not exist. More child pornography is believed to be coming into South Australia from other States.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Who believes that?

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've been away; you wouldn't know which day of the week it was.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Newspaper reports have suggested that there is now in South Australia a scarcity of child pornography. I instance the reports in the *News* of March 28 and in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*. The whole point is that any campaign against child pornography and the involvement of local children (any children, but particularly, from South Australia's point of view, South Australian children) in this despicable and filthy trade must have a two-pronged and parallel approach: it must

be handled by dealing with the distribution and by controlling the sale of such material. It must deal with the actual involvement of young children by photographers and others in the production of this material in South Australia. Unless it has that two-pronged attack it will not succeed. Unless the Government is willing to take that action soon, South Australia's children will still be at risk. It is unworkable to do one thing without the other.

The Premier has obviously taken such an attitude throughout the entire exercise. He has been trying to keep as closely as he can behind the decision making to give the impression that he has made the decision and set the pace. The Premier wants to give the impression that he cares, but obviously he does not care. Although he is reacting belatedly and reluctantly to public opinion, he is actually maintaining the *status quo*, and nothing more. The genuine and widespread concern that has stirred the community must surely have a message for the Premier and the Government. The people of South Australia care about this problem. We, as members of the Liberal Party and the Opposition, certainly care. Why does the Premier not do something positive about this whole matter, instead of merely paying lip service to it? Obviously, we can only assume that it is because he does not care.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have listened to the Leader's outburst this afternoon with no little interest. He began with his usual florid abuse of me, but he did not talk much about the subject for quite some time. I tried to distil from what he had to say what was the gravamen of his complaint, other than that he does not like the fact that my public approval rating happens to be rather different from what he suggested in the House yesterday.

Mr. Mathwin: After the commercial, let's get back to the subject matter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I want to deal with the motives of the Leader for the kinds of thing he has had to say. If one can distil from his remarks what it is he is complaining about, it seems to be two things. First, he says that not enough has been done about preventing the distribution of material that contains pornography involving children, but he does not suggest what else is to be done than what has been done by the proper authority. The proper authority is an independent board that properly takes at the behest of the Legislature account of community opinion and community standards. Applying those standards, the board has refused to classify pornography involving children, and, therefore, it is subject to prosecution if it is offered for sale; its sale is prohibited in South Australia.

The Leader's complaint really seems to be that I did not go and tell the board beforehand what it was to do. Somehow or other he then evolved from that that I was dilatory about doing anything in this regard and somehow came in after Mr. Ellicott and Sir Eric Willis, but that is not true. The meeting of Ministers on this matter took place before there was any publicity on the subject, and I was the Minister who raised the question of paedophilia and sadism at that meeting. It was not any other Minister, it was I, and I did it at the request of the board. I have acted as Minister in concert with the board entirely in the way required by the Statute. I commend the board for its view, and it has taken a proper view, as a result of which

obviously investigators who go round trying to find pornography of this kind in South Australia will find a dearth of it because it is illegal. If they can find it, I shall be glad if they can let us have details because we will prosecute whoever has it on sale.

The second ground for complaint is that the Leader says that somehow or other there is some kind of hole in the law about prosecuting photographers who photograph young children whom they have procured to commit acts of sex. That is not so. I have had no complaint from the Police Force or the Crown Law Department that there is any difficulty with the present law, and I cannot see why there should be. The Leader has cited two cases: one of them is now before the court and it is not proper for me to comment on it, other than to say that it is a charge, under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, of procuring an act of gross indecency. That charge is there and there is no difficulty about laying such a charge in the circumstances to which the Leader is referring.

Where is the loophole in the law? If we could find one we would act, but there has been no suggestion to me that there is any difficulty about charging people involved in an act of this kind. Apparently, the Leader has not consulted lawyers in his Party as to the state of the criminal law.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He probably carefully avoided doing so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The other case to which the Leader has referred was of the mother who has complained about her children being photographed by a friend of a former friend of the family. This case has been completed, and I understand that there was no suggestion that he was taking photographs for publication. He was properly prosecuted and dealt with by the court. The mother's complaint was not that he could not be prosecuted but that she regarded the view taken by the court in that case as not severe enough in its penalty of a suspended sentence on that individual.

I point out to honourable members that the maximum penalties involved are considerable. It must be left to the court to decide in those cases what are appropriate penalties within the range given to it by the Legislature. Advice was taken by the Government whether, given the circumstances of the case, a superior court, on appeal, would have imposed a greater penalty, and the advice was that it would not. How has the Government been lacking in its duty in this regard? I can appreciate the feelings of the mother concerned and her desire, frankly, for some revenge. That is not an unnatural attitude. However, the courts do not normally consider the punitive element of penalty, but consider reform and deterrence, and those things affect the courts' assessment of the penalty. In this case the court did what it thought was appropriate and the advice to the Government was that there would be no likelihood of a greater penalty being imposed if we took the matter on appeal. That has been explained to the parent in this case.

The Leader cannot cite a single case in which there has been any difficulty about our prosecuting anyone that we could find involved in this ghastly activity. Prosecutions have taken place in the past in South Australia. I understand that a tiny number of people in this State are affected by paedophilia. It is unfortunate that these deviates occur from time to time in the community, and when they are discovered they are prosecuted, and they will continue to be. The whole of the rest of the Leader's emotional tirade was to the effect that he thought I had grabbed some headlines on this subject. If ever there

was anyone in South Australia who has been playing porn politics on this subject, it is the Leader. It is he who wants to grab the headlines, and he says, "Do something", although he cannot specify what it is we have not done.

That is a disgraceful way of carrying on. I am not surprised that he does it. Sir Eric Willis is doing the same sort of thing in New South Wales, and I have had some experience in relation to Sir Eric Willis on this score, because he was the Chief Secretary at a time when this material was freely available in New South Wales, and not in controlled situations. You could walk into a delicatessen and get it. He did not enforce the law. Now he screams to high heaven when he thinks there is a band wagon he can jump on with the necessary noise.

Dr. Tonkin: You didn't?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I certainly did not. On the one hand, the Leader accuses me of trailing the field, and then says that I am leaping ahead to try to grab headlines.

Dr. Tonkin: No, you're leaping after them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have responded to inquiries in this matter, and in every case when a public statement has been made it has been made as a result of inquiries, except for yesterday, when I informed the House of the action I had taken in relation to sending material to the Chairperson of the board for the proper consideration of that board. I have responded to inquiries made to me about the matter and have informed the public, in accordance with the material brought to me by the Registrar.

Dr. Tonkin: Having checked your ground first.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not normally go off half-cocked, as the Leader does.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have seen the Premier fighting a rearguard action again this afternoon in connection with a matter of considerable importance to the public in this State. He states, although on what evidence I do not know, that a minute number of people is involved in this matter and that this is something that has blown up out of the blue. The press reports initially were to the effect that an increasing flood of this material was coming into South Australia. It was stated that South Australia and New South Wales were leading the field in this matter.

I would reassure the Premier on one point. If he thinks that the fact that he has an adequate publicity machine which manages to let people in other States know that he is the Premier and that 39 per cent of those people believe that he has a favourable image has led the Opposition to mount this attack, he is more ignorant than I think he is. The Premier is saying that we have passed through this Parliament the Classification of Publications Act, setting up a board whose duty is to classify such publications, and that there the matter rests; Parliament and the Government are absolved from all further responsibility. I believe that Act is deficient, and the Premier has shown by his actions in the past week or two that it is deficient.

The Premier also said that Opposition members had not consulted the members of the legal profession in their Party, and that the Opposition did not propose anything positive. If he had taken time to see the public statements of the Leader of the Opposition in this place, he would have seen that the Opposition plans to do something positive about it. In fact, the lawyer member of the Opposition in the Upper House, the Hon. John Burdett, is to introduce a Bill to do something about penalties in this area. I have a draft copy of the piece of legislation that the Hon.

John Burdett will be introducing into the Upper House; it is a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Do not let the Premier say we are huffing and puffing, as is his wont. The Opposition is concerned about this matter. It considers that Parliament has a responsibility about it and that the Premier should not be hiding behind the Classifications Board set up by Act of this Parliament, and asserting that there the matter rests. In my view and that of the Opposition that legislation is deficient and the gyrations of the Premier during the past week or so show that it is deficient. The Premier has written a letter to the board giving his view on what are community standards. That is interesting. The fact is that the board had run into a certain amount of trouble. The Premier does not disagree with the provisions of the Classification of Publications Act, section 12 of which provides:

(1) In considering questions as to whether a publication is offensive, or suitable or unsuitable for perusal by minors, the board shall have regard to standards of morality, decency and propriety that are generally accepted by reasonable adult persons.

(2) In performing its functions under this Act, the board shall give effect to the following principles—

(a) that adult persons are entitled to read and view what they wish—

the Premier does not depart from that principle—

and

(b) that members of the community are entitled to protection (extending to both themselves and those in their care) from exposure to unsolicited material they find offensive.

The answer to that question has been to put material below the counter if it falls into that category and not to leave it where minors can see it. The Premier is standing fairly and squarely behind the principles of that Act. Despite all his gyrations and the generous headlines his press staff has been able to promote, the Premier is not resiling from that position. He is saying in effect that the Government is not prepared to take a lead in this matter and the Government is not prepared to outlaw child pornography.

There is a fundamental difference in approach in this case between that of the Premier and that of the Opposition. We do not believe, and we are prepared to say so, that adult persons are entitled to read and view what they wish if they wish to procure and to use child pornography. The Premier has said that at the moment he believes that community standards are such that it would be better for the board not to classify this material. There is no departure in the Premier's thinking from the basic tenets of that law. He is saying that in his view community standards are such that at present he though it expedient to write to the board to tell it not to classify this material. If those who want to view this material can get enough publicity, and in his judgment community standards will now accept it, we can revert to the provisions of the Act. That is an abdication of responsibility.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not say that, and you know it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a clear implication from the tone of the Premier's letter. The Premier has said that community standards are such that he believes that at present the board should not classify this sort of material. Did the Premier say that, or did he not? What sort of lead is that from a Government? It is a passive, following role. If the people who want to produce and peddle child pornography can attract enough favourable publicity (as all these radical types of movement seek to do), in the Premier's judgment, which would be dictated to by publicity, as that influences his thinking more than anything else, he would not need to send such a letter.

The Premier said the law is satisfactory in relation to the prosecution of offenders and the provisions of the Police Offences Act. Obviously the mother and the family of the children concerned in the recent incident do not think so. She is reported as follows:

"There must be harsher penalties," she implored. "We have been through so much," she said. "We know what this has done to our children and we would not wish it on anyone." The woman would not allow her family's name or address to be published. The children are a boy, 7, and a girl, 10. They had been deeply shocked by the experience, she said.

She also said that if she had known what would be the end result she would not have gone through the trauma of the court case. The fact is that the Premier is not taking the lead in this matter. He has sniffed the breeze; his assessment is that community standards dictate that this material be not classified, but that means that, if community standards should change, we can return to the terms of the Act that I have already reminded the House about. The relevant provision in the Police Offences Act to deal with people who would seek to peddle child pornography is section 33, which refers to the printing, publication and distribution of pornographic material—indecent matter, as it is referred to in this section. The penalty prescribed is \$200 or imprisonment for six months. We agree with those in the community who believe that the production and distribution of child pornography should be spelt out as a specific offence and that appropriate penalties should be prescribed. I, like all people in the community who believe that the law has a protective role, particularly in relation to children, do not believe that it is satisfactory that people who are supposed to be giving a lead in the community should be prepared to sit around and sniff the breeze in regard to what are community standards at any point in time.

Legislators in this place have a responsibility to the community to take a lead in these matters. The Premier, as has been pointed out by the Leader, has shelved his responsibility and thrown it on to a board. I believe the principles enunciated in the Classification of Publications Act do need some amendment and that, indeed, a specific offence should be created. I believe Mr. Ellicott has made the position of the Commonwealth Government quite clear. He has said that he believes that the States are in the best position to control this matter. Surely the Premier's memory does not need much refreshing in that regard. It is in the hands of the States to control this matter and, if it is the will of the Government to do so, it can take far more drastic action than it is obviously prepared to take. I say quite unashamedly in conclusion that the press has been very kind to the Premier in this regard. The *Sunday Mail* report to which I have referred had the lead line that not much child pornography seemed to be available. In the present climate and with the publicity we have had in the past three or four weeks, if I went into a sex shop as a reporter and asked about the availability of this material, I would have expected anyone to be rather cautious about giving evidence that there was much increase in this traffic.

I read the report with interest. The key phrase used in that report by the reporter was that this "soft clamp down" on pornography was occurring, and the operative word, of course, is "soft". The Government is completely soft in its approach to this matter. If the Premier wished to take a lead he would introduce legislation, as an Opposition member in the Upper House plans to. The Premier is obviously ill informed. He claims that we are not prepared to take action. Indeed we are, and I trust

that, if that Bill passes the Upper House, he will have a good hard look at it when it comes into this place, and I hope the Government will be prepared to accept the lead offered by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I think it was the Premier in this afternoon's debate who raised the question about just what the Opposition was seeking to achieve by this debate. I think he asked what was the gravamen of the Opposition's argument. I believe the answer to that question has become clear from the remarks made by the Deputy Leader a few moments ago. There is no doubt that the Opposition saw in this issue an opportunity to beat a drum that it thought would be to its political advantage. No doubt the Opposition saw this as an issue on which it could run a bit of a campaign. The evidence is clear that the Opposition started to manufacture this campaign, and the Bill that the Hon. Mr. Burdett has introduced in the Upper House, I believe today, is a clear indication of that, as that sort of Bill cannot be produced in five minutes. There is no doubt that it was part of a carefully laid plan to beat the drum on this issue. For the information of the Deputy Leader, I point out that the Bill being introduced in the Upper House is completely and utterly unnecessary, because there already exists in South Australia legislation which can cover adequately this situation. The proof of that is that a person has been charged with the offence of procuring a child to commit an act of gross indecency. That matter is before the court now, and it is clear proof that the law is adequate, as the Premier has suggested, to deal with the matter.

For the sheer cynical convenience of its argument, the Opposition carefully skirted around any reference to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The Leader of the Opposition huffed and puffed in his usual fashion and referred to the Police Offences Act and to what he saw as deficiencies in that legislation. He did not refer to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which remedies any so-called deficiencies in the Police Offences Act. I shall refer to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to illustrate that the Opposition, by introducing the Bill in the Upper House, is seeking to do nothing more than try to sensationalise the issue. Section 58 (1) (b) of that Act carries, for any person found guilty of a first offence, a penalty of imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, and, for a subsequent offence, imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years. Broadly, those penalties are in line with the penalties provided in the Hon. Mr. Burdett's Bill. The Opposition is not seeking to do anything new. The Bill it is introducing in the Upper House is unnecessary. A person is being charged on the same facts as set out in the Opposition's Bill. He is now before the court, so I am precluded from saying anything more about that matter.

Mr. Allison: Guilty of what?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Guilty of the offence of procuring a child to commit an act of gross indecency. The facts of that case are exactly similar to the matters that have been referred to by Opposition speakers. Their concern is for the person who takes photographs of children in explicit positions intending to use those photographs for commercial purposes. That is the type of factual situation that has led to the charge now before the court. The Opposition must have been disheartened when it picked up the *Sunday Mail* last weekend and read the report on pornography therein. The two reporters who wrote the report were, I believe, senior reporters, and no doubt they would have been looking for a sensational

report. The *Sunday Mail* is not a newspaper that is known for its temperate approach to these matters. No doubt the reporters were given this assignment to try to seek out pornography involving children in South Australia, but they were unable to do so, for the good reason that they stated in the first paragraph of their report, as follows:

Action taken by the State Government in the past nine months seems to have stopped a flow of "child porn" from becoming a major part of South Australia's sex shop scene.

The report further states that the reporters were unable to find examples of child pornography in South Australian sex shops. If anyone could have found such examples, it would have been reporters from a newspaper of that sort. Frequently the police have difficulty finding this type of information because people are aware of the identity of Vice Squad detectives, but people would not be aware to the same extent of the identity of newspaper reporters. Nevertheless, these reporters were unable to obtain any child pornography from Adelaide sex shops. That is the situation. This Government has acted, wherever there has been evidence of child pornography, to bring the matters to the courts. The Leader's attack on the Premier for not taking action in this matter smacks of untruths, because the Premier was Attorney-General when the information concerning the charge of procuring was laid: that clearly indicates that this Government is taking action wherever evidence exists of child pornography. Adequate offences in the law can be used to charge people involved in this kind of practice. It does the Opposition no credit that it has sought merely to sensationalise this matter by trying to run a campaign to create fear in the community; that is the kind of thing it is into.

Undoubtedly (and I hope that the House will heed my warning), this will not be the last we will see of the Opposition's raising matters of this kind for political gain. Undoubtedly the Opposition will attempt to run a law-and-order campaign in the next election, regardless of whether it can find any facts or substance on which to run its campaign; it is trying to beat the law-and-order drum. We will see plenty of that being done before then, because the Opposition will use every opportunity it has to raise this kind of issue. Whether there is any factual support or basis, it will raise this issue because it thinks that there might be a few votes in it. It thinks that, by initially creating a climate of fear, it will be able to come along and say, "We will be the saviours of this State; we will save you from the fear we have created in your hearts and minds." That is what the Opposition will be into. I warn the House that this will not be the last we will see of this type of motion.

The Leader has tried to suggest that this is a matter of urgency, but I join with the member for Mitcham in showing contempt for that claim. The matter, to the extent that it can be dealt with, is being dealt with. The only case known of to the police or to the Government is now before the courts and, if the Opposition believes that it has evidence of child pornography in South Australia or of people manufacturing and peddling it, I invite it to come to me and I will have Government officers investigate the claims. The Opposition has not produced any evidence of child pornography.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you saying that it doesn't occur in South Australia?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am saying that it is rare and, when brought to the Government's attention, we act to ensure that the people responsible are taken to court and dealt with by the appropriate authorities.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Go to the police, for a change.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The police found evidence in the case now before the court; they believed that there was sufficient evidence in that matter. Where has the Government in any way failed to act in that situation? The police brought the evidence to us, and we acted. That has been the Government's record all along, as members know.

In my view, there is sufficiently tough and appropriate legislation on the Statute Book now to deal with this matter. It is a pity that the Opposition does not take more legal advice. If it has been taking legal advice, it should take other legal advice in order to be properly apprised of the legislation now on the Statute Book so that its Leader may be well apprised of the fact that there is in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act an offence which can be and has been used to cover the situation he has raised today.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Although I do not have a copy of this urgency motion (that courtesy was not extended to me today), I have a pretty good idea of what it is, because at 8.30 last evening I found in my letter box a copy of this motion, with a compliment slip from the Leader of the Opposition, for yesterday. It was to be moved yesterday.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I didn't think he was speaking to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is not. He could have told me at two o'clock if he wanted to, as we came into the House, that he was anxious to move an urgency motion yesterday. I found it in my box on Tuesday at 8.30 p.m.: I had cleared my box before lunch yesterday, and it was not there then. I remember broadly what is in the motion, because at about 5 p.m. yesterday the member for Mount Gambier told me what I had not known until then, that the Opposition meant, if they could cut me out yesterday, to move this motion then. Although I do not have a copy I know something of its contents, and I agree with what the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have said about the evils of child pornography. They having said what they have, there is really no need to say any more about it.

There would not be one member (I hope there would not be) who would disagree, and there is no point in reiterating the same thing. With great respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I also agree with what you said before this debate began about the need for an element of urgency in an urgency debate. Liberal Party members are lucky that you had already accepted this motion when you spoke, because had you not already accepted the motion I am sure you would not have accepted it, as obviously it does not conform with your ruling. As the Premier and Attorney-General have both said, there is no element of urgency about this matter: it is simply a matter of administration. Yesterday, the Premier made a Ministerial statement about it, and nothing new has been added in this debate so far today. If any further proof was required of the lack of urgency in the technical sense of this subject, it is that nothing new has come out of this debate yet.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It is a bad misjudgment of what is urgent and what is not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We know (and I take up the point made by the Attorney-General), even though no-one has said it, the real reason why this motion was moved today and why the Opposition Liberal Party hoped to move it yesterday. It was not because they regard it as a matter of urgency: they wanted to kick the can a bit about porn, but the real reason was to cut me out. On March 17, 10 days ago, I wrote to the Leader of the Opposition giving him notification of the urgency motion that I intended to move yesterday, and asked for the support of his members in it. I had a reply from him, but

it did not state whether I would get support or not: it beat around the bush. I wrote to him again last Friday (and he would have received the letter on Monday morning) regretting the illness of the member for Alexandra and stating that I intended, because of the real urgency of the matter, to go on with it yesterday, and I asked for his support. I did not get it, and we know what happened, so we need not go into that.

Also, I wrote to him several days ago telling him that today I intended to move a motion of urgency concerning the colleges of advanced education and the report that had been released by Dr. Sandover, and again I asked for his support on that matter. I have no doubt that the real reason for bringing on this motion today was to ensure that my motion of urgency about the colleges of advanced education would not be debated today, because (and I remind you, Mr. Speaker, and everyone else in the Chamber of the procedures of this House) an urgency motion can go only until 3.15 p.m., and there is therefore no more than an hour for the debate. It is therefore impossible for there to be more than one urgency motion debated on any one day. If one urgency motion is accepted, any other one must fall by the wayside. The Opposition today deliberately went on with this motion, knowing that I proposed to move on what I regarded as a matter genuinely of urgency regarding the colleges of advanced education.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member for Mitcham that he is getting far from the motion under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite, but I did it, and I shall make no more than a one-sentence explanation. There are people who have come to listen today to that debate, and I want to explain to them why it is not proceeding.

The SPEAKER: That is not the matter under discussion. I remind the honourable member for Mitcham that what he is saying at the moment is irrelevant to the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. I intend to try again tomorrow to get that motion on. The last thing I propose to say (because the more people who can speak in these debates the better, and I have no doubt the Liberals will make sure it goes until 3.15 p.m. so that there is no chance of anything else being discussed this afternoon) is that this debate was not brought on out of any genuine concern for this matter. It was a matter of Party-political tactics.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You lie.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I ask for a withdrawal of that interjection.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the remark as being unparliamentary.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I withdraw the word.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask for an unqualified withdrawal. I am not sure that that was one.

The SPEAKER: I am satisfied that the honourable member has withdrawn the remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. With deference, I accept your ruling. That was the real reason why this debate was brought on today, and until my friends in the Liberal Party realise that it is—

Mr. Max Brown: How many friends have you got?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They may all have elected themselves enemies, after what I read in the paper this morning.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you go on with the debate on education?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is one thing about the member for Glenelg: he had the guts in his Party to fight back from an impossible position—

The SPEAKER: Order! That matter is irrelevant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and in the teeth of the opposition of his Leader to his preselection for the next election.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member that he is now discussing a matter that is completely irrelevant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I should like the honourable member to get back to the urgency motion as moved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The last thing I want to say to the members of the Liberal Party is that, if they want to get anywhere in politics in this State, they must start putting genuine issues before personalities.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): Without wanting to inflate the ego of the member for Mitcham, which some people would say was a difficult task, I say that it is normally reasonably hard to follow him in a debate for the reason, if nothing else, that he provides matters of substance. On this occasion, when we are discussing what is considered by almost half the number of members of the House to be of some urgency and gravity, he spent most of the eight or 10 minutes in which he spoke dealing with the feud that exists between the new L.M., which he leads, and his old Liberal Party, and dealing with the philosophy which he thought some people inside the Liberal Party should adopt.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think it would be difficult to lead a one-man Party?

Mr. McRAE: That is always inherently difficult. For that reason, it is difficult to follow him on this occasion, but I should like to make one or two brief observations. I agree with all speakers that the evil raised is a grave one indeed, a sickening one, and abhorrent to any man of reason and common sense. The question of penalties which was raised, I think by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I do not quite understand. I should have thought that, under the existing criminal law of this State, there was more than adequate machinery to punish harshly the persons involved. Whatever may be said as to the difficulties of rationalising the sentences of the courts, I have always known that a person charged with an offence of abusing, degrading or sexually molesting a child has been uniformly harshly dealt with, and properly so; I trust that would be the case.

I hope that the case the honourable member referred to perhaps has not been properly explained to him or perhaps there is some other reason that I do not know about. In the normal course of events, the courts would treat such behaviour very harshly indeed. The main tenor of the debate seemed to be the time sequence regarding various actions by the Premier. I found that part of the debate to be singularly unconvincing. I thought that the Premier explained in some detail, and clearly, what he did, why he did it, and when he did it, and it seemed to fit a logical pattern. I could not find anything terribly sinister about it.

By coincidence, on this day last week I was at the Legislative Assembly in Victoria and I was surprised to find the Liberal Party Chief Secretary, I think, or certainly a Minister in the Lower House of the Victorian Parliament, opposing a Labor urgency motion couched in terms similar

to those put by the Leader today; in other words, the Labor Party in Victoria demanded that the Chief Secretary or the responsible Minister should take immediate steps to stop the prevalent practice in that State of abusing children and using those acts to cash in on a racket. He refused to do anything for a year.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He disregarded the advice of the court.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. I was quite stunned by what was going on over there, but I was not there for the whole debate and I should not make too much of it. It seems that the whole issue relating to the South Australian Government's policy on publications has been accepted by the community. Philosophically and in every other way it represents a fairly reasonable balance between the right of people to read what they want to read, and, on the other hand, the right of people not to be misused or to have objectionable material, or material which they regard as being objectionable, flaunted at them. One of the difficulties I perceive that that philosophy does not and perhaps never will overcome (but perhaps some effort should be made to look into this) is the racket which obviously exists inside the industry (I shudder to call it that except for want of a better term) of producing pornographic material. There is no doubt that it is a large-scale industry. Workers known to me in the printing industry union have told me they have objected strongly to being employed on premises which are producing this sort of material. The Griffin Press, which I regard as a fine press, at one stage was, and I think even today is, producing a fairly high quantity of this material.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Hard core?

Mr. McRAE: I am not talking about hard core pornography but about novels which are objectionable and which are classified by the board. The workers and apprentices in the industry object and they have told me so. The philosophy the Government has put forward is one that I think is accepted by the community. While we always have instances where that philosophy has to be corrected from time to time, nevertheless the major issue that I see lying behind this relates to the racketeers who are making money from it. Whether that money is in relation to children or in relation to adult people I do not particularly care. To me, it seems abhorrent that a person whom I would regard as a cheap crook and a gangster is using any human being in such a degrading way as to take pictures and make use of those pictures as though the people concerned were less than human, and then sell this stuff on the market. And we have reached the stage where a leading press in this State, although not doing that, is involved in that sort of cheap industry.

To me that is a cheapening racket. I would like to see some inquiry as to who are the people and what is the price structure behind these publications. During a grievance debate I put the suggestion that this is one of the areas where there is no price control, and it seems to me that one of the reasons why these people can exist so well is that they can live so lucratively from the high prices they charge for the rubbish they churn out. In no shape or form should this have been called an urgency motion, and to the extent that you, Mr. Speaker, in your generosity have accepted it as such it ought to be roundly defeated by this House.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I see no reason whatever after what has been said this afternoon to reduce my anger that child pornography is available in Australia. We are not talking about politics: we are talking about

children, and that is the only matter at issue this afternoon. Child pornography is available in Australia. Three issues are at stake: production, sale and possession. Irrespective of whether or not we condone all three of those or only one of those, if a classification board has to classify any material before it can be sold under restricted sale it still has to be produced somewhere in the world. As humanists we should concern ourselves about it wherever in the world it is produced. There is no doubt the material is being produced in Australia because recent material shown on television quite clearly indicates an Australian beer bottle and an Australian fruit case with a child in a pornographic position. It is a case of child abuse and that is the basic issue behind the whole of this matter. It is matter of considerable urgency, not something that we can sit through and laugh at smugly, irrespective of the side of the House on which we sit.

Mr. Langley: Who's doing that?

Mr. ALLISON: There were two cases on my left this afternoon. I do not want to name them, but I will if you insist. There is no room for smugness in this issue. Before the classifications board can classify material it has to be produced and to my thinking there are no shades of grey in this issue. We should not condone the production, sale or possession of material in the making of which children have in any way been abused. If stringent laws concerning the production of this material are not working, perhaps we should have even more stringent laws against the possession and sale of it.

It is said that the classifications board simply does not consider this type of material. Irrespective of a person's politics, I do not think we would have any opposition at all to introducing far more stringent legislation against child pornography. Some people would defend it on the grounds that perverts may need this sort of material to stop them from laying hands on the real thing, but that would be an even sicker approach. That point of view was partly illustrated in an article by Peter Ward in *Forum* in which he stated:

The people who purchase paedophilic literature are not necessarily, even not probably, child-molesters or corrupters.

He then went on to defend them. Surely that is not relevant. A child has been abused if that material is available, and that is the real issue. I do not know how those people who believed that the penalty was too light managed in the first place to keep their hands off the guy who was taken before the courts. I can sympathise deeply—

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

URANIUM

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith, such suspension to remain in force no later than 9 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

Earlier in the session the Government gave an undertaking that, following the publication of the first report of the Fox commission, there would be a debate in this House after members had had an opportunity to examine it and any other relevant material, because questions about the future of uranium mining in South Australia are of vital importance to this State and, indeed, to the whole country. The policy of the Government has been clearly stated previously: that we would not consent to the mining or treatment of uranium in South Australia unless it was clearly established to the public that it was safe to provide uranium to a customer country.

Following the publication of the Ranger commission report we have examined the report itself and material which was submitted to the Ranger inquiry. The inquiry did not deal at all fully with the questions of the final safety of providing uranium to a customer country, a matter of some disappointment. It was essential to determine the future course of Government that we should examine that matter in some detail. We are under considerable pressure, naturally enough, to provide uranium to customer countries, particularly to Japan. There is considerable economic argument for doing so. Japan is Australia's major trading partner, taking 54 per cent of our product. At present there is no sign that Japan can maintain its industry on provisions of fossil fuel to it until such time as alternative energy resources other than nuclear energy are available to it. What is more, there are considerable reasons why Japan is reluctant to continue indefinitely with the heavy use of fossil fuel because of the pollution problems which are evident in Japan.

If Japanese industry were to lack fuel and there was to be a marked reduction in imports from Australia our industry would suffer badly. The economic down-turn we are presently facing would be minor compared to the results to Australia that would then occur. In Australia it is vitally necessary to Government in planning for the future that it ensure the provision of stable and secure employment of its people. Having said all that, and having also looked at the fact that if we are to provide uranium to a customer country the best way to do so is through a uranium enrichment plant and to the fact that the mining and enrichment of uranium in Australia should not in itself provide for us any particular hazard, I point out that there are quite compelling economic reasons for considering that we ought to be supplying uranium to a customer country; but it is necessary for us, if we are to do that, to look at with what safety we can provide uranium to a customer country.

I think that there are three issues in the safety area that must be looked at. The first is as to the security of the transporting and use of uranium in nuclear reactors. There are the problems, in addition to this, of the safe operation of nuclear reactors themselves. Finally, there is the problem of the disposal of high level nuclear wastes. An examination of these problems can only lead one to the conclusion that for us to be able to provide uranium safely to a customer country there must be the most stringent conditions constantly policed for more than the foreseeable future. We must be satisfied as to the international standards which can be established and maintained. It is difficult to forecast that there is going to be the necessary political stability for the future that would ensure, beyond the foreseeable future, a high level of inspection and control in these matters,

Mr. Millhouse: It is not difficult, it is impossible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I agree; it is impossible to forecast that. In addition to that, we are faced with the very real problem of disposal of high level atomic wastes, which have a very considerable life. It is plain that the major proposed customer country at the moment has not got any clear policy for the future established to the satisfaction of its own people about the disposal of high level atomic wastes. When I was last in Japan, one of the Japanese senators was happy to suggest that Australia could be the host country for these wastes since the present proposed technology for dealing with high level atomic wastes is that they be vitrified and buried, either in salt pans or in ancient geological formations that it can be forecast are not likely to change for some millions of years.

Of course, they look to pre-Cambrian rock areas, of which Australia has a considerable quantity. I cannot believe that on environmental or security grounds Australia should be willingly host to the disposal of high level atomic wastes in its area. Quite plainly, Japan and many Japanese citizens are not happy about the disposal of atomic wastes in their area, either. There is no clear sign at present that it is going to be possible to resolve these difficulties. At this stage of proceedings we cannot forecast either the technological developments which may occur and which may change the situation, and we cannot forecast what international inspection agreements may be achieved. What one can say is that at present, and for the future as far as one can see, it does not appear, to me at any rate, that one can be satisfied as to the safety of providing atomic or nuclear material (uranium) to a customer country.

There can be very many different points of view in this and many shades of opinion, because the differences between experts, the differences in emphasis that occur to people in making their judgments on a number of varying factors as to value judgments in this area, can be so great that one can get a very wide variety of opinion on various aspects of the total problem. I can only say (and I here speak for my Party) that we believe, on examining all the evidence that we have been able to assemble (and the officers of the Policy Secretariat of the Government as well as the officers of the Mines Department have been working on material of this kind for some time to provide us with as wide a range of information as they can), that the Government as a whole cannot be satisfied that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country, and in those circumstances we do not believe that we should proceed to the treatment and mining of uranium here.

I know that it can be argued (and this is one of the arguments often produced) that, since other countries have committed themselves to the development of nuclear energy, if we choose not to provide them with uranium they are going to get it from elsewhere and we then will not have any say in the international arrangements that must be made for the future safety of mankind in dealing with this material.

Dr. Eastick: Have you withdrawn your application for a plant as a result of this decision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have never had an application for a plant. What was produced in South Australia was a feasibility study about the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant. That feasibility study has continued and will go on. We need to know about the possible development of uranium technology and, if there is a change in the future that can give us assurances of safety, that is, of course, something that we could conceivably proceed with. I have outlined the reasons why I,

personally, have come to the conclusion that I have stated to the House and why the Government has come to the conclusion that it should put forward this motion as a basis for discussion. While there are, as I have said, very strong economic reasons for our supplying uranium to a customer country (particularly Japan) and very strong economic reasons why, if Australia is going to do that, we should take advantage of the technology for what happens here (because whatever would happen in the mining and enrichment of uranium in South Australia could quite safely be done here), it is not what happens in South Australia that we need to be worried about the safety of: it is what happens in the customer country that is the worrying factor.

At this stage in proceedings I believe that anyone really honestly looking at this problem will find it very difficult to be satisfied that there are sufficient technologies or international arrangements developed that could assure us of safety in that course. If that is the conclusion that we come to, I believe that the only proper decision for us is the decision that is put forward in this motion. Speaking as Premier of South Australia, one who has been involved in its development and one who has been involved in the development of feasibility studies about uranium technology here, it is not an easy decision to come to, but it is a vitally important one for the people of South Australia as a whole and it has to be dealt with honestly and fairly. If one reaches the conclusion that I have reached, I believe that the course I have put forward is the only fair and honest course. In addition it is vital for us to pursue urgently alternative energy resources. Later the Government will make a statement on its longer term proposals for alternative energy resource examination. The Government has decided immediately to provide \$250 000 this financial year for the immediate stepping-up of investigations into alternative energy resources. We believe that that, too, is a vital course for us to take.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It is difficult to find fault with this motion. I find it a little disappointing. It is not an impressive effort, because it does avoid, in spite of the strong divisions which exist in the Labor Party and throughout the community, crystallising any one point of view. It is significant that the Premier has spoken of the difficulties that surround the use of nuclear energy and that he has given his opinion, if I understood him correctly, that it will be some years before it could even be considered that nuclear energy would be used in this State. The wording of this motion allows him to do that, and it would also allow someone else to speak to and support the motion in the belief that six months would be a satisfactory time.

I cannot complain that the motion is not a cleverly worded motion. I am certain that it was passed unanimously through Caucus, as there could be no way of disagreeing to it. The motion panders to every point of view and is obviously designed to avoid controversy not only in the Party room but also in the Labor Party ranks in this Parliament. The motion therefore avoids the crystallising that is the essence of debate on this most important subject in the community. Debate is what this motion is all about, or so I understood. The motion was to give everyone an opportunity to consider the Government's views on the matter, to criticise them constructively, to pass other views, and perhaps even to disagree, yet controversy is not built into the motion, and it contains no firm stance.

In its way, I suppose that the motion is an endorsement of the Federal Government's policy on uranium. In its way, it can also be taken as an endorsement of the policy so clearly announced by Mr. Whitlam this morning in the *Australian*. If it does that, it favours proper safeguards so that mining can proceed when those proper safeguards are established. As I read the motion, that is one way that it can be interpreted and, as such, is very much a tacit endorsement of the Federal Government's policy as recently stated by Mr. Anthony, who gave qualified support for uranium mining, the qualification being that there are legitimate concerns regarding safety which need to be answered and that a decision should not be made without proper consideration by the Government after discussion by the public of the second Ranger report.

The Prime Minister, on behalf of the Federal Government, is negotiating proper safeguards to be applied in Australia with the International Atomic Energy Commission. President Carter is also seeking the same proper safeguards before uranium is mined, processed, exported or otherwise used. As announced in today's *Australian*, Mr. Whitlam's policy makes clear that he favours the use of uranium and to signatories of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty; all sales being subject to International Atomic Energy Agency Safeguards Agreement; guarantees from buyers that Australian uranium will not be reprocessed to yield plutonium; and Australian participation in research to find safe storage procedures for nuclear waste. Those are matters that have been put up clearly by the Federal Government.

This motion does not really cut across anything that has been put forward by either the Federal Government or the Federal Opposition. Proper safeguards are the complete and absolute consideration in this debate. The motion could, on the surface, represent a rejection of the contrary view, the left-wing view, the absolute ban, the moratorium for at least five years or more that says, "Leave uranium in the ground and don't touch it." This motion does not cut across that view either. The motion can be interpreted in any way one wishes. I suspect that the Premier's viewpoint suggests strongly that, if a moratorium is to be imposed on any further mining, the motion certainly endorses the left-wing view as propounded by Mr. Uren and cuts across the statements that have been made. It also pre-empts the second Ranger inquiry.

Mr. Keneally: Half the left-wingers in Moscow?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Half the left-wingers in Italy?

Dr. TONKIN: Left-wingers have had a pretty fair victory in Caucus this morning.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's Liberal Party policy?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Sir, but it is interesting to listen to the reaction coming from opposite, because it indicates the direction in which the motion is moving. The major problem is that the words of the motion "demonstrated to its satisfaction" are important words. The Premier has not given a firm indication of how it will be demonstrated to anyone's satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country. I should have thought that this was a major item to be covered; I should have thought that the Government would be in a position to make firm recommendations on this matter. The Government says that it is necessary to demonstrate to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country before the mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

Will a political decision be made on this issue? Will it depend on the outcome of the second Fox report? I think that is unlikely, because the second Fox report will deal entirely with the mining of uranium, so it comes back to whether it will be a political decision. If that is the case this debate, although it is not totally redundant, must be repeated when more information is available and when South Australia has a Government which is willing to put up reasons why it might or might not be safe to mine uranium and which will allow the issue to be debated. When we have a Government in South Australia that is willing to put up a motion that has some guts in it to which we can agree or disagree, that is when the issue will be debated. As the motion stands no-one could disagree to it, but further debate must occur on the issue. This motion only scratches the surface and is designed to do so purely and simply because the Government promised time for the issue to be debated. I sincerely hope that the Government does not consider that this has been a sufficient time or basis on which to debate this wide-sweeping and important issue. Plans are well developed in South Australia for uranium use. On March 23, the Minister announced:

The State Government is preparing a detailed submission on Redcliff in a bid to get Federal funds for the project. There were several items there, but the most important, and one of which you, Mr. Speaker, are well aware, was the article in the *Pirie Recorder*, under the heading "State Government move on Redcliff funds", under which appears the following:

The State Government is preparing a detailed submission on Redcliff in a bid to get Federal funds for the project. However, whether that will be entirely to Dow Chemicals and Petrochemicals, I do not know.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's what it was about.

Dr. TONKIN: Right. We all recall that that site was widely propounded not long ago as being suitable indeed for a uranium enrichment plant. The Premier stated on July 1, 1976, that his Government would be bound both by the conclusions of the Ranger inquiry and by Australian Labor Party policy. If any conclusion can be drawn in relation to uranium mining now as a result of today's motion, it is that the Premier has pre-empted the Second Ranger Inquiry Report and the proceedings of the next A.L.P. Federal Conference which will bring up policy on this matter in July, and I have no doubt that he has tried to pre-empt the heated debate he is expecting on that subject when it comes to Federal conference. Considerable politics is creeping into this matter.

On July 2, 1976, the Premier was quoted as saying, "I would still prefer that all the money came through the A.I.D.C. However, we would be ready to go along with any plan that ensured Australia had a majority and controlling interest." On the same day, our policy announced support in principle for the Redcliff proposal with the qualification of the need for safety and environmental safeguards being determined prior to any mining. On July 27, in the House of Assembly debate on the Opposition censure motion on uranium (page 192 of *Hansard*), the Premier said:

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

The Opposition move to have an independent State inquiry into the provision of uranium to customer countries was rejected by the Premier, because, he said, the terms of

reference of the Ranger inquiry were applicable to Redcliff and covered that point. The Premier also said that such an inquiry would take two years and would be a collective decision between the Federal Government, the State Government, and the A.I.D.C. There is no question that this Government has been quietly moving along towards the processing of uranium, so I repeat the considerable concern among industry and people in the community about what are the Government's intentions. Those intentions are in no way disclosed and in no way telegraphed, and community concern is in no way allayed by the terms of the motion.

Finally, I find a glaring omission from the entire motion. It was an afterthought the Premier had, I suspect when he saw details of the amendment that I proposed to move handed around, that is, the question of alternative energy sources. Last weekend, the Victorian Premier (Mr. Hamer) took the initiative by offering \$2 000 000, I think, to scientists at the Australian National University to further research into the use of solar energy, and said he would like that research to be done in Victoria. The New South Wales Premier (Mr. Wran) has stated his support, too, for the principle of State moneys being appropriated for solar energy research within his State. We in South Australia are particularly fortunate in having a fine research department at Flinders University. Although I am pleased to hear that the State Government intends to give some funds towards energy research development, I regard solar energy research and research into alternative sources as being so important as to hold the key to the very future of this State, both in pure energy and in the supply of water, and I think the sum referred to this afternoon is a puny one indeed.

I think that the Federal Government should also give urgent attention to solar energy research, and I believe that it is doing so. I believe that the longer we delay the more likely it is that we will have to resort to sources of nuclear energy in South Australia. I intend to move an amendment to incorporate in the motion support for the principle of State funding—let us at least keep up with Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth. The Minister of Mines and Energy appeared on *This Day Tonight* recently and said that Australia had a unique problem in the transportation energy field and that this was the rationale for priority being given to energy requirement other than solar. South Australia must realise (as I am sure that the Minister does) that the transportation energy problem is paramount in all western industrialised countries. There is no justification (if I understood him correctly) for his argument to assign solar energy research a lower priority. What is required is that one-third of the world's energy consumption go into providing heat, one-third into transport, and one-third to generate electricity.

A study of resources indicates that in future we can hope that there will be no shortage of the means to produce heat, provided that a switch can be made from oil and natural gas to coal. The Minister would no doubt fully agree with me that Australia is richly endowed with coal, but eventually we must turn to solar energy for producing heat. However, reserves of energy suitable for transport are totally inadequate, and energy for the generation of electricity will also be a pressing problem at least until the year 2000. Alternative forms of energy, such as hydro-electric, tidal movement, wind, geo-thermal, show no immediate prospects of solving the world's energy problems. Much work needs to be done to make these practical alternatives. It is vitally urgent that that work

be done. Thermo-nuclear fusion, solar energy and geothermal energy may well be solving the world's problems by the year 2000. Otherwise, nuclear fission energy produced from uranium may be the only possible alternative to fossil fuels in the short term.

Non-renewable sources of energy will continue to be used short term, but transition from oil and natural gas to coal is one step. Nuclear reactors (breeder reactors should be avoided) and uranium mining will be essential, I think, over a period of 20 years to 25 years. A maximum effort should be devoted to safety and security requirements during this time, and no use of nuclear power should be made without those full and complete safety and security requirements. A parallel effort should be devoted to the development of alternative technologies—solar energy is the obvious one. We should all become less wasteful of our energy resources, and we must conserve energy. The long-term possibility, through the hydrogen economy, will be a potentially ultimate solution to the world's energy needs. Hydrogen from sunlight offers the tantalising prospect of a clean, limitless source of energy. Accordingly, to this motion, which I find very much a foot on either side, I move the following amendment:

After the word "Australia" add the following words: and further believes that the South Australian Government should give the greatest possible financial support to research into the use of solar energy and other alternative energy sources as a matter of extreme urgency.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): First, I find nothing especially offensive in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, but I shall comment on it. I think it is absolutely vital that, in relation to money that may be provided by up to seven Governments in this country for research into alternative forms of energy, efforts should be effectively co-ordinated. Recently, the Commonwealth Government established an Energy Advisory Committee on which are representatives from each State. Unfortunately, there was no consultation with some of the States with regard to the constitution of that committee. The Premier has announced this afternoon the provision of \$250 000 for research into alternative forms of energy in this State.

Mr. Gunn: How far will that go?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It will not go very far, but the sum that one must speak about in order to go a long way would be hundreds of millions of dollars, and that would involve increased taxation; I doubt that the member for Eyre would support that. The point I am making was made recently at the Australian Mineral and Energy Council meeting held in Canberra a few weeks ago. It was that each State, as it provided funds for energy research, was likely to establish its own local committee to advise who should get funds, what projects should be supported, and what not supported. If the Commonwealth had its own committee and was making a separate allocation of funds for energy research, as a responsible body of Ministers representing all Governments throughout the country it was essential that there should be some kind of effective co-ordination.

I put to the Commonwealth Government that, as each State Government provided funds, it should establish an energy research advisory committee to advise it on the appropriate allocation and, in turn, the Commonwealth committee should have representatives on it from each of the State committees, together with what other representation the Commonwealth considered desirable. It is essential that, if we are to provide money, there should be some effective co-ordination of research effort throughout the

country. It is important that members should recognise that the only effective co-ordination in the country that can be provided is by the Commonwealth Government. We do not want a situation to develop in which competing submissions are made to a series of separate committees throughout the community. I hope that the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Anthony) will listen to that suggestion, because it received a degree of support from other Ministers, and I believe there is a certain logic in it. I refer to the Leader's comments about what I said on *This Day Tonight* recently regarding energy research in this country.

Mr. Gunn: Before you were pulled into gear?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not been pulled into gear by anyone, and it would be least likely to be done by the member for Eyre. The point I made on *This Day Tonight* was that in this country it was unlikely that alternative methods of generating large-scale electric power would be required before the end of the century, but that alternative sources of fuel for transport would be required before the end of the century. It is true that some progress has been made in the use of solar energy at least in the conservation of fuel: for example, in this State we already have the commercial availability of solar water heaters, but they only conserve fuel and do not conserve generating capacity.

The introduction of solar water heaters has no impact on the Electricity Trust's requirements for generating capacity, for the simple and obvious reason that, on cold and cloudy days in winter, ordinary power will be required as a back-up supply. A solar water heating unit will not do the trick, but what it can do is save some fuel (and that is worth doing), but it will not save any generating capacity. The problem that arises for our kind of community is what kind of peak load does the trust have to meet and how, as that peak load expands, is it to be met. It can be said that in most States of Australia the peak load will continue to be met by the use of fossil fuels, at least until the next century. It is also correct to say that we are a long way from establishing the use of solar energy in practice to provide basic generating capacity.

We know economically, and in a viable way, how to use solar water heaters to conserve fuel, but in order to provide part of the capacity to meet any peak load we still do not know how practically and economically to do it. Several ways have been suggested theoretically to do it. For example, Carden from the Australian National University proposes to use solar collectors to collect solar energy, which will then through an ammonia process enable the storage of that energy and its ultimate release. However Carden and his research team at the A.N.U. need to spend many millions of dollars before they can demonstrate that this project is economically viable.

Other proposals have come from Professor Butler and company in Sydney, and other propositions have been developed in the United States. At this time we are purely at the innovative stage in terms of ideas, and no-one in the world has committed himself to the expenditure of the large sums that will be required to implement those ideas into practice. We have to recognise that, for every dollar that goes in basic research in solar energy or any other form of energy, probably \$20, \$30, \$50, or \$100 will be required in developmental expenditure in order to prove the idea.

There is no way that this State Government will ever have the financial resources under existing arrangements to develop solar techniques that are used for the large-scale generation of electric power, unless we are able to spend hundreds of millions of dollars. That is the

order of expenditure. The argument I was trying to develop in a limited way on *T.D.T.*, because time was short, was simply that other countries of the world will have to move into alternative methods of generating electric power before this country does so, because other countries are much shorter of fossil fuels than is this country.

On the other hand, proportionately to our total costs, transportation enters into costs in this country more than in any other country in the world. Not only do transport costs figure in our basic costs of industry in a greater proportion than in any other country in the world, but we build our cities in a way that makes a significant percentage of our population dependent on some form of individual transportation. One way or another, if the world does not run out of oil before the end of the century, it will be extremely short of it. Indeed, the problem of shortage of oil will be apparent well before the end of the century. Australia has now no way of avoiding by 1985 being reduced to a state of being only 30 per cent self-sufficient in terms of oil. There is no alternative to that. Any new oil discovery will not come on stream early enough to offset that situation.

Dr. Eastick: What has delayed its being found?

Mr. Gunn: The Connor policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members opposite can say that, but that assumes that there is further oil to be found. Whether or not that is the case in this State, I point out that pro rata we have had more oil exploration in this State in the past couple of years than has occurred in any other State. Whilst Dr. Hopgood was Minister of Development and Mines, and whilst I have been Minister of Mines and Energy, when Mr. Connor was the Federal Minister, on a number of occasions we issued licences for further oil exploration against the active opposition of Mr. Connor.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Members opposite do not really support this motion. They are embarrassed by it, as the Leader's speech has demonstrated, and they are trying to get on to another tack. At present, Australia is 70 per cent self-sufficient with oil, and by 1985 the figure will come back to 30 per cent, and there is no effective alternative. It is not thanks to anyone in particular. Basically, it is likely to be—

Mr. Becker: Tell the—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If I can get through the Party political garbage of the member for Hanson, I can say that basically it is because Australian oil reserves and potential oil reserves are not all that attractive.

Mr. Coumbe: What's the position with gas?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Fortunately, it is a little better. The North-West shelf gas situation is very substantial indeed and it should be possible, hopefully, for the Commonwealth to approve the export of liquid natural gas from the North-West shelf to make the scheme viable and still leave sufficient natural gas in the North-West shelf reserve for a future transcontinental pipeline which, hopefully, would take us well into the next century.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Those reserves haven't been proven.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In terms of proven and provable reserves at the North-West shelf, that is already feasible. I am making that as a broad generalisation, and the honourable member can do what he likes with it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It is very much a generalisation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can speak in this debate if he wishes, but I do not think he will, because I do not think the Opposition likes the debate at all. Members opposite know that their Federal colleagues want to export uranium. They know they will be committed by their Federal Party, and they do not know what to do about the issue here.

In relation to our future problems, it did not matter who was the Federal Minister for National Resources or for Mines and Energy, because the basic problem is that our big issue for the future relates to transportation and somewhat less to the generation of electric power. It seems to me that with limited funds available in this State the rational proposition is that we should direct our funds to solving those problems which are peculiar to us and, to the extent to which we can use the Commonwealth Government or the rest of the world as our shopping basket for other ideas, we should do so. That is only rational. Let me come back to the question of nuclear power.

Mr. Dean Brown: About time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Davenport has the guts to get up and speak in this debate and support the motion and the amendment, I shall be surprised. If one goes abroad as an Australian having taken part in any discussions on this question in this country, one goes with the impression that the chief problem with nuclear power is the disposal of radioactive waste. The first shock one receives is to discover that, broadly speaking, in Western Europe and the United Kingdom it is not regarded as the fundamental problem or difficulty. The order of magnitude of the relative problems associated with nuclear power that seemed to be put in Western Europe, the United Kingdom, and North America, was, first, terrorism, and the possibility that someone would get hold of plutonium oxide which has to be mainly transported, and turn that into weapons grade plutonium, manufacture some kind of nuclear device, and hold communities to ransom.

I suspect that part of the worry there is that, if someone makes a threat, one can never be quite sure whether or not he has done it. Although everyone thinks clearly that there are substantial cost difficulties in the way of translating plutonium oxide into weapons grade plutonium and then into a nuclear device, what do Governments do if some terrorist group says it has a nuclear device and threatens a city such as New York, London, or Paris unless certain things are done by that Government? The problem there relates particularly to the fact that in relation to more recent terrorist activities since Munich, and apart from the singular exception of the Entebbe raid, Governments in other countries have tended to play it cool in the face of terrorist activities and terrorist threats; they have not taken a hard line of confrontation. Overseas there is the great concern about what happens if there are nuclear threats by terrorists. If Governments will not take a hard line of confrontation when a Jumbo jet is hijacked, what will they do when a group of terrorists somewhere in the world says that it has a nuclear device and, unless certain things are done or certain prisoners released or millions of dollars are paid, the nuclear device will be exploded? The worry is that the development of the nuclear power industry will contribute to that potential terrorist threat.

The advocates of nuclear power say that if terrorists want to get active there are many more effective ways of doing it than trying to pinch plutonium oxide, turn it into weapons grade plutonium, and then turn it into a nuclear device. They would have to spend so many millions of dollars, that

it would be better for them to threaten to blow up some l.n.g. storages or something like that. That is the big issue about which everyone has to make up his mind, and overseas at the moment it seems to be the number one issue.

Mr. Gunn: You haven't told us anything about the report you were hawking around the world a few months ago.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said previously that I did not hawk any report around the world. The member for Eyre is an unmitigated dispenser of untruths. He is one of the worst terminological inexactitudinarians it has ever been my unfortunate experience to have had any dealings with, and he is a disgrace to the general standard of politics in this State and to his Party. It does not matter what you say: if the member for Eyre thinks he can spread an untruth, he will keep on spreading it. He is a disgrace. The other great shock one receives—

Mr. Gunn: You still haven't told us what you did with it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a demonstration of what I was saying. I can say so many times that I did not do it. When did the member for Eyre stop beating his wife; will he please tell us? I do not believe he has stopped. That is the kind of garbage and political argument that the member for Eyre would reduce this House to. The other great shock one experiences overseas when one discusses the question of disposal of atomic wastes with people associated with various Governments and with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna is that there is a reaction of astonishment. They ask what on earth we worried about that for, because they believe the problem has been solved.

Mr. Coumbe: How?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: By vitrification, turning the atomic wastes into glass form and by burying it in some form of geological structure. They believe the problem has been solved. They also point out that natural uranium has a half-life of $4\frac{1}{2}$ billion years and uranium 235 has a half-life of 800 000 000 years, and plutonium has a half-life of only 25 000 years. They point out that if natural uranium did not have this huge half-life it would not be there. They also point out that the longer the half-life the lower the radiation at any given time and that in fact plutonium does not have all the forms of radiation but only the alpha emission, and the very simplest procedures will shield the people from the radioactivity of plutonium. A few inches of earth would give a high degree of shielding from the radioactivity of plutonium. The highly dangerous products from the point of view of radioactivity are those with the short half-lives. All sorts of arguments are presented on this score that we do not have time to discuss this afternoon.

Although the issue of radioactive waste products is still an important issue in this country and people in general, including members of this House, are not satisfied on this question, overseas the emphasis is quite different. The second most important problem concerning people overseas is the question of nuclear reactor safety, and they believe that that problem has also been mainly solved, and that the dangers of core melt-down are fewer than has been popularly suggested and that the dangers of radioactive emissions are significantly fewer and involve less hazard than those associated with coal-fired power stations.

Mr. Coumbe: Including the breeders?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. There are two points I want to make.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'd better make them a bit more quickly than the last one.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Kavel is an unpleasant man, and if he cannot keep his unpleasantness to himself it is a pity. The first general point is that one has to make a judgment whether or not the rest of the world will continue with nuclear power developments. It is suggested regarding Western Europe, North America and Japan that further development is inevitable. In that connection, if Australia's uranium in the total world context is not significant what we do with it does not really matter to the rest of the world, but if it is significant and we do not supply it and if the rest of the world accepts our non-supply of that uranium so that they cannot get enough uranium for their nuclear reactor development, the only alternative to the rest of the world is to go to the breeder reactor. Whatever one says overseas about the problems of the ordinary nuclear reactor and the way in which it is argued about overseas, most people are worried about the breeder technology. The reason is that the breeder technology involves a much greater transportation of plutonium, and the potential terrorist activities relating to plutonium are the main worry.

The second point I want to make is to refer to a book that is not yet available in our Parliamentary Library. I think it raises issues which we will all have to consider and on which we will have to make up our minds in order to come to some ultimate definitive decision. The book which was published last year and which is entitled *Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear* is written by Petr Beckman. Beckman develops a whole series of arguments based on United States statistics to suggest that in terms of the health of people coal-fired power generation is, in his figures, 100 times more hazardous than is nuclear power.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you subscribe to that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, but I think it is an interesting argument. I have not made my mind up on it. Nevertheless the issues Beckman raises are sufficiently significant that everyone will have to face up to them and make up their own minds.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you give the page number?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member might care to listen. Beckman states that per billion megawatt hours of electric power consumed the cost of fatal accidents is 189 lives in coal mining for coal-fired power, and two lives in uranium mining for nuclear power. Secondly, per million megawatt hours of electric power consumed, there were 1 545 disability days among coal miners for coal-fired power and 157 for uranium miners. Thirdly, per billion megawatt hours of electric power consumed, there were 1 000 deaths by black lung among coal miners and 20 deaths by lung cancer among uranium miners. In transporting coal from mine to power stations in the United States there were about 100 accidental deaths a year. There are no recorded deaths in the uranium area. This comparison arises because to generate 1 000 megawatt years of electricity one needs about 38 000 normal size railcars of coal or six truck loads of nuclear fuel. In terms of radio active emissions a comparison is again made.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister's time has expired.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The latter part of the Minister's address has been rather more interesting than the first 20 minutes that he took to make his initial point. It is difficult to establish on which side he is, in fact, arguing. From all of the points he raised in the latter part of his speech (and indeed that was the most interesting part of his speech because he was at his boring best for the first 20 minutes), it would appear the Minister, in fact, is arguing in favour of the extraction of uranium, and nuclear reactors.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not want to be subjected to continuing misrepresentation. I was raising issues that have to be decided on before anyone can be satisfied. That is entirely in terms of the motion. I do not want to be subjected to the kind of lying misrepresentation one continually gets from the member for Kavel and the member for Eyre.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There was obviously no point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: During the course of the honourable Minister's speech there was a tremendous amount of interjecting. I called members to order on only one or two occasions. I hope in future members on both sides of the House will stick to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I realise that it is not hard to attract the ire of the Minister. I find him a most unpleasant person and the fact that he finds me so does not worry me in the least. This is, in fact, a particularly weak motion by the Government. It indicates that the Minister and the Premier seem to have almost turned full circle on this question of uranium mining. We have been aware for a long time (and indeed the public and commenators have also been aware) of the split right down the middle of the Labor Party on this uranium issue. As senior protagonists we have had the Attorney-General, the Minister for the Environment, the member for Florey, who is anti-uranium mining, and we have heard from other people in the Labor Party.

On the other side of the argument, if we take any notice of the public statements made by the Government side about 12 months ago, we had the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy leading the pro-uranium lobby. The Minister has been at some pains to refute the suggestion that he was overseas on anything connected with this uranium business. He became a bit heated when the member for Eyre interjected and said that he was engaged in this sort of activity overseas. Obviously the Premier did not know what he was doing overseas. It will be interesting to refresh the memories of members.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why must you repeat lies all the time? What is the matter with you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister's interjections are out of order.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why must the Deputy Leader constantly repeat untruths?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will stick to the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am trying to. The Minister is getting very testy. All I am doing is reminding him of what the Premier said while the Minister was overseas. I do not know what he was doing overseas, but there was a great deal of prominence given to the matter and words from the Premier's own mouth indicated that the Minister

was very much involved in the uranium issue. I refer to a newspaper report of July 1 last year when the Minister was going overseas. The headline is "Globe trot Hudson seeks cash for uranium."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That makes it true, if it appears in the press?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier is quoted—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You believe what you read in the *Sunday Mail*. If Max Harris is saying something—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is getting more than testy.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you write Max Harris's column?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister does not communicate with the Premier and did not communicate with the Premier on this occasion, it is time he sorted his leader out. This is what the Premier said:

Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff, Mr. Hudson, will be looking for financial backing overseas for the development of the uranium enrichment plant.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Apparently the Premier was telling lies. The report continues:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said this today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Headline hunting again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is accusing his leader of being a liar. The report continues:

The uranium enrichment plant is estimated to cost \$1 400 000 000.

I did not hear of any action being taken against the press by the Premier.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There were denials issued but you chose to ignore them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be grateful if the Minister would let me continue with my speech.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I would be grateful if the honourable member would stop lying.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not lying, I am quoting the words of the Premier as reported in the *News* of July 1 last year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Deputy Leader resume his seat? As I mentioned before, there were far too many interjections during the course of the honourable Minister's speech. I did not call anybody to order because I thought members would control themselves. We are getting to the stage now where members on both sides of the House are not controlling themselves, and I invite the honourable Deputy Leader to continue, as I see nothing out of order with the copy he is reading from now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will modulate my voice if you can manage to shut up the Minister. The report continues:

"Originally, we had looked at a scheme of obtaining finance from overseas, and then paying back this overseas investment with uranium products," Mr. Dunstan said. "That scheme is still being looked at, along with other finance schemes." Mr. Dunstan said the final go-ahead for a plant depended largely on the Federal Government. "The Federal Government will have to be satisfied that the project is feasible and that it is safe to export enriched uranium to other countries," he said.

"Much still depends on the findings of the Ranger committee report, which is due to be released later in the year. "I would like to make clear that there is no real

difference between the State Government's stand on this issue and that of the trade unions. It is A.L.P. policy that if such a plant were established, it would be done with the understanding that production of enriched uranium was both safe and that it could be exported with complete safety."

On the possibility of getting a plant established in South Australia, Mr. Dunstan said: "It is far too early to say what chance there is of getting the plant established. At this stage, because we have done our homework, we are well ahead of any other State in this field." If the Minister of Mines and Energy has a quarrel with the Premier over that statement and if he is saying either the Premier is lying or the press reporter is lying—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Denials were issued by both of us at the time that you have chosen to ignore.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Minister will cease interjecting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a defence against murder on the grounds of provocation. I take the point of order that the Deputy Leader is deliberately being provocative by spreading stories, once again, that he knows have been denied previously. Two people have to contribute to an argument.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order and I hope that the honourable Deputy Leader, while I am listening to the honourable Minister's point of order, will cease to speak. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Sir, but when one's time is used up continually by a Minister who is unwilling to listen to a newspaper report it becomes frustrating.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have given the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition permission to quote the report, so he is in order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am well aware that the Minister on his return sought to indicate publicly that was not a correct report of his trip, but I have no recollection that the Premier suggested that they were not his words. I am not quoting the Minister; I am quoting what the Premier said, and I do not recall a retraction by the Premier of those statements. The Premier was pleased to float this \$1 400 000 000 plant at Redcliff. I well recall the headlines that appeared in the *Australian* at about that time. At that time (and nothing has occurred since to change my view) the Premier sought interstate publicity to show that he was in the forefront and that he would get a uranium enrichment plant before other States. The headline, less than a year ago, was "Dunstan scoops Premiers with uranium plant". I have not heard a retraction by the Premier of that report, which is as follows:

"I would still prefer that all the money came through the A.I.D.C.," Mr. Dunstan said. "However, we would be ready to go along with any plan that ensured Australia had a majority and controlling interest." Mr. Dunstan is not concerned that the enrichment plant would come under Commonwealth control. His prime aim is to get Australia's first—and for a long time, only—uranium enrichment plant built in South Australia, a dream which would put his State in the same league as the mineral-rich Western Australia. At the moment, South Australia's Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hugh Hudson, is on a seven-nation overseas business trip. The nuclear enrichment plant is high on his agenda.

The Minister has denied that, but to my knowledge the Premier has not denied that he discussed in some detail the establishment of a \$1 400 000 000 enrichment plant at Redcliff, that he was keen to see it attracted to South Australia, and that he had stolen the march on the other Premiers of this country. The Minister can do his

darndest to interfere with what I am saying, but I have no recollection of the Premier's refuting that, in fact, he was pleased to accept the publicity in other States to get his much vaunted ratings about which we heard today and which show that 39 per cent of Australians have heard about him and believe that he is reasonable.

The motion is weak and indicates that the Duncan-Simmons-Wells axis in the Labor Party has had some success. The Premier and the Minister now seem almost to have turned full circle on this issue. I tried to follow what the Minister of Mines and Energy was saying in his speech this afternoon, but it was difficult to find a coherent energy policy enunciated by the Labor Party. The clearest part of his speech was the latter portion, where he extolled the virtues of uranium mining and spoke about the hazards of coal mining. He seems to have pinned his hopes on an assured supply of gas from the north. An interesting report appeared last week in the *Motor Trade Journal* (which is distributed to members) about the future of energy and the activities of the Minister. It is headed "Horse trading in oil" and, because it will be illuminating for the Minister if he has not seen it, I will read it. It is as follows:

It is a fact that the world is running out of crude oil. If America continues with its present rate of growth in energy usage it would in the next two decades on its own use up all the world's known reserves. In Australia we have never been self-sufficient in oil and we are running out faster than most. What we, however, do appear to have are reasonably abundant supplies of natural gas and the prospects in South Australia and elsewhere of finding more.

From what I have heard, the certainty that the Minister indicates does not exist. The possibility and even the probability exists for an assured supply, but not the certainty which the Minister tended to indicate this afternoon. The report continues:

What we do not have, nor in South Australia appear likely to have, are any further significant supplies of liquid hydrocarbons. How valuable then was the horse trading engaged in recently by South Australia's Minister of Mines and Energy when at the inaugural meeting of the South Australian Division of the Australian Institute of Petroleum he told the oil companies they would get "public utility prices" for gas but could take "world parity price for liquids". Mr. Hudson obviously is concerned in his Ministerial responsibilities about our future supplies of power, heat and light. Just as obvious is the fact that our supplies of coal and gas will ensure this supply from indigenous sources at least until the end of this century. At the "public utility prices" he will give for it, it will also be a relatively cheap source. For this the Minister is to be commended.

But we wonder if he has told his Ministerial colleague, the Minister of Transport, about his give-away on the liquids. Faced with massive deficits in the operation of our public transport we wonder how Geoff Virgo favours a doubling, trebling or quadrupling of the price he has to pay for his energy needs. We wonder if Mr. Hudson has told the road transport operators or the motorists in our State about his give-away. We wonder what they and the primary producers of our State would think about it.

Mr. Hudson in his other role as Minister of Planning probably quite rightly predicts that inevitable and extremely large increases in the price of petroleum will make traumatic changes in our lifestyle. He talks of people becoming "housebound in remote suburbs—the need to develop higher density living—more neighbourly communities that will reduce social isolation and remoteness from services and social amenities". What he hasn't said is how these vast changes, necessary not only in land usage and community development but in transportation for people and goods, are to be funded.

What he hasn't said is that under "parity pricing for liquids" we are talking about thousands of millions of dollars over the next decade—not something in the future but something now. Thousands of millions of dollars that, if given to the oil companies, will be siphoned off for oil search or investments much of it overseas. Thousands of millions of dollars that, if taken by the governments in

Australia as it is in the OPEC countries, will be available to fund the changes necessary within Australia. Adoption of parity pricing without the establishment of a national energy policy is suicidal. An essential part of that policy must be a continuing oil and gas search, the investigation of alternatives, the research of impending changes. For this we will all have to pay but our ability to pay will not be helped by horse trading that could involve a massive give-away.

I found it difficult to ascertain a coherent policy from the Minister's speech today. One can take no great exception to the motion, except that it indicates that the Minister and the Premier have gone almost full circle on the issue; that the Duncan axis in the Labor Party has had a victory. The Labor Party does not know where it is heading. If people concerned with the production of liquid fuels do not know in future whence supplies will come, we will have much to be concerned about with the activities of the Minister in this State.

The Minister challenged us to support the motion, which we are pleased to do with amendment. The motion says nothing except that the Minister and the Premier have back-pedalled fairly hard, that all the headlines they were grabbing last year are now making them eat humble pie, and that other factions in the Labor Party are more powerful than they are. I suppose that the Premier is really sorry that, under pressure, he said he had given the undertaking that he would introduce a motion. I recall that, when the Government was choking off debate earlier, he gave that undertaking. The Government found that it had a day to waste today, because it had not much business to put before the House. Realising that it would be reminded of that undertaking, the Government has given the afternoon over to debating a motion which Caucus has cooked up and which in its view will do the least amount of political damage, and satisfy the promise of having a uranium debate. The whole matter is a fizzer. The Government does not know where it is going. It has no cohesive policy. It has come up with an innocuous motion. We will support the motion in the hope that the Government will come up with some cohesive policy so that the public will know where it is being led. I object to the Government's grandstanding a year ago in order to grab headlines, and now repudiating what it said about a year ago.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment): The final recommendation of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry (the first Fox report) stated that time should be made available for public consideration of the report and debate on it. Public discussion is essential because of the complexity of the issues related to the exploitation of uranium and also because of the continuing doubts as to the ultimate safety of nuclear power generation. Those doubts were expressed both in the Fox report and in the Flowers report of the Sixth Royal Commission into Environmental Pollution, devoted to nuclear power and the environment in the United Kingdom. I welcome this debate. There was no intention on the Government's part to resile from the promise made last year. In moving the motion today, we are carrying out both our promise to provide a forum for discussion in the House and contributing to the general discussion which the Fox report said was so urgent and important on this matter.

I am only sorry that the Opposition has so little to contribute to the debate. It is in a cleft stick. It says that the Government has no stated policy. The policy which has been stated today is a sound one, and it is the only one that any thinking person could come to at this stage of our knowledge, but that is not good enough for the Opposition.

It wants the Government to come out on one side or the other so that it can immediately attack. I think that the Government attitude, as expressed in the motion, is most responsible, because there are doubts as to the safety of nuclear reactors. Nuclear power proponents have not shown to my satisfaction or to that of many other Australians any proven safe way of disposing of nuclear waste. There is a possibility of sabotage and blackmail of nuclear plants for their radioactive products.

Until answers are found to these problems, Australia should show restraint in the development of its uranium resources. In line with the motion, South Australia is showing restraint, but it is unlikely that the colleagues of the Opposition will show the same restraint in Canberra and, as a result, Australia may well be placed in a most unsatisfactory and unhappy position because of the desire of the mining interests to exploit our resources, whatever the consequences to world peace or to the future of mankind.

Mr. Vandepuer: Did you hear the Minister describe how to make the wastes safe?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Possible suggestions are being made about dealing with radioactive wastes but, to me, they have not been proven safe. Until proven to my satisfaction, I think that the policy expressed in the motion is the only satisfactory one that any responsible person could adopt now. I am not precluding the possibility that some time later it could be shown that these wastes can be satisfactorily disposed of, but that is a long way off, I believe, and therefore I think the motion contains a responsible policy. I think it is worth while looking at the environmental hazards associated with each stage in the nuclear fuel cycle. I think it is true to say that, with proper technology and management, serious environmental hazards do not exist until the nuclear reactor stage. The first stage is the mining of uranium ore, and here there are some hazards. For example, miners could be exposed to radioactive radon gas, and mine tailings can result in the contamination of surface and ground waters. I think that that must be accepted. On the other hand, proponents of nuclear energy have made the point that probably the amount of fossil fuel needed to generate the same amount of energy would involve considerable hazards to those involved in the extraction of coal. Evidence suggests, I am told, that exposure to radiation could be maintained below permissible limits. The problems related to water pollution need to be assessed on an individual basis, and will be considered in more detail, in the case of the Ranger mine, in the Fox inquiry's second report.

The next stage is the production of uranium hexafluoride. The principal hazards in the conversion of yellowcake to uranium hexafluoride arise from the toxicity of the hydrogen fluoride and fluorine used in the process. Radiation hazards are small, although it must be added that uranium hexafluoride is a viciously corrosive, reactive gas, requiring careful handling and high-quality metallurgy in the vessels through which it travels. These are technological matters to which possibly there is an adequate solution. Regarding uranium enrichment, if a full environmental impact study is carried out in relation to the selection of a site, the major potential environmental impact of a uranium enrichment plant (leaving aside the implications of high energy consumption associated with such a plant) is the accidental release of uranium hexafluoride.

Here again the available evidence suggests that the dangers are similar to those encountered in other large chemical industries, but this is not to say they can be

ignored. They need to be carefully examined in this industry, as in other large chemical industries, but they are not necessarily insuperable. It is on reaching the power generation stage of the "nuclear cycle" that really serious concern arises, although it is probably fair to say that, under normal operating conditions, a nuclear reactor is environmentally cleaner than the fossil-fuelled station, which emits sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and the oxides of nitrogen.

The nuclear reactor cannot explode like an atomic bomb, but it was noted in the Fox report that many witnesses were concerned at the possibility of a major accident resulting in the dispersion of radioactive materials. Such an accident could be due to natural disasters or operational failures. There have been reports of failures of both a serious and a trivial nature. The most publicised failure to date has been that at the Brown's Ferry 1 and 2 boiling water reactor at Alabama, which at the time was the world's largest operating station. On March 22, 1975, the electrician and his assistant were checking air flows through wall openings for cables by holding a candle next to the opening. The draught blew the candle flame and ignited the foam packing around the cable tray. The electricians could not put out the fire and, when the temperature rise was noticed in the control room, the room was flooded with carbon dioxide to extinguish the fire. However, by that time the fire had spread into the reactor building. In a single stroke, it impaired most of the emergency core cooling system, the reactor isolation system, and the remote control for several vital pumps, valves and generators.

This is important to bear in mind, because we are constantly told that engineering skill has been used to its utmost to provide fail-safe devices at such stations. However, here was a case in which, despite such devices, the back-up emergency facilities were seriously impaired by something that started as simply the igniting of the foam packing by a candle flame.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a good lesson for all of us.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Quite. Fortunately, there were no breaks in the main cooling pipes, and the personnel were able to shut down the plant manually. Although it can be argued that there were adequate safeguards to ensure that there was not a radiation hazard, it is interesting to note that some critics have claimed that the calculated probability of such an accident was once in a billion reactor years. Despite expert optimistic forecasts, one is entitled to view them with some degree of scepticism, and that is my attitude.

One of the most serious accidents to occur was at the small prototype military power plant at the National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho. In January, 1961, three men were killed when a fuel core melted and exploded. The tragedy was triggered by a central control rod that was withdrawn from the reactor, which immediately speeded up the fission reaction. Other incidents have included a partial cooling failure at the Dresden 2 boiling water reactor near Chicago in 1970, and a fire at a military reactor making plutonium bomb fuel at Windscale in Cumberland. This accident released large amounts of radioactive gas over the countryside, but very rapid measures, including the destruction of milk from the area for four days, managed to prevent any known casualties or other harmful effects.

One source of trouble is in emergency core cooling systems. The barrier standing between normal operation and a nuclear accident is the emergency core cooling system (ECCS), which has been designed to send standby coolant

into the reactor vessel if the primary system fails. There are many uncertainties pertaining to the effectiveness of the cooling system. One such system would shoot water into the reactor under pressure. Another would pump it in. However, it is possible that the core could become hot enough to turn incoming emergency cooling water into high pressure steam, which could exert a counterpressure and block the rest of the water coming in.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to test these things in advance. One can do simulations on certain assumptions, but the only real way to test such a system is to have an accident, and no-one is willing to go to that length to test it. Moreover, no-one knows for sure what would happen to the long thin fuel rods in a loss-of-cooling accident. If the heat generated swelled and bent the closely packed rods, cooling water could be blocked.

There are problems in connection with the operation of nuclear reactors, and it is nonsense to say that these accidents cannot happen. What we have to remember is that, though the possibility may be remote and may be reduced to an absolute minimum by the most extreme engineering skills, the consequences of such an accident are so enormous that, even though the possibility is slight, the risk is too great.

I think the next area in which there is much concern (and it was referred to by the Minister of Mines and Energy) is the possibility of action by terrorists or saboteurs. Over the whole question of reactor safety lies the human element—the skill and awareness of technologists and plant operators. But, more disturbing is the insidious human element of possible blackmailers, saboteurs, and terrorists. The serious dangers of accidents throughout the nuclear fuel cycle could be relatively small compared with the risks society faces from the threat of nuclear theft and sabotage. Both the Fox report and the Flowers report expressed serious concern at the possibility of using nuclear material, especially plutonium, which could be used for weapons or as a radiological poison, for threat and blackmail against society. A further threat was sabotage of nuclear plants causing destruction with the resulting radiation hazard to the surrounding population and costly disruption to power grids.

Both the Fox and Flowers inquiries concluded that the construction of a crude nuclear weapon by a terrorist group was credible, particularly if the reprocessing and recycling of plutonium is carried out on a large scale. The amount of plutonium required to construct a very crude bomb which could explode with a force of a few tonnes of TNT could easily be carried by hand. The device, although extremely inefficient in nuclear terms, could still cause much damage and would create immediate radiation which would be lethal over a range of several hundred metres as well as dispersing radioactive material over a wide area.

There is doubt as to whether a terrorist group could construct a weapon of much greater yield, say 100 tonnes of TNT or more, but one that could cause the damage to which I have referred would be enough.

Both the Fox and Flowers reports considered the real danger of sabotage. It was pointed out that it would be quite possible for a sufficiently determined group to take control of reactors, fuel manufacturing or reprocessing plants, or waste storage facilities, and threaten a release of radioactive materials. The Fox report detailed some of the options open to terrorists, although the consequences of such an attack were open to conjecture. For example, if the aggressors included a nuclear specialist with a knowledge of safety systems, it may be possible to by-pass the system and set up a loss-of-cooling accident.

The older gas-cooled reactors have relatively more accessible coolant pipes and heat exchangers. An explosion in a heat exchanger could possibly force steam and water into the core and induce local explosions. Society, as a result of recent incidents, now appreciates the characteristics of international terrorist organisations, which could make nuclear facilities and materials prime targets. They display complete ruthlessness, with a lack of thought for their own safety or the suffering of innocent victims. What is more, unlike nations that have to live with the possibility of nuclear reprisal, because in many cases they do not have any territory they are not concerned about nuclear reprisals. Because of the seriousness of the terrorist activities that have taken place in the past few years, we would be foolish if we did not give the utmost consideration to the possibility of this enormously damaging material being used by such people.

The other area of danger relates to waste disposal. This has particular relevance to Australia because it is unlikely that for some time at least we will have nuclear reactors and therefore the danger from accidents in such stations and the danger from terrorists or saboteurs would be minimal in Australia, but waste materials pose a real threat to this country. If the views of some proponents of nuclear power are to be heeded—and I refer to Dr. Matheson, who suggested Ayers Rock as a suitable disposal site, and Professor Arndt, who suggested an area 1 600 km to 2 400 km west of Alice Springs, getting well towards the coast—

Dr. Eastick: Did one or the other refute that they had made that statement?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is news to me. The report by Professor Arndt has hardly had time to be refuted, but I see no reason to believe that he would not have said it, because it is a logical attitude to adopt. The people who want us to exploit our uranium resources are acting quite logically (I am not saying sensibly) in suggesting that we should consider the use of some Australian territory for storing radioactive waste. Premier Court, in Western Australia, and his Minister of Mines have indicated that they would be happy to take some of these nuclear wastes in Western Australia in return for a chance to make some cash out of the exploitation of uranium. It is logical to expect that, if we are to go into this business, we will be faced ultimately with a situation in which we will have to take some of these radioactive wastes.

There is a parallel between the situation of an Australia which would be overly dependent on the sale of its uranium and that of Bulgaria and Nazi Germany before the war, when the Germans very shrewdly so tied the economy of Bulgaria to their war machine that it was not possible for Bulgaria to back out and break the relationship because it would have meant economic ruin.

Mr. Allison: Are you suggesting that our Premier is like Hitler?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am not suggesting that. It would need the mind of the member for Mount Gambier to make that sort of interjection.

Mr. Allison: There's no logic in your argument. We wouldn't have to take waste.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: There is complete logic in it. There is a real danger that, if we get into the business of exporting uranium, either as an ore or as an enriched material, we will become extremely dependent on the receipts from other countries for those sales. When we reach that stage of dependence, there will be tremendous pressure on this country from the purchasing countries to take back some of the radioactive waste, because a small

country such as Japan, which is already using nuclear power to a considerable extent and is a potentially large market for our uranium, is a most unsatisfactory country in which to store the wastes generated from the operation of the stations.

Mr. Allison: There is no logic in our taking it back.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The only logic is that the Japanese will drive a fairly hard bargain. When we are absolutely dependent on their purchase of our material they will say that they will buy our uranium provided that we take back some of the rubbish, because they have no satisfactory place in which to store it. Japan is a small country, prone to earthquakes, and what is needed to store radioactive waste as safely as we can see at the moment is some geologically stable area.

Mr. Allison: There is a trench 30 000 fathoms deep straight off the coast of Japan, the deepest area in the world, and anything that goes down there stays there.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: There is plenty of literature available. If the member for Mount Gambier chose to look at it, he would find that much of the dumping carried out in the sea so far is fraught with considerable danger to the human race. Until the containment of radioactive waste can be adequately ensured, it is criminal to think of putting it in the seas of the world, whether at 30 000 fathoms or anywhere else.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: You're going around in circles.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: No, I am speaking with direct logic. If a country becomes completely dependent on a particular purchaser, eventually it will have to accept the terms on which we will buy its product. In the case of Japan, it is almost certain that Japan would buy our uranium and pay us well, but in return we would have to take back some of the nuclear waste because it cannot be contained adequately in that small country. At that stage it would be interesting to see the logic of the situation. Blind Nellie could see the likely consequences of such a policy. I am not saying that it is impossible that we should sell our uranium in those circumstances. I am saying that we should be aware that we will be required to take back these wastes, and until a guaranteed way of safely disposing of them has been found we should not put ourselves in the position of being blackmailed by a potential customer.

The future of reprocessing of wastes to separate uranium and plutonium from contaminants is currently in a parlous state. At present, no major oxide fuel reprocessing plant is operating, owing to engineering problems, difficulties with licensing, and economic considerations. For example, it has been reported that a plant at West Valley, New York, the first commercial centre in the United States of America, may never run again. In 1972, the facility was shut down to increase capacity from 300 tonnes a year to 600 tonnes a year to meet rising demand from utilities. However, new regulatory requirements have raised the investment estimates from the original \$15 000 000 needed for just the expansion to more than \$600 000 000 now, because they have learnt more and have found out how expensive this type of installation will be. Fuel reprocessing, to say the least, is not a very satisfactory way of dealing with these wastes.

The high level radioactive wastes that remain after uranium and plutonium have been extracted by reprocessing result in many of the troublesome problems of waste management. These materials have very long half-lives which, in some cases, can be measured in thousands of years. Wastes containing such materials would remain

hazardous to the human bodies for tens or even hundreds of thousands of years. The ultimate safe disposal of radioactive wastes is essential for the continued expansion of the nuclear power industry, but while experiments have been going on for years no proven method of disposal has been developed. The waste is currently stored as liquid in stainless steel tanks. We have heard how these tanks, dropped in the ocean, have been found to be corroded.

Mr. Millhouse: And leaking.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Yes. It is intended only as a temporary measure. How it will be possible to get back what has been temporarily dropped in the depths of the oceans, I do not know, but it is a temporary measure until a more permanent solution is found. The witnesses at the Fox inquiry generally agreed that waste should be solidified for final disposal. This could be carried out either by calcining (drying out by heating) or by vitrification (incorporation in a glass-like substance). These tests are now only at the pilot plant stage, and although the technologists throw this forward as the solution of the problem they have not proved that the solution is technically feasible, and until it is we cannot accept it. I pointed out earlier that experts like Dr. Matheson have suggested geologically stable areas, and they would stick it under Ayers Rock if we gave them half a chance. If such a proposal was put forward affecting such an area in South Australia it would get short shrift indeed.

In conclusion, it is obvious that the development of nuclear power is fraught with long-term technical, environmental, moral and political difficulties and doubts. Before any irrevocable decisions are made on the development of Australia's uranium resources it is essential that this Government show restraint until the consequences and implications of such a development are known, or at least foreseen. That is why I think the policy put forward in the motion is the only responsible policy that this Government can adopt. I wish that the Opposition would accept it and say so in so many words because to say otherwise is to say that it ignores all the risks I have mentioned and that we should go ahead blindly whatever the consequences.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I think it was in answer to a question I put on notice that the Government gave the undertaking to have during the present session a debate on the uranium issue, and I have been looking forward to the debate with much anticipation because I hoped that for us anyway in this place it would have defined the issues and shown where we all stood on it. I must say that I am disappointed indeed in the debate we have had today. I am disappointed in the motion itself. It points in the right direction but that is about all one can say about it. The fact that the Liberal Party has been able to accept it so easily shows that it is a wishy-washy motion and the debate we have had—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In what way?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Henley Beach will wait for a moment I will explain in what way, and I will suggest what should be done to toughen it up. The debate we have had has really matched the lack-lustre nature of the motion itself. I observed that the Premier was certainly anything but enthusiastic about what he said. He spoke with no conviction and indeed said little; that is unusual for him. I say that, even though as a rule we do not agree on matters political. The same can be said, although I do not add the rider, for the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition. The debate has therefore been an anti-climax and I am sorry about that.

No-one on either side has made any commitment about anything that I can understand. I suppose it illustrates the difficulty which the establishment Parties have in coming to grips with this issue. It is one of the most significant issues today and for mankind in our time, and it is an issue far wider than South Australia. I remind the member for Henley Beach that the motion is confined to South Australia. The matters we are debating today are matters of principle, matters of worldwide significance. Mankind is, with nuclear energy, playing with fire, but it is not the sort of conventional fire we are used to; it is infinitely more dangerous than anything any of us as individuals can possibly imagine. That is why this issue is of such crucial importance. That is why I hoped that the debate today would bring forth some expression of attitudes from the two big Parties represented in this Parliament, but it has not and it has added literally nothing to the debate. People outside will know no more about our attitudes after it has finished than they knew before.

I am proud of the fact that my Party, small though it may be, was the first Party in South Australia to have an attitude and an expressed policy on this matter. We adopted that policy after debate last November at our policy convention, and it is as follows:

Energy: The new L.M. will encourage research into the production and application of solar energy. We will oppose the mining, production and use of nuclear fuels until time or circumstance shall provide the necessary knowledge for dealing adequately with waste products and the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons and terrorism.

Mr. Dean Brown: What are you getting excited about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish the member for Davenport would shut up. He is not even in his seat as he interjects. I wish he would listen to what I have to say. One of the surprises of this debate is that while the Minister for the Environment has referred to the Ranger report he is, I think, the only speaker to have done so, and not one speaker so far has quoted from the report itself. I intend to do that to illustrate those three problems I mentioned as referred to the policy of the new L.M.

Mr. Dean Brown: I think everyone recognises the problems.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For God's sake get up and say something definite about them. If you have any guts at all, if you differ at all from your Leader you will take part in this debate and say what you think. Not one member of the Liberal Party has said a thing. The Leader said nothing at all. There would be hardly anything in his speech worth reporting. God knows what the *Advertiser* reporters will do about that; out of loyalty to him they will have to dream up something. The Deputy Leader spent the whole of his time trying to score political points. They both entirely ignored the gravity of this matter.

First, I refer to the problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is dealt with in the report and I am amazed that no-one has quoted from the report on this matter. After all, this was commissioned by the Australian Government as the inquiry into these problems in Australia. The report has come out and apparently it is being used as decoration and nothing else. On page 147, referring to the problems of proliferation, the report states:

The main limitations and weaknesses of the present safeguards arrangements can be summarised as follows: the failure of many States to become parties to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty; the inability of safeguards to prevent the transfer of nuclear technology from nuclear power production to the acquisition of nuclear weapons competence; the fact that many nuclear facilities are covered by no safeguards; the existence of a number of loopholes

in safeguards agreements regarding their application to peaceful nuclear explosions, to materials intended for non-explosive military uses, and to the retransfer of materials to a third state; the absence, in practice, of safeguards for source materials; the practical problems of maintaining effective checks on nuclear inventories; the ease with which States can withdraw from the NPT and from most non-NPT safeguards agreements; deficiencies in accounting and warning procedures; and the absence of reliable sanctions to deter diversion of safeguarded material. The commission recognises that these defects, taken together, are so serious that existing safeguards may provide only an illusion of protection. However, we do not conclude that they render valueless the concept of international safeguards. We believe it is both essential and possible to make safeguards arrangements more effective.

They say they are not effective at the present time. That is the first point. Let us look now to see what the report says about terrorism. This follows from what the Minister for the Environment said. On page 158, the report states:

"Weapons grade" plutonium can be produced in most power reactors by operating them in a manner which is not compatible with the most efficient generation of electricity. However, the evidence points strongly to the conclusion that very destructive nuclear explosive devices could also be made from "reactor grade" plutonium produced in power reactors operated normally.

On page 159 the report continues:

An attempt by even a small, well trained and armed group to take over a nuclear installation could have a good chance of success. Subsequent threats to destroy the installation and release large quantities of radiation would have to be taken very seriously indeed. . . . Measures designed to prevent theft of nuclear materials and attacks on nuclear installations have been tightened in recent years. Welcome as those measures are, the evidence indicates that the risks are presently real and will tend to increase with the further spread of nuclear technology.

Let us return to the question of waste. At page 110, the Fox report states:

At present most spent fuel is being held in storage tanks, as no commercial plants for reprocessing oxide fuel are operating. Reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel yields radioactive wastes of varying activity. Low-level wastes are usually released into the environment. Intermediate wastes in solid form are either stored, buried on land or dumped under international supervision in the deep ocean.

I can see that the member for Mount Gambier and other members of his Party, who seem to take this debate very lightly, do not seem to have any conception of the seriousness of the matter we are debating. I know that that is typical of their Party. I know that they are caught because their Federal colleagues in Canberra are fairly obviously going ahead with the mining and development of uranium, and they are tied hand and foot to the Federal Party. They never say or do anything that is opposed to their Federal colleagues; that is why they will never succeed in South Australia. They do not seem to have the ability for any independent thought on any topic at all and so, of course, to them this debate is a waste of time. What they say and do is dictated and decided in Canberra, but that is not the case for the rest of us. Having said that (and I hope installed some sense into the younger and newer members of the Liberal Party so that they may possibly take this debate seriously, even if their Leaders have not), I return to what I was reading. The report continues:

It is generally agreed that present methods used for burial or ocean disposal will have to be improved if these procedures are to be a satisfactory long-term solution. High-level wastes are at present stored mainly in liquid form, and some constituents will remain dangerously radioactive for several hundreds of thousands of years.

I ask members to note the next sentence. The report states:

There is at present no generally accepted means by which high-level waste can be permanently isolated from the

environment and remain safe for very long periods. Processes for the conversion of high-level waste to a relatively inert solid are being developed. Permanent disposal of high-level solid wastes in stable geological formations is regarded as the most likely solution, but has yet to be demonstrated as feasible. It is not certain that such methods and disposal sites will entirely prevent radioactive releases following disturbances caused by natural processes or human activity.

There it is; that is the way the Ranger report sums up those three problems to which there has so far been no solution and to which I doubt there will ever be any solution. Until there is a solution, I am not willing to give my assent to the mining or development of our uranium resources at all.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why do you think that the Ranger report, in its second conclusion, came out with the statement that it thought it was safe to use uranium for nuclear power, in view of all the other qualifications that they put in?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is misrepresenting the position; he has not, I think, the report in front of him. Perhaps I can read out what the second finding is. It states:

The hazards involved in the ordinary operations—
I ask him to note that phrase.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That applies—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Listen to me! You asked a question, and I am trying to answer it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't be like that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought you were going to say, "Don't be like Goldsworthy." The report states:

The hazards involved in the ordinary operations of nuclear power reactors, if those operations are properly regulated and controlled, are not such as to justify a decision not to mine and sell Australian uranium.

That second recommendation is restricted to the ordinary operations, and I do not think anyone would deny that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But ordinary operations produce radioactive waste.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not talking about the waste; it is only talking about the safety.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't know; it is part of the ordinary operations.

Mr. Becker: If you chaps don't mind, we'll all go home.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Hanson is the least interested member of the Liberal Party. He has been making silly remarks, not only while I have been speaking but for the whole afternoon. It is obvious that he has no conception at all about this and could not care less about it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't worry about the member for Hanson.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not worry about him. The Minister will remember that only a few days after the report came out the Commissioners made clear, I think in a letter that they put in the papers, that they were being misrepresented on the first two findings in much the same way as the Minister represented that second finding in asking me that question. That finding, of itself, is restricted to the safety of nuclear power stations operating normally. They are safe, although nothing is perfectly safe.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If they're operating normally they have to produce nuclear waste.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but that does not deal with the question of waste. How can that recommendation be

lined up with what I quoted about the dangers of waste? That cannot be done. The Commissioners are not fools. They would not say that in the body of their report, and then put something else in the conclusion. The Minister knows that full well.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, I don't know that, because I believe they have been told overseas that reactor soap was more of a problem than disposable waste products. That is one of the puzzles I have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not my understanding or impression of the report or what I heard as an argument in the last week of the inquiry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When you go overseas you get a different impression.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is now clearly showing his own personal convictions.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm not.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he is. There is no doubt that the Minister has been rolled on this matter in Caucus and in Cabinet. Every interjection he is making now makes clear that he is in a minority, thank God, in his Party, that he is a pro-nuclear chap, and will do his best, if he can, to work his Party and this Parliament around to that. Every interjection he has made confirms that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I don't want to conclude that you're the same as—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it has lost its sting now after what I have said. I prompted him to say that. There is no doubt his own personal convictions are coming out in the interjection he is making. Before I leave the objections I have, let me make another point, which is not referred to in our policy. It relates to policing nuclear reactors. If we are in future to guard ourselves against terrorism or the proliferation of weapons by inspection we will, of necessity, lose a very great part of the personal freedoms that we now enjoy. It will be inevitable: otherwise, no system of surveillance in any country throughout the world could possibly work. The thought of what would be required if we were to go nuclear and preserve ourselves against a world cataclysm is appalling. It will mean the loss of those personal freedoms that we now enjoy. That is another point which is not much developed in the Fox report but which is perfectly obvious to anyone who thinks about what safeguards are proposed if we go nuclear.

I hope that my colleagues on this side of the House will not mind my quoting another publication, which is now on sale and which I obtained yesterday. It is the case against uranium mining and is entitled "Red Light for Yellow Cake". It has a foreword by Professor Manning Clark. As it has just appeared, it is contemporary. I happen to have a great respect for Professor Manning Clark and his views, although I do not agree with them all. Naturally, none of us ever agrees entirely with everyone. The foreword in this book is so succinct and sums up so well the case against the mining and development of our uranium resources that I intend to quote it. It is as follows:

Everyone knows the Australian economy is in a mess: inflation and unemployment are still with us despite the attempts by the two main political groups, the Labor Party and the Liberal and National Country Party coalition, to grapple with those two problems. So when the mining interests announce that there are thirty billion dollars worth of buried treasure in the form of uranium in Australia, some people grasp at this as a solution to those problems to which the politicians do not seem to have the answer.

The authors of this book have presented a compelling case against the mining and export of uranium. They emphasise the conclusions of the Fox Commission that uranium mining would not create significant economic advantages for most Australians. However, even if it did, they show that the consequences of uranium mining are so serious that they outweigh any possible material gain. This is not an argument that is easily made attractive to some people, because they tend to confound the profitable with goodness and happiness. Nevertheless, even such people will find food for thought in the broad survey of the local and international consequences of uranium mining carefully documented and presented in layman's language here.

Several local consequences are described. For the Aborigines living in the top end of Australia, mining would destroy the physical environment on which they depend for the survival of their culture and would introduce adverse social effects. Mining would mean a loss of land for the Aborigines: by losing their land they lose a part of themselves: they lose that which helps to give a meaning to their lives. For the miners digging the uranium from the ground, exposure to the radon gas released would increase their chances of contracting lung cancer. Finally, affecting all Australians, mining may destroy the unique ecology of the top end of Australia.

The majority of the book is devoted to explanation of the dangers in the use of uranium as a fuel for nuclear reactors overseas—the dangers through explosion or through the leakage of radioactive waste materials, the threat of a rapid spread of nuclear weapons constructed from nuclear fuels and the dangers inherent in the expanded police powers necessary to protect the various stages of the nuclear fuel cycle.

Perhaps the most disturbing point made in the book is that on the question of uranium mining the truth has been the first casualty. The authors point out that neither the press nor the politicians seemed capable of telling Australians accurately what was in the report of the Ranger commission.

It is pretty obvious that hardly anyone, if anyone at all, in this House has even bothered to read that report. The foreword continues:

For this reason alone this book should be widely read. The book and the public meeting are two sources of truth in Australia today. All those who still believe in those two great sayings, "great is truth and it shall prevail" and "what does it matter if a man gains the whole world but loses his own soul" will be very grateful to Friends of the Earth for letting us know what is happening in Australia.

I could not do better than that, nor do I believe anyone else could do better than that. I apologise to those carping critics of mine who do not like my quoting, but it was so apt a quotation that I ventured to quote it to the House. A campaign known as the uranium moratorium has now been mounted in our community. The aim of the campaign is to have a petition signed, hopefully (but it will not happen, of course), by someone in every household in Australia. The petition will then be presented to the Federal Government asking for a five-year moratorium on this matter so that adequate debate can occur in Australia on this issue, which is of such crucial importance to us all.

I have said that, in my view, the motion before us is pale: it says virtually nothing. It is a motion on which no argument has occurred today because it is so pale. As a House, we should incorporate into the motion the terms of the petition that the uranium moratorium is circulating.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I suppose you've got to get on someone's bandwagon hoping that they will get on yours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Again the Minister is jibing at me. I do not care; he can say what he wishes. He knows perfectly well that many members in his own Party, if not the majority of them, support the uranium moratorium. I have met those members at meetings—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I won't deny that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —to organise that, so let the Minister beware. He can say what he wishes about me, but if he says things publicly about me he is saying the same things about his colleagues. I do not know whether I will even get a seconder for my amendment, but I invite members to listen to the terms of my amendment and I also invite any member on either side of the House, if he is willing to put his convictions on this matter ahead of his career and loyalty to his Party, to second the amendment. The Attorney-General need not smirk. I shall read the amendment and then invite an honourable member to second it so that it can be debated. We will then see where members stand on the issue. I move:

After the word "House" insert—(1); and after the word "Australia" add the following words: (2) acknowledges that the mining or treatment of uranium—

(a) increases the risk of nuclear war,

(b) the real prospect of nuclear theft, sabotage and blackmail, and

(c) the lack of any safe means for permanently disposing of high level radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants,

and therefore calls on the Australian Government to—agree to a five-year moratorium on the mining and export of uranium;

promote full public discussion of all the questions raised by the mining and export of uranium, leading to a decision by all the Australian people; and

develop a national energy policy which concentrates on energy conservation and the research and development of safer energy sources."

They are the terms of the amendment and they convert into parliamentary language for the purposes of this debate the petition which is being circulated widely in our community and which I know is supported by individuals in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must now ask for a seconder. There being no seconder, the amendment lapses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not unexpected, but it is a great disappointment to me that on a debate on this issue, which is so vital, every other member (it does not matter of which Party) is prepared to go for something that means really nothing at this stage, instead of being prepared at least to debate what are the real issues. The member for Davenport jibed at me a moment ago when I read out my policy. He said that the policy was already in the motion and that we all agreed to it, but why could he or one of his colleagues not second my amendment? There are not so many interjections now that I have read out my amendment and it has failed, there having been no seconder for it even to allow it to be debated. That shows even better than the debate we have had the hollowness of the whole motion and of the time we have spent in the House today.

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

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The motion is a major one, and it is rarely that in a State Parliament there is an opportunity to debate what I consider to be one of the three major problems confronting the world. Those problems are inter-related. I see them as war, overpopulation, and the question of energy resources, and they were summed up much more wisely than I could ever do by Professor Arnold Toynbee in his last published work before his death, namely, *Mankind and Mother Earth*, in which he said:

Mankind's material power has now increased to a degree at which it could make the biosphere uninhabitable and will, in fact, produce this suicidal result within a foreseeable period of time if the human population of the globe does not now take prompt and vigorous concerted action to check the pollution and the spoliation that are being inflicted on the biosphere by short-sighted human greed.

On the other hand, mankind's material power will not avail to ensure that the biosphere shall remain habitable so long as we ourselves refrain from wrecking it; for, though the biosphere is finite, it is not self-sufficient.

In a nutshell, he points out that, for the first time in human history, man has the potential to destroy the very world in which he lives and the atmosphere around it. In the past 20 years, we have seen the most tremendous developments in technology, not the least of which has been the harnessing of the atom for good and evil and, secondly, the conquest of outer space. Both of these discoveries emphasise the point he makes: we are living in an age in which the technological capacity of man is so great that it may jeopardise the whole of the life of mankind on earth. We have, however, certain realities that we must face.

It would be simple to move a motion which simply said that this State Government would in no circumstances involve itself with the mining of uranium. That might satisfy many people in the community, but it might not necessarily solve a tremendous problem, namely, whence do we get our energy and power once the fossil fuels have been exhausted, as they must inexorably be exhausted according to every rational and accepted scientist on earth? I believe that the motion is by no means a face-saving device but a consensus in the sense that there must be throughout the community and in both major political Parties considerable divisions as to where we place the emphasis. There is an inversion of the onus of proof, so that before South Australia can proceed with mining of uranium for the use of nuclear power in any form it must be shown that certain safeguards can be maintained.

In supporting the motion, I point out certain grave consequences, and draw certain matters to the attention of the House which, I think, may not have been dealt with. One has already been dealt with by the Minister of Mines and Energy, namely, whether coal, oil, gas and fossil fuels will continue to supply energy needs for the next 20 years or 30 years or whether they will inexorably be exhausted. At the same time, there is hope that solar energy and possibly other forms of energy may replace those forms of energy without our necessarily using uranium or other forms of nuclear power. A grave problem faces the entire world—certainly Australia, which is among the group of nations that should be considered as being uncommitted in respect to the use of nuclear power. Norway also falls into this category, and the Norwegian Government, as an uncommitted nation, had the following comments to make on nuclear power:

First, nuclear power is needed. Secondly, nuclear power is here to stay. Thirdly, let us make the best of it. Fourthly, let us work to strengthen the non-proliferation treaty of the United Nations and for co-operation between the nuclear supplier nations.

The first point is obvious, because nuclear power is needed, and great nations on earth (nations to which we as a nation are committed by treaty) are already using it in vast quantities, and that applies especially to Great Britain, the United States and Japan. Nuclear power is here to stay, because for Japan, at least, I think there is no other alternative. The attitude taken by the South Australian Government to the uranium issue has earned respect in industry and, I think, among the community, because it has been a middle-of-the-road attitude which has permitted active investigation of potential uranium resources while, at the same time, ensuring that the Government will have control and be fully informed about what is happening.

The situation that confronts us, therefore, is that, by not taking advantage of the uranium resources which are on our doorstep (and they are here; as I shall go on to say),

we may place ourselves in a most invidious position. Although it may be true to say philosophically that the motion before us is in some terms vague, let us not forget that it will have dramatic and immediate impacts on the South Australian economy, and it would be false to disregard that. However, before reaching that point, I will deal with some of the points made by the member for Mitcham and other members, namely, the specific objections to the use of uranium and other sources of nuclear fuel. The major one raised was the blackmail and hijacking issue, and I will refer to two others, which have been widely canvassed and which do not seem to be true. One refers to reactor safety.

All available evidence both in the U.K. and in the U.S.A. indicates that there is no greater degree of danger in the case of nuclear reactors than in the case of other large and concentrated industrial organisations. The other point made is that in the management and disposal of waste there is a grave danger. That point was made by the member for Mitcham, but that is not the view accepted by Governments in the United States and in the U.K. In the past 15 years in the U.K. there has been a large-scale industrial nuclear power capacity, which has been controlled at different times by Conservative and Labor Party Governments. The attitude has been that waste products are minimal. One suggestion made to me was that, if all the United States power capacity was nuclear, the total amount of waste for each person for each year would be about the size of a cent, and it could be disposed of with the ease that one can dispose of a cent—and that is not difficult to do.

The opinion of both Governments takes that into account, as the Minister of Mines and Energy has said. By comparison, if one considered controlling the residue of coal production, one would find a different situation, because there are waste products from coal that are frightening. In Sweden, copper smelting has produced, as a by-product, about 100 000 tonnes of arsenic, with an infinite half-life, that is, it is for ever on this earth. However, this seems to have been regarded as being no problem. Perhaps someone does not have a true perspective about this matter. A major point raised by the member for Mitcham related to safeguards against blackmail, theft, sabotage, terrorism, and the like, and we have discussed those matters before.

Many countries on this earth, be they right or wrong, already have a nuclear stockpile. Those persons who seek to blackmail the rest of the earth or a certain part of it have as much capacity to blackmail us by an attack on those installations as they do by using nuclear waste products to make up their home-made equipment. Is it really likely that it is a major threat that someone could steal plutonium waste and through that make up some form of bomb, and then blackmail? Is it not far more likely that, if such an attempt were to be made, there would be a large-scale attack on an existing nuclear bomb resource? Better a ready-made bomb than a home-made bomb.

Referring to South Australia, by passing this motion we place in jeopardy large potential economic growth in this State. I refer to copper exploration in South Australia, especially at Roxby Downs, where, by the nature of the geological structure, copper is linked with uranium, and the producers and developers at Roxby Downs are faced with the situation that it may not be a viable proposition to mine for copper in that situation, if that could be done by removing the uranium and selling copper on the international market at a profit. By passing this motion, in relation to Roxby Downs alone we are demonstrating

our good faith in relation to problems that have been raised by environmentalists. Let it not be forgotten that, in relation to the Roxby Downs project, there is a major project that might create, and perhaps would but for this motion have created, a city the size of Mount Isa but which is now to be forgone at least until some problems that have been raised are solved.

Similarly, in relation to the proposed uranium enrichment plant to be situated in the North of the State, again we are forgoing a possible investment of hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps more, and employment for thousands of people. Furthermore, by passing this motion we risk the whole of mineral exploration in this area of the State. If the argument being put forward by some people here is that this motion is too wishy-washy, I doubt that that is the case. On the contrary: I think the motion is so strong that it wrecks the prospect in the foreseeable future of two major economic developments, and perhaps wrecks the prospect of major mineral exploration on a large scale in other areas.

Nonetheless, I support the motion purely on the ground that there is such a division of public opinion and such a division between responsible people as to what the true answer may be. I believe that mankind will be forced to use uranium and nuclear power on a large scale: not just major countries but all countries including Australia will be forced to that conclusion by the hard facts of reality, and there can be answers to the questions that have been raised by environmentalists. Certainly, that is no wishy-washy policy. I would not have supported the amendment of the member for Mitcham, on the ground that it would forestall for ever the possibilities that are before us now. I have sympathy with the philosophy expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that we should be looking for other sources of energy. If it turns out that solar energy becomes the answer, so much the better, because it removes this whole divisive area. I support the motion.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): At the outset, I say that I accept the realism that the member for Playford has shown in this debate with his valuable contribution. He has indicated that he supports the motion: that was obvious, and I am equally gratified to know that he supports the theory of the amendment. From the earlier comment of the Minister of Mines and Energy (if I am repeating him correctly), I believe the Government will have no more difficulty in equally supporting the amendment as it has in supporting the motion. It, too, is realistic.

My next congratulation should go to the Premier for his bikemanship or cycling prowess. I warn him, however, of the dire consequences that follow if a person should stand on the pedals of a bicycle, especially the old-style gent's bicycle, which has a horizontal bar protruding forward about four centimetres below the seat. If the cotter pin breaks or the chain comes off, or indeed a foot slips off a pedal, the consequences are well recognised by all members. That is the position in which the Premier finds himself as a result of his contribution this afternoon, when he said, in effect, "Yes, I agree with that side and, yes, I agree with that side, and I hope I do not have to come down on the barbed-wire fence between my legs."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about a special cushion?

Dr. EASTICK: A special cushion would have no real effect on the consequences to which I have referred. The contribution of the member for Mitcham was based on many facts, but I was disturbed by his assertion that "because I say this is right and because no-one wants to support me, you are all wrong and I am totally right." I

do not accept that situation. I believe that it is important that we progress debate on this issue. I am convinced that we should progress it further than the motion and, indeed the amendment allows it to be progressed at this time. I say that against the background that, without an incentive, there will be insufficient consideration of all those matters that are necessary to be determined before making progress and introducing this form of energy.

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

Dr. EASTICK: Before the adjournment, I had mentioned the somewhat difficult position in which the Premier found himself on this subject. If we are to advance our knowledge and therefore the ultimate use of uranium and its products, one of the important issues is that there must be an incentive to find the answers to the difficulties that exist. Those incentives will not apply and the answers will not be obtained until effort is put in. The driving force behind the effort will be that there is a known use of the products.

The Minister of Mines and Energy referred to this matter when he mentioned the problem in relation to Australia's petroleum products. This Government has seen fit to announce a \$40 000 000 project over a period of years to prove further and investigate the presence of natural gas in South Australia. Before the down-turn associated with the Connor regime in relation to mineral resources, this work was taking place because there was an incentive for production, an incentive to invest, and the companies were finding and providing these areas of involvement and undertaking the type of research necessary to bring financial benefit and the use by people throughout the world of these various resources.

We have only to look to the development of the Norwegian and English off-shore drilling exercise, where the problems which existed have been offset and answers found to what were believed to be insurmountable problems of utilisation. That has been done because there has been an incentive. This motion puts the lid on effective incentive for that further experimentation, and to follow the line of reasoning set out earlier by the member for Mitcham that there should be an outright moratorium would be to put the lid on it much more severely and prevent effective utilisation or evaluation of uranium, its products, and its methods of use for an indeterminate period of time.

Earlier, the Premier revealed to the House that there had never been a commitment by the Government in relation to a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. He said that the Government had done the groundwork but was not involving itself in an actual promotion of the exercise. The member for Kavel and others have indicated the statements that have appeared in the press on this matter as direct quotations from the Premier. For the Premier now to have walked away from this announcement and for the Minister of Mines and Energy to say that he did not go overseas nor did he involve himself whilst there in an exercise looking at money for a uranium enrichment plant, and so on, is wanting this House and the people of South Australia to believe that they made statements about a project that they knew to be incorrect and that they were prepared more than once to allow that view to be considered as their view by the public. If that is the case (and we have only the word of the Premier and the Minister to accept on this), they have indicted themselves and their Party as people who will use for political gain statements that they know to be incorrect.

I shall say no more than that, because this issue is a much wider one, but we have had this example today from the Premier and the Minister of their willingness to involve themselves and their Government in kite-flying for political purposes, promotion of untruths for their Party's political gain.

In this situation, as indeed in all major issues, we hear constantly claim and counter-claim. The various lobbies will put forward their views on the issues. It is difficult to find a forum in which the pros and cons are looked at objectively. So many of the documents made available seek to put only one view, generally an extremist view. It is a fact of life that many people vitally involved in this issue have accepted the reality of a number of pros and cons. What we seek and what the member for Playford clearly did was to accept that there is a reality somewhere between the far extremes on both sides.

A document has been circulated, and I believe most members will have had access to it. It is entitled *The Nuclear Debate—a Glossary of Quotations*. I do not hesitate to say that it was issued by the Australian Uranium Producers Forum, but in that document we find some realistic views expressed. On page 2, under the heading "Editorial" from the *Wall Street Journal*, the following quotation appears:

The National Electric Reliability Council has just warned of a possible shortage of electrical generating capacity in some parts of the country by the late 1970's and in others by the early 1980's. It is very common in some circles to portray this doubtful future as a problem for the electric utilities. It would be more realistic to portray it as a problem for everyone who would like to lift his living standards or even retain the amenities he has now. Energy and living standards are inseparable; as with all economic problems, the poor and defenceless will be hit hardest by an electricity shortage. When huge and costly projects are tied up or scrubbed as a result of endless litigation, the result is enormous economic waste. That has an impact on capital markets and electric light bills right now, even before actual shortages.

I realise that further evidence in that area would be necessary to make that statement totally meaningful, but I want members to take heed of that and of one or two other comments I shall make. The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution in 1976 stated:

There is a tendency to dramatise the risks about radioactivity in ways which may convey quite misleading impressions to people who have no basic understanding of the subject. It is said, for example, that a piece of plutonium the size of an orange contains enough of the substance to kill everyone on earth. So it does, but it is impossible that it could be so distributed as to have this effect.

Here we have to come back to a realistic view of the matter. One statement is correct, but the practicality of implementation of the worst possible effects is the matter that should be looked at. In the same document Dr. Paul Ehrlich is referred to. He is the American biologist and population expert and a much wanted person by the anti-nuclear groups; he is one of their best supporters. I stress that he is not a great nuclear knocker. In Sydney he said:

The relative efficiency of nuclear power stations, the exposure of uranium miners to radioactivity and the release of radioactivity from nuclear power plants were not sufficient reasons alone to ban nuclear power. In spite of the unsolved problems of nuclear waste—

we all accept they are at this moment unsolved and will remain unsolved until such time as there is initiative or incentive to get out and work on the problem—

which would require humanity to accept the responsibility for storing dangerous material for 250 000 years, it was not inconceivable that a technical solution would be found.

I make the point that no significant step has ever been made without some technical difficulties or some unknowns.

It is a fact that there have been a great many fears in the mind of the public generally, but most of those fears have been based on a lack of knowledge of the basic issues. That certainly is a problem here. Although the Ranger inquiry has asked for the widest public debate I would hazard a guess that it will never be possible on the Australian nor on the world scene to relate information to the whole of the population in a way that would allow the whole population to have significant knowledge of the basic issues.

Dr. Tonkin: You would certainly not call this a wide public debate today.

Dr. EASTICK: This is not a wide public debate; it is hampered by the narrowness of the motion, and the fact that it seeks to call a halt to a further progressive approach to the matter. But there was (and I will come back to this) in what the Premier said today one bright spark, and that was a revelation that within his own department and within the senior Government departments there is a constant and continuing review of all matters related to uranium use and by-product handling.

If the Premier believes that the public of South Australia should be better versed in all of these matters, I ask him to urgently make available the reports presented to him and his Government (and perhaps to his Parliamentary colleagues) so that the information which has been gleaned by these experts can have wider coverage and so that members on this side of the House and the people that they represent, and those who advise them, are able to sift through these documents, which are extremely important for a better understanding of this complex matter. If the Premier is really interested in advancing knowledge in this State on this subject, he will accede to the request that I make and make these documents available.

One of the most recent examples of an attempt to increase the public debate on this issue is highlighted in the University of Sydney publication called *The Gazette*. It is a letter to graduates, and more particularly it contains an area of debate known as "the nuclear debate". I refer to volume 3, number 4, dated February, 1977. That debate sets out remarks made by Professor Stuart Butler, Professor of Theoretical Physics. Dr. Butler is one of the three co-authors of the publication *Uranium on Trial*, which has been presented by Howitz Group Books of Sydney and is dated January, 1977. The other authors were Charles Watson-Munro, professor of Plasma Physics, University of Sydney, and Robert Raymond. The report states:

"The Rassmussen report produced in the U.S. is a case in point. The opponents cite the so-called "worst case" mentioned in the report, which tries to envisage the effects of a complete melt-down and total release of radioactivity in a very large reactor situated on the outskirts of a city the size of New York. It is assumed that every factor that could make the catastrophe worse, including the weather, combines to exacerbate the situation.

Then, says the report, some 50 000 people in the surrounding area will suffer radiation sickness soon after the accident. Most will recover initially, but perhaps 3 300 will die. About 10 years later an increasing number of cancer cases will begin to show up in the population, and eventually another 45 000 people will die of cancer over the next 30 years.

No indication is given of how many of those people were going to die of cancer, quite apart from any nuclear involvement. The report continues:

The proponents of nuclear energy quote the same report as saying that the chances of such an accident occurring are one in several billion. They argue that if you are going to consider only the "worst case", then you have to compare it to "worst case" possibilities in daily life—such as two fully loaded jumbo jets colliding over Melbourne and falling into the middle of the 100 000 crowd watching the grand

final at the Melbourne Cricket Ground. In any case, they say, society already accepts at least 100 000 death a year from road accidents (50 000 a year in the U.S. alone).

I do not want to glorify the fact that people are going to die. I am not putting forward that proposal, but what I want to point out is that there has been a tremendous amount of work undertaken on the worst that could possibly happen in regard to nuclear waste. The report continues:

Public debate must be made confusing to many people by the two groups of extremists: those for totally unrestricted use of nuclear energy, whatever the form of reactor, on the one hand and those against the use of nuclear energy in any form, on the other. These groups appear to be engaged in trying to score debating points from each other. Moreover, both proponents and opponents appear able to quote the same sources to support their side of the argument.

That was the point I endeavoured to make earlier. There are claims and counterclaims, coming in many instances from the same source. There is in fairly graphic form in this document statements attributed to four different classes of people. I mention them because I think they add to an overall appreciation of the complexity of this problem. One is a statement attributed to an optimist, as follows:

Look, we've got the stuff. The world needs it. It is the best available alternative source of power for an energy-hungry planet. It has the potential to transform the lives of millions in the under-developed world. There have been no serious accidents yet and since we are getting to know more and more about nuclear engineering the chances of accident are declining. As long as uranium is sold under adequate safeguards to responsible customers, there is no reason to believe it will not be used for peaceful purposes. There have been no serious accidents yet.

That view is accepted by many people in the community. Whether it is the right view is a matter for all people to balance.

The pessimist, in the same circumstances, would say:

However small the risks, we owe it to future generations not to take them. In any case, the risks are considerable—there is the waste disposal problem, the danger that nuclear material might conceivably fall into the hands of international terrorists, the fact that a foreign Government which can be trusted today may change tomorrow.

We know that to be a fact. The pessimist continues:

Think of that Indian nuclear explosion. Besides, if we were only prepared to explore them more fully, there are alternatives like solar energy and the greater use of coal.

The fatalist could be expected to express himself as follows:

It does not really matter whether mankind can be trusted not to abuse nuclear energy. The simple fact is that he has already got it. Leaving Australia's ore in the ground will not change that, though it may make the stuff more expensive. We control about one-fifth of known available supplies of uranium. Other governments will certainly flog the rest whatever we do. All we can achieve by refusing to join in is deny ourselves a great deal of money.

The idealist, being the last of the four views put, would say:

The issue is essentially a moral one. An Australian decision to make money by selling material which may ultimately destroy us all would not be made less immoral by the fact that others are doing likewise. Moreover, an act of self-denial by Australia may persuade other nations with uranium reserves to follow suit.

No doubt each member in the House would have heard those views expressed by the people they represent or by people with whom they discuss the matter. Other comments are made in the report by world renowned people on this subject. Sir Frederick Warner, one of the 15 signatories to the Flowers report (the English Royal Commission on this matter), states:

The first thing I'd like to say is that as an engineer by training and profession it's futile for someone like myself to pretend that accidents can't, don't and won't take place in any area of technological activity or progress. Chemical plants shouldn't blow up, but they did in Flixborough in

England, with disastrous consequences and loss of life. Bridges shouldn't be run into by ships and fall down into rivers, but they did in Hobart and even do so of their own accord without human intervention on occasions as in Vienna recently. . . . My second point follows from my recent trip to attend for the first time the general meeting of the international atomic energy agency, a body charged not only with supervision of international safeguards under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, but also with the sharing of advanced technology with developing countries.

As a consequence of personal discussions with representatives of these developing countries I'm much more aware of the resentment which will follow a refusal by Australia to supply uranium to countries which desperately need it, and of the consequent damage to our international relationships. Such an act will not be seen as a noble act of self-restraint in the cause of world peace or the preservation of the human race, but as yet further evidence of the greed of the rich countries of the world—withholding resources from poorer countries in the desire to widen the gap between the haves and the have-nots, rather than narrow it.

After making other comments, Sir Frederick continues:

My third point is that surely we must keep all our energy options open for as long as we possibly can. There are no clear-cut answers to our energy independence in this all-important oil area. We do not know as yet how to economically use solar energy for production of electricity, let alone for transportation purposes. Research in the latter area is or could be vitally important to Australia.

He makes other points, but my time is limited. In every area in the past where a new advance was made it was criticised, fears were expressed about it, and there were grave ethical doubts. One could go back to the introduction by Sir Phillip Scott of anaesthesia, where it was used in an early instance to assist in childbirth. A member of the Royal Family of England was one of the first who used the invention. The use of the invention caused a cartoonist of the day to ask a question of the new-born princess, "I wonder whether your mother knows you are out yet?"

We have seen this criticism in relation to inter-planetary travel and missiles; we have seen it in relation to the problem of putting a man on the moon. Yet we must accept that, as a result of those actions and many other similar actions, the world in which we live is a better place today because we have been able to utilise electronics, ceramics, various systems and so on in a rational manner and thereby have been able to advance the welfare of the people of this world.

I am firmly convinced that, with the challenge to ascertain the answers to the technical difficulties that beset a better appreciation of the nuclear and the uranium potential, those answers will be found. Unless the challenge through initiative and incentive is present we will flounder and be none the wiser in five to 10 years from now. I support the motion and the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable the Attorney-General. Mr. Gunn: You've had a—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): My past is one of the matters I wish to refer to in this debate this evening, so I thank the honourable member for raising the matter; in fact, I might deal with it initially, because I wish to point out to the House that my interests and views on this matter have been well known for some time. I wish to place in a historical context the way in which I reached my conclusions and decisions on this subject. In 1972, I was fortunate to attend a meeting of the United Nations Conference on the Environment in Stockholm. On that occasion I was impressed by the arguments advanced by people who were concerned about the development of nuclear power. Until then I had not given the matter much consideration, but on that occasion I had opportunity to talk to people

who had concerned themselves with this issue. As a result I was convinced that the development of nuclear capacity and nuclear power should be handled cautiously and carefully. As a result I have continued my interests in the subject. I am disappointed about the level of debate that has occurred in the House today, because this subject raises in a broad way the whole question of the future of energy resources and the way they are used in this State and nation.

Dr. Tonkin: That's probably what we should have debated.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No suggestion has been made by members on this side of the House or by the Speaker, if I am not reflecting on you, Sir, in saying this, that any matter raised in this debate would have been too broad to be included. I regret that members opposite have failed to grasp the opportunity for a wide-ranging debate about the future of energy resources and energy use in South Australia. The Government has given all members of the House the opportunity to express their views on energy use, resources and management in this State and nation. One might well say that the Opposition particularly had failed to grasp this opportunity; I do not include the member for Light and the member for Mitcham in my remark, because I think that their contributions showed that they had certainly grasped and tried to grapple with some of the enormous issues involved in the debate.

What the debate has shown more than anything else is that those issues and the issue of the use and development of nuclear power are enormously complicated issues, so much so that many members feel concern about their ability to grasp and grapple with them. I know that I find the issues tremendously complicated and difficult to deal with but, when finally faced with an issue such as this (and as members of Parliament we do not have the technical expertise to deal with them at the depth at which we would like), the level at which we must approach the question is to ask ourselves whether we fully comprehend all the issues placed before us. Where the technocrats are unable to agree and we cannot firmly rely on their advice in these enormously complicated matters, we must decide for ourselves finally, and not run away from it.

The way in which we should make that decision and concern ourselves with the problem is to ask whether we understand the issues. If we are not sure of the way in which the issue is developing, and if we are unable to comprehend the complicated technical and scientific data being thrust on us, we should say to ourselves, "Until satisfied that this issue is safe and we are about to deal with the problems we perceive, we should not take any steps to develop it any further." That is what the motion is all about. It takes, in effect, the conservative approach, and I for one am unused to arguing the conservative approach to matters. In this instance, however, it is an issue of such complexity that we must say to ourselves, "The dangers are so great that, unless we can reassure ourselves that the proposed developments have relative safety and that safety precautions have been examined, I believe it is an issue on which in conscience we, in looking to the interests of our electors, should say, "Hasten slowly. Let us take some precautions in this matter and concern ourselves with the issue of safety particularly, and let us not proceed until such time as we, as individuals, can assure ourselves that it is safe to proceed."

Dr. Tonkin: That advice could well apply to consumer legislation.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have tried to deal seriously with this issue, not to trivialise it. If the Leader wants to interject, he should respect my approach to the matter, because I believe that this is one of the most fundamental and serious issues. This is one of the most far-sighted debates that has confronted us since I have been a member of Parliament, and I think it does the Leader no credit to enter the debate in the sort of trivial fashion he did a moment ago.

Dr. Tonkin: It was a serious remark.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In dealing with other preliminary points before reaching the substance of my argument, I will deal with criticisms that have been made of Government members. It does the Opposition little credit to make such attacks, and I will answer one matter particularly. It has been suggested that the Premier particularly has changed his views on this matter, so I will quote from the record of the 1976 Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party in South Australia. An item moved by the Unley sub-branch, moved by Mr. Stokes and seconded by the Premier, states:

This convention calls on all levels of the A.L.P. to oppose as strongly as possible any decisions or plans for the mining, treatment and export of uranium, and by-products, until an independent public inquiry can show that the known safeguards regarding the disposal of wastes and safe transportation of such material or its by-products can be clearly approached and guaranteed.

Why I place that motion on record now is that, basically, it is in similar tone to the motion before us. It is not in any way a somersault for the Premier or members on this side, because that has been my Party's policy since the June, 1976, convention of the South Australian branch of the Labor Party, and that is the policy the Government has sought to express in the motion. It is important that that be emphasised.

Another matter with which I will deal in my preliminary remarks is the contribution made by the member for Mitcham. I thought it unfortunate that he decided to try to introduce Party politics into the issue by moving his amendment, because I am sure that he, basically, is delighted with the motion before us. I can for the moment take some credit for the fact that he now has such attitudes on this question, because he has been to some extent a protege of mine in this matter.

Dr. Tonkin: He may not thank you for it.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Nevertheless, that is the case. He appeared as counsel for conservationists before the Fox inquiry.

Mr. Becker: Who paid?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not know. Before he attended that inquiry his views were largely in favour of mining uranium but, once he had done his homework on the subject, he was converted to the belief that uranium should not be mined and that nuclear fuel should not be developed.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why didn't you second his amendment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Basically, when the member for Mitcham turned his intelligence to the matter, he was able to understand the complex issues involved. Regrettably, the Opposition generally has either not turned its intelligence to the issues involved or has not had the intelligence to understand them.

Mr. Becker: At least we can't be bought off.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why not answer the question? Why didn't you second the amendment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The amazing member for Hanson says that, at least, they cannot be bought off. I do not want to go into the issues of who has and who has not been bought off in this matter. Undoubtedly, the Opposition has been severely embarrassed by its Federal colleagues, who are frantically dashing to develop uranium mining in Australia. Undoubtedly, the reasons why they are so anxious to do that is to pay back some of their supporters at the last election. I now refer to several technical matters. I do not intend to reiterate the arguments against the development of nuclear power as a source of energy in Australia or in the world, as these arguments have already been covered. Nor do I intend to restate the potential array of catastrophe for the human race that must arise from the proliferation of nuclear weapons. No-one would disagree about that. Nor do I need to remind the House and the people of South Australia of the dangers that present themselves if we, at this stage, decide to proceed with the development of uranium mining and the use of nuclear fuels. We know that the production of radon gas at the mining stage of the process is a dire health hazard. The United States Atomic Energy Commission has forecast in one of its publications that about 20 per cent of all post-war uranium miners are likely to die as a result of lung cancer.

Mr. Allison: They monitor it now, though.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: They did not do so then, but they do now. I thank the honourable member for that point, because it raises the issue of the concern of this Government. What other matters do we not know of at present? That is a frightening thing. We are in the area of the unknown, and until proper safety standards are available to meet a whole range of present objections I am not willing to see uranium developed further. Secondly, we know that there are dangers inherent in the act of transporting the mined or enriched uranium. Also there are dangers of theft, hijacking, and international conspiracies or accidents, and I need only refer to the incident of the loss of an atomic bomb by the Americans off the coast of Spain. No-one has referred to this incident, but it was fortunate that the bomb dropped in the sea and not on land. If it had dropped on land, the consequences could have been catastrophic.

We know the potential for accidents in reactors in other parts of the world, as has been adequately demonstrated. I quote from the *Age*, September 21, 1976, referring to an American expert in the nuclear reactor safety business. Mr. Bridenbaugh came to Australia on a three-week tour that was organised directly out of the fact that he and two other persons who were safety experts in the nuclear business had resigned from their jobs because they were fearful of the developments and trends in the nuclear industry. The report states:

Mr. Bridenbaugh shocked the industry earlier this year when, with two other senior executives, he resigned, describing nuclear power as a "technological monster".

This man was high up in one of the major nuclear power corporations in the United States, and he was concerned about accidents in nuclear power plants, which was his speciality. The report also states:

He quoted a United States Government study which showed a major core melt down—causing a serious accident in the plant—was one-in-17 000. "With 1 000 reactors operating that means you are going to have a major accident in 17 years". He said that there were several alternatives to nuclear power which had not been properly considered.

That report clearly indicates the sort of problems that are likely to develop, and there are no satisfactory answers to these problems. We also know now that the amount of

energy (and by that I mean electricity) needed to produce uranium fuel and build a nuclear power station is enormous and expensive. To use so much energy to produce energy of such an ambivalent nature as uranium would seem to be a cancelling equation, a potentially wasteful exercise in redundancy. We also know that the ultimate and probably insurmountable problem at the end of the nuclear cycle is that of waste disposal. Plutonium is generally a man-made element: it normally does not occur in nature. We know that plutonium is one of the most dangerous substances known to man. I do not over-emphasise that, because it has been said in the past, and we know it. These are matters which are well known and which are accepted by people in the nuclear business as being generally considered to be the facts of the situation.

Two moral questions emerge from all this: first, are we at a point either intellectually or technically where the legacy that we are to leave to our children and future generations of humanity may possibly mean that they will suffer generic defects and an increased incidence of cancer? That is what we are likely to do from the vast development of nuclear power. Secondly, are we at a point either intellectually or technically where the legacy we leave to our children and future generations of humanity may be one of official genocide, of escalated terrorism, and of international blackmail? These are matters that have been referred to today, but they are related to the use of nuclear fuels.

Until the problem of plutonium and waste storage, disposal or destruction, is technically and morally soluble, this Government believes that it must enforce an indefinite halt on contributing to the development of nuclear power. We believe that a halt in the development in South Australia will have a significant effect not only in this State but also in this nation, and I am led to believe from my recent overseas studies that this action by this Government will have a significant effect throughout the world. The movement against nuclear power and the use of nuclear fuels has accelerated rapidly in the past couple of years. When one reads the international press, one can see clearly that, in all major industrial countries, a complete rethinking of the philosophy behind the use of nuclear power is under way.

Mr. Allison: What was the result of the referendum in several States in America?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is well known that, since the 1940's, there has been a nuclear lobby in most industrialised countries, a mouthpiece that has been well funded by the Government. For example, in Australia we have had the Atomic Energy Commission, but where has been the mouthpiece speaking on behalf of alternative sources of new energy? Where has been the mouthpiece speaking on behalf of solar power? We do not have that sort of Government-funded instrumentality at present, so in America large sums of Government money were spent by the Atomic Energy Commission in fighting and defeating the referendums. That situation has been acknowledged in the United States. Anyone who has read the international press would know that that is so. For their own purposes, members opposite simply chose to refer to the referendums in the United States of America. The situation in Sweden has been very much different. I had not intended to mention that, because I believe such tests of public opinion have depended on the circumstances in the country or State concerned, and I do not think it is especially valid to quote either the American experience with referendums or the Swedish example of the election fought largely on the question of the development of

nuclear power. I do not think that is a particularly fruitful course of debate for us, because I do not believe that it has provided any real indication of support for or opposition to nuclear power throughout the world.

I think we should look to some of the references to the international situation contained in the Fox report. I want to quote from it particularly to answer the point made by the member for Mitcham. I think this is a valuable document, and it has made many points which are particularly valid.

Mr. Millhouse: It is—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Had the honourable member been here earlier, he would have heard me make the point that I was so disappointed—

Mr. Millhouse: I was listening with attention in my room.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —with the level of debate from so many members opposite. I think they have abrogated their responsibility in the matter. In the whole question of the international debate, I think the Fox report made a couple of most significant points. It points out that the non-proliferation treaty has internal contradictions. At page 126, under the subheading "Conflicts in the treaty objectives", the report states:

A serious threat to the viability of IAEA and NPT safeguards as a means of restricting nuclear energy to peaceful uses is likely to come from the inherent conflict of aims in the Agency Statute and more particularly in the NPT.

They are referring to the fact that a non-proliferation treaty is in fact a proliferation treaty: it encourages the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. That point has been overlooked in the debate at large, because people generally have said that if a country has signed the non-proliferation treaty it is all right to deal with it, but that is not the case. Secondly, in the international debate I believe it is most important to look to the views contained in the Fox report on the potential for nuclear power in developing countries. On page 53, the report states:

However, a number of witnesses argued that nuclear power has a limited contribution to make in most developing countries because it is not suited to their needs. Even if the demand for electricity does grow comparatively rapidly in these countries in future, it does not necessarily follow that there will be rapid development of extensive grid systems capable of supporting large power generating units.

Further on the report states:

Another point made was that, in many cases where distribution grids exist, they supply electricity for a small, affluent group of people living in cities rather than the rural masses.

I quote from the conclusions of the Fox report, stated on page 56, as follows:

The evidence also points to the conclusion that, while some of the more advanced developing countries—

and by "advanced" I presume is meant wealthy developing countries—

may proceed with plans to install nuclear capacity during the remainder of the century, nuclear power is unlikely to contribute on a large scale to the energy needs of the less affluent countries.

Mr. Allison: What about India?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That shows the lack of depth of the Opposition. India, in terms of its industrial development, is quite an affluent nation. The honourable member should know that. The report further states:

Nor does it appear that the further development of nuclear power in economically advanced countries will make any significant difference to the ability or the willingness of those countries to assist less affluent countries.

The final point to draw from that is that nuclear power will not lead to a solution to the problems of the world in the energy crisis we are facing. The real solution in the short term is conservation of energy. My recent visit to North America in the middle of its winter apprised me on this point. The Americans have all their buildings overheated and they use large cars which are chronically wasting energy every time they are driven. Generally, there is little or no comprehension of the need to conserve energy in the United States. That is the sort of issue we have to face.

Mr. Becker: What sort of car do you use?

Mr. Mathwin: You want to get yourself a Mini-Minor.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My own private car is a much smaller car.

Mr. Dean Brown: Such a hypocrite!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Members opposite are anxious to stop me from concluding, but I intend to ensure that I do so. Finally, I emphasise that the opposition to uranium is simply not emotional or simply not moral, but is based on a very practical concern and doubts about the technological and economic viability of such a project. To be against uranium development is not to be against progress. I want to stress that. Perhaps for the first time we have some chance to direct and control the impetus of progress in our societies. I think that is very important. A recent commentator has observed that modern capitalism has increasingly turned towards technological advances that are suspect in the extreme. They are marked by their dubious or plainly negative contribution to human welfare and by their destructive efforts on the environment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister's time has expired.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to comment briefly on certain aspects of the Government's debate this afternoon and this evening. I shall comment at some length on the remarks of the Attorney-General and then outline my own position. Interestingly enough, I shall also comment on the position of the member for Mitcham. I shall start with some brief comments about the way this motion has been introduced. I agree with the Attorney-General that it is an extremely important motion, and it is a debate for which one would have thought the Parliament would have unlimited time. More importantly, for what the Attorney-General described as one of the most far-sighted debates since he entered Parliament, the Opposition and this Parliament could have had some notice of what the motion would be. It was introduced by the Premier, who said that he wished to move a motion without notice. It is a damnation of the Government's own stand that the Attorney-General has taken, because, on an issue that he said is the most important in this Parliament in the past four years, the Opposition had no notice of what the motion would be.

Dr. Tonkin: They did give us an hour.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It was a motion without notice introduced into this House. My second point relates to the great variability within the arguments put forward from the Government side. The Premier said basically that there should be no mining or enrichment in South Australia for the time being. I heard the Premier's interview on the A.B.C. news, and he went much further in that interview this evening than he had done in this House. He is having his usual bob every way possible so that he will pull out the appropriate quotation at the appropriate time to suit whatever argument he likes to put. The Premier during this debate this afternoon talked about how the feasibility study into a uranium enrichment plant in

South Australia would proceed, and said that South Australia must be kept up to date with technological developments in the enrichment field.

There we heard the Premier taking a stand and wanting to be with it, wanting to be ready to jump in and then saying on the news tonight that he thought the uranium should stay in the ground, possibly indefinitely. On the other hand, the Minister of Mines and Energy, as we all know, believes that, because of the grave shortage of means of generating energy the world is facing, the world will have to develop many more nuclear power plants, and that this will mean the mining of uranium in Australia, so that enrichment should be done here as well. I think that is a fair summation of the general policy of the Minister, although he does point out some of the risks involved.

I think the Minister of Mines and Energy put forward by far the most practical and pragmatic argument on the Government side. I believe it is by far the most realistic argument, and one which looks at the facts rather more than the emotional clap-trap that we have just had from the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General said, "The dangers are so great." Nearly all his argument was that we must get down to the basic facts. He said we did not want the political style debate we have had this afternoon. "Let us get down to the facts", he said. I agree with him. Then he came up with the emotional clap-trap; he had no facts, but threw up these emotional aspects and said that we were all wrong, and that anyone who wished to mine uranium in any form or to use nuclear power must be wrong and was ignoring the dangers. Let us look at some of the dangers. The Attorney-General did not quote any figures; I will quote some figures from the January, 1976, edition of *Scientific American*, one of the most reputable publications. An article entitled "The Necessity of Fission Power" goes through the risks in the United States of America—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who wrote it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: H. A. Benther. It goes through the risks of death. It says that from motor vehicles there is a probability of 50 000 deaths; from other accidents, 30 000 deaths; from drowning, 6 000 deaths; from fires and hot substances, 7 000 deaths; from falls, 18 000 deaths; from routine emission of radiation, two deaths; and from nuclear reactor accidents, two deaths. We can combine the entire possibility of death from nuclear power and uranium radiation, and there is a total of four out of a possible 100 000 deaths. That makes a mockery of what the Attorney-General was saying about how "the dangers are so great". The dangers are not great if put in perspective, but they can be great if adequate safeguards are not taken. I will come to some of those safeguards shortly.

The Attorney-General read out a motion that was passed at the 1976 June convention of the Australian Labor Party. The interesting thing about that motion was that the safety of using and mining uranium had to be "proved by a public inquiry". At no stage today has the Government, in putting forward its argument, talked about yet another public inquiry. This would be an additional inquiry to the Fox report. This raises two points: is the A.L.P. prepared to accept the Fox report as the official public inquiry, or is it now advocating that there should be a further public inquiry over and above the Fox report? I believe that the Government should answer that very important question.

One important aspect that the Attorney-General failed to cover was what countries such as Japan would do to fill their energy gap. He did not cover that aspect at all, except at the end of his speech when he said that they must conserve power and drive smaller cars, particularly

in countries like the U.S.A. As I said then, that was really a hypocritical comment for someone to pass who drives around in a massive Ford with the biggest V8 engine you can buy in an Australian-made vehicle. Yet he is advocating that people in other countries should drive small cars to save power. It is not feasible for countries like Japan to fill their energy gaps simply by conserving power. They need to get their power from somewhere else. From logistics relating to generating that power from coal, I understand it is almost technically impossible to do that. The waste and pollution from the coal and the pollution from generating plants is so great that it would be impossible to fill the energy gap in Japan by using coal-generated electricity, so that country needs to consider other forms of energy. The danger is that if the Japanese do not use nuclear power plants they will start developing breeder reactors, and that certainly would be a tragedy because of the dangers involved. The Minister of Mines and Energy is in an unfortunate position.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you say that is a danger if you do not acknowledge the present danger?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The danger is far greater. The member for Mitcham has not presented any figures as to what the real dangers are. He throws up arguments of the type used by the Attorney-General, that there will be genetic abnormality, which is an extremely remote possibility, and obviously, as a lawyer, he knows nothing about genetics. It is a pity he did not find out something about the subject before making accusations like that. I felt sorry for the Minister of Mines and Energy this afternoon because of the dilemma he is caught in. As Minister responsible for this area, he is in an unfortunate position. He has a Party (including a Cabinet), that is going in all directions. He has taken by far the best and most pragmatic stand on this issue, yet he finds the Premier goes part way with the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General is jumping off the deep end, despite the fact he would not second—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you opposing the motion?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, I am supporting it. I am largely supporting some of the arguments used by the Minister of Mines and Energy. The member for Mitcham read out the policy of the new L.M., that was adopted last November. Its policy on energy is as follows:

The new L.M. will encourage research into the production and use of solar energy. We will oppose the mining, production and use of nuclear fuels until time or circumstances shall provide the necessary knowledge for dealing adequately with waste products and with the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons and terrorism.

That policy is the same as in the motion before us this afternoon, yet it was the member for Mitcham who tried to amend the motion (he couldn't get a seconder) by introducing a five-year moratorium on the mining, enrichment and use of nuclear power.

Dr. Tonkin: Isn't that an extreme left-wing idea?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Mitcham has certainly taken a stand equal to that of the left wing of the A.L.P. The *Australian* today acknowledged that.

Mr. Millhouse: There are a hell of a lot of other people who take the same view but you, in your arrogance and intolerance, may not agree.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In fact, there was a disagreement in the new L.M. about its policy. It is incredible that the new L.M. is now split with the Party itself having a policy and its only member of Parliament having a different policy,

a radically different policy; in fact, a policy so different that he tried to amend a motion similar to his own Party's policy to his own policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, in the stand for the five-year moratorium taken by the member for Mitcham, there has been a lack of thought on his part. He has made a bold assumption that no technological development or advancement will be made in the next five years. That is wrong, as the rate of technological change is increasing at an ever-increasing pace, and to say that it must be five years before we develop it in any form is a bold assumption. Any such assumption is foolish and ignores the facts around us.

It is appropriate that I now turn to my own personal point of view, because the Minister of Mines and Energy specifically asked me for it and I promised him I would outline it. I believe that a major energy shortage will occur in many developed and developing nations of the world. It is not feasible from existing energy sources, with the exception of uranium, to fill that energy gap. The world has much to do to conserve energy, but even the conservation of energy will not fill the energy gap that is bound to become wider and wider. For the next 25 years the energy gap will be critical. The Opposition moved an amendment to the motion to develop solar energy. I support the amendment wholeheartedly. It would be foolish to believe that solar energy will fill the energy gap significantly in the next 25 years. Major technological work must be done before solar energy can be used as the major source to develop electricity. Therefore, the energy policy of the new L.M. is not feasible if it is developed to the extent that it was adopted by the Party's one member of Parliament.

Unfortunately, to fill the energy gap some secretaries of the world must rely on nuclear power. Already countries like Japan are relying more and more on nuclear power. Uranium will eventually be mined in Australia and, hopefully, South Australia will eventually be successful in obtaining a uranium enrichment plant, but I include the strong qualification that we as South Australians need to know the risks involved and be sure of the safeguards and assured that they will work. The Federal Government is now negotiating with several bodies, including the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the USA about some of the risks and international safeguards involved.

As the Minister of Mines and Energy outlined, the three basic risks are terrorism, proliferation and the future problems of dealing with nuclear waste. I do not believe that terrorism is the major problem, whereas the Minister did. I see the basic long-term problem as nuclear waste.

Mr. Keneally: I didn't think you thought there was any problem.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I certainly see this as a problem, and anyone who does not believe it is a problem is a fool. The risks can be calculated. It is a matter of ensuring that the risks are so low that they become insignificant compared with other risks in the community.

Mr. Millhouse: How can one calculate risks when there is no solution to the problem or if you can, you give us your calculations now.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have already referred to the figures. I would suggest to the member for Mitcham that he go back over my speech (if he has not had the courtesy to listen to it), and consider the figures. I was

the only member to quote specific figures dealing with deaths and dangers related to nuclear radiation. If the member for Mitcham will now give me the courtesy that he demanded when I interrupted him only once—

Mr. Millhouse: You walked out.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I did not. When I interrupted the member for Mitcham he became so heated that he almost took his Fox report and walked home. I wish now to outline briefly what I personally expect are the sorts of safeguard we can expect. First, I would insist that the second Fox report be released and that it must recommend the mining of uranium before I could approve mining development in South Australia. Secondly, the Federal Government must reach a satisfactory conclusion in its present negotiation on the safeguards involved before mining, enriching and exporting uranium from South Australia is undertaken. Thirdly, I do not believe that South Australia should develop a nuclear power station at this time. Fourthly, I would insist on being able to examine the safeguards proposed by the Federal Government and on being able to make my own choice whether or not they were adequate. Fifthly, I believe that we would need a clear indication through opinion polls or from public reaction that the public of South Australia was prepared for the State to mine, enrich and export uranium.

I hope this evening that I have at least stated clearly where I stand on this subject. Most other members have waffled and have not laid down conditions. I have given five specific conditions on which I would insist before allowing the mining, enrichment and export of uranium from South Australia. I now comment briefly on the motion before us and the difficulty that passing it will cause in South Australia. The motion has allowed a wide range of people to support the motion even though the opinions of those people differ. The member for Mitcham and the Attorney-General are on the same side; the Minister of Mines and Energy has a totally different view; and other members have different views; yet all are supporting the motion. That is unfortunate, the motion is so general that it has not been successful in arriving at a general consensus of this Parliament. Debate has been largely futile and has been turned into a political slanging match that has achieved nothing for the State. The wording of the motion is so general that it does not allow the people of this State to know under what conditions uranium can be mined, enriched and exported from the State.

The motion refers to "demonstrate to its satisfaction", but what is the satisfaction of this Parliament? The motion also states "safe to provide uranium to a consumer country", but what is safe? It is a relative term. The motion is not specific or objective in spelling out what conditions would be regarded. Finally, the motion states "until it is demonstrated". Demonstrated to whom—this Parliament, the State of South Australia, the Cabinet, the Government or the Premier?

Dr. Tonkin: Therefore, there must be another debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: According to A.L.P. policy passed at the 1976 State conference another public inquiry should take place. Unfortunately, the motion has not encouraged sound public debate in this Parliament. It has let down the recommendations of the Fox report and it was introduced without notice by the Premier. The motion has produced a superficial argument with a limitation on time for debate. Many members who would have liked to speak to the motion have not been able to do so. The motion will not achieve a thing in spelling out to prospective

miners or prospectors who may develop uranium where this Government or Parliament really stands on the issue. It is so general that any member with any common sense would support the motion and, as such, it has become a futile motion and debate. However, I will, unfortunately, because of the motion being imposed on the House, join with the large number of futile members who support this futile motion.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Stuart that, at about 8.55 p.m., I shall have to start putting the vote.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): It usually takes me half an hour to say hello, but I shall try to confine my remarks to the time at my disposal. In repeating what most other members have said, I say that this is an issue of major importance on which every member of Parliament should be willing to state a point of view, difficult as that might be for lay people to do. It is an issue on which men of good will throughout the world will find themselves on opposing sides, and it irritates me to hear the Leader consistently refer to what he calls the left-wing view. I was fortunate to have had a trip and to visit Canada, Russia and Japan recently and I spoke to people in those countries on this subject. I spoke to what the Leader would refer to as socialists and capitalists in Canada, socialists in Russia, and capitalists in Japan. Irrespective of their political views, they all supported development of the Australian uranium resource. When I asked them questions about safety in the nuclear technology, they were unable to convince me. I say clearly that the onus of proof of its safety rests squarely on the shoulders of the proponents of nuclear technology. If they are unable to convince the average individual, let alone the average member of Parliament, that this technology is safe, it ill behoves any member to support the development of our uranium resource.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KENEALLY: I have already pointed out that no member should abdicate his responsibility. I think it is also clear to each of us that, as lay people, nuclear jargon is almost incomprehensible; nevertheless, we have to make an attempt at understanding it and, in doing so, we rely on the experts. However, in an area in which experts disagree, what right have we, as lay people, to come down with a firm decision saying either "Yea" or "Nay"? I believe that the only sensible decision this Parliament can make is to support the motion. I believe that in this area South Australia has the capacity, if not to be a catalyst in what is almost a nuclear technology in the world today, to give a lead to those people who might be seeking a lead on this issue. We can be more effective than we might think. Given two or three years of study, if the proponents were able to come up with safer processes, the anti-nuclear lobby would be prepared to accept them. I do not believe that the economic or any other arguments the proponents may put up can overcome the one threat that it is possible that this technology is unsafe and, unlike all the other anti-nuclear developers, I am opposing it on that basis alone. I know that the member for Davenport has said that this is an emotional issue; that may well be so, but neither he nor any of his colleagues can convince me of the validity of the argument. The motion, which is the only sensible approach this Parliament can take, deserves the support of all members, support it will no doubt get.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act, 1941-1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill, which amends the principal Act, the Industries Development Act, 1941, as amended, establishes the machinery to give effect to a proposal of the Government that will (a) provide additional capital on favourable terms for specific industrial enterprises; and (b) enable employees engaged in those enterprises to acquire a financial and managerial interest therein. This measure is essentially an enabling one. It will not have any effect until a scheme acceptable to the Treasurer and to the Industries Development Committee has been proposed by the relevant enterprise.

The scheme envisaged involves, amongst other things, the creation of a trust to provide benefits in the nature of superannuation for employees. When this trust is created and the scheme is approved by the committee, a loan from a commercial lender may be arranged by the trust. This loan will be guaranteed by the Government. The trust will thus secure an interest in the enterprise using funds made available by the lender. The lender will ultimately be paid back by the trust to the commercial lender from contributions by the enterprise in its capacity as employer, being contributions paying the employer's contribution to the superannuation trust. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

The establishment of employee trusts where such trusts become part owners of the enterprise will provide employees with certain rights in the management of the enterprise. In particular, employees may acquire the right to representation on the board of the enterprise. Thus, the proposed amendment to the Act and consequent developments that ensue would enable two major objectives of the Government to be met: the development and diversification of industry within South Australia; and the development of meaningful industrial democracy programmes. It is anticipated that the development of such schemes will occur initially through approaches by the management of South Australian companies to the Unit for Industrial Democracy. Then discussions will take place with other relevant departments, such as Legal Services, Treasury and Economic Development. Once the scheme has been drawn up it will come to the committee, whereupon it will be established whether all of the conditions set out in the Act can be fulfilled. In cases where the committee approves of the Government acting as guarantor for the establishment of an employee trust, the outline of the scheme and all associated details would be put to the trade unions representing the employees within the organisation. The shop floor union members would then, after receiving advice from their officials and/or shop stewards, decide whether they wished to be a party to the scheme with or without amendments or whether they wished to reject the scheme.

It is the Government's belief that the adoption of such schemes would prove advantageous to enterprises, employees and the State of South Australia. The advantages that would accrue to the enterprises are as follows:

1. The enterprise would receive an employment-creating capital injection which would enable the enterprise to diversify into other industries or improve its technology in order to enhance its competitive position. In either case enterprises would be made less vulnerable to the fluctuations of market demand.
2. Enterprises would receive capital injections at lower costs than is presently possible. This would occur because the employee trust would be established as a superannuation fund and the enterprises concerned would be able to pay back the loan principal plus interest pre-company-income-tax. There also would be some saving to enterprises through lower interest rates because of the provision of the Government guarantee.
3. It is anticipated that the employee trust in conjunction with the associated employee representatives on the enterprise board would create a more open and cohesive industrial relations climate and a better method of achieving more of the aims of the enterprise and the trade unions in a form that is advantageous to and compatible with both groups.

The advantages that would accrue to the members of the work force are as follows:

1. It would provide greater economic security through the establishment of a superannuation plan and disability payments in the event of premature retirement.
2. Once superannuation needs are fully funded, it would provide the employee trust with a second income through the receipt of dividend payments.
3. It would provide the employees, either through the employee trust or directly, with representation on the enterprise board, which, in turn, would foster participative styles of management at all levels enabling a greater potential of the work force to be realised.
4. The employees through their representatives on the board would gain greater access to information and, therefore, acquire a better understanding of the factors promoting and inhibiting the growth and viability of the enterprise.
5. The operation of the employee trust and the associated representation on the enterprise board would provide a method of gaining for interested employees practical top-level financial and commercial experience on a first-hand basis of a level and depth not presently available to trade unionists.
6. It would provide an initiative where trade unions and their members could extend their industrial horizons beyond wages and conditions and, hopefully, lead to the development of a meaningful trade union and management agreement on a shop floor industrial democracy programme.

The advantages that would accrue to the State of South Australia are as follows:

1. It will enhance the possibility of localising ownership and managerial control of the enterprise in South Australian hands rather than in interstate or oversea head offices.
2. It will provide a method of building up the industrial infrastructure in South Australia without cost to the taxpayer.
3. It may provide a method of bolstering industry decentralisation in South Australia on terms satisfactory to the enterprise and without an additional strain on public funds.

4. It will provide a method of raising employee income levels that is not incompatible with the enterprise's long-term capacity to pay for and maintain an expanding employment level.
5. With the representatives of capital and labour sharing in the ownership and control of the enterprise it is anticipated that South Australia's already good levels of industrial peace may be further improved.

Whether schemes as outlined above will occur in South Australia, will depend on managerial interest, ability of enterprises to satisfy the conditions set out in the amendment to the Act, and the willingness of the trade unions to agree with the specific proposals before them. The amendments to the Act are merely an enabling device. However, it is hoped that the number of enterprises avail themselves of the opportunities that would be provided by the successful carriage of these amendments, because there are advantages to be gained for employees, for enterprises and for the State as a whole.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the only operative clause in the measure, and proposed section 14a (1) permits the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of a loan made to trustees of a trust that has the objects set out in that subsection. Proposed subsection (2) ensures that no guarantee will be given unless the Industries Development Committee has inquired into the matter and is satisfied as to the matters set out in subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (a) and, further, that the Treasurer is satisfied that the interest on the loan is reasonable, having regard to the fact that the security for the creditor arises from a guarantee by the Government. Proposed subsection (3) is formal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Commission Act, 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: 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

This short Bill makes two disparate amendments to the principal Act, the Land Commission Act, 1973. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 4, the definition section of the principal Act, and is consequential on the substantive amendment proposed by clause 4. Clause 3 proposes an amendment to section 12 of the principal Act. Subsection (6) of that section provides *inter alia*, that the commission shall not acquire by compulsory process (a) any dwelling house that is occupied by the owner as his principal place of resident; and (b). . . The application of this provision has, in the view of the Chairman of the South Australian Land Commission, somewhat inhibited the function of the commission in its activities.

Specifically the commission has been unable to comply with some requests from suburban and rural local government authorities to assist in the orderly development of their respective areas because of the existence of "principal place of residence" on part of the land required for

development schemes. This problem is exacerbated when the "principal place of residence" is situated on an allotment of greater than one-fifth of a hectare; it is a relatively easy matter to design a re-development "around" an allotment of lesser size. Accordingly, on the recommendation of the Chairman of the commission it is now proposed to limit the restriction provided for in paragraph (a) of section 12(6) of the principal Act to a "principal place of residence" situated on allotments of or less than one-fifth of a hectare. The other restrictions contained in section 12(6) will remain. Clause 4 is essentially a machinery amendment, and by an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act vests the management of the South Australian Land Commission Fund in the commission itself. This amendment merely recognizes the existing practice.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to an agreement between the State and the Commonwealth in respect of a scheme to provide assistance to persons engaged in rural industries. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: 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

This Bill ratifies and approves an agreement made between the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the States of Australia on January 1 of this year. This agreement is set out in the second schedule to the Bill. The agreement arises in part from a report and recommendation of the Industries Assistance Commission following an investigation into rural reconstruction in Australia. Under the agreement the following forms of assistance will be available:

(a) Debt reconstruction: in certain circumstances assistance will be provided to a farmer who has sound prospects of long-term commercial viability but who at the material time has exhausted his cash and credit resources and cannot meet his financial commitments. Generally debt reconstruction will take the form of re-financing existing financial commitments.

(b) Farm build-up: assistance provided in this area will be aimed at assisting a farmer to build up his holding by acquiring adjoining holdings that themselves do not have prospects of long-term commercial viability.

(c) Farm improvement: here assistance will be provided to farmers whose present property is uneconomic but can be rendered viable without necessarily adding to its size.

(d) Rehabilitation: assistance in this area may be provided to farmers who are compelled to forsake farming and who may thereby be suffering temporary hardship.

(e) Carry-on finance: assistance in this area may be provided to specific areas of primary industry which are suffering from severe marketing difficulties.

(f) Household support: assistance here may be provided to give the farmer "economic breathing space" while deciding whether or not he will leave farming.

In form the Bill closely follows the Rural Industry (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972, the principal change being in the rather more comprehensive rural assistance

coverage provided under this Bill. On the coming into operation of the Act presaged by this Bill no further assistance will be provided under the 1971-72 Act, but that Act will remain in operation until farmers' commitments to the authority under that Act have been discharged.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions used for the purposes of the measure. Clause 5 formally approves and ratifies the agreement and authorises the Government and authorities and instrumentalities of the Crown to carry out and give effect to the agreement. Clause 6 formally appoints the Minister having the administration of the proposed Act to be the authority within the meaning of the agreement. Clause 7 establishes a fund to be known as the Rural Industry Adjustment Fund, and sets out the mechanics of its operation.

Part III, which consists of clauses 8 to 21, provides for the grant of protection certificates in the circumstances set out in clause 9. The scheme of protection certificates is well known in this State where they have been used effectively to enable farmers to continue farming in times of great economic hardship. In fact, the provisions in this Bill are substantially the same as the corresponding provisions in the Rural Industry (Special Provisions) Act, 1971-1972.

Clause 22 protects certain moneys payable by way of assistance under the Act from previously incurred debts or charges. Clause 23 grants the Minister a power of delegation and is in aid of the convenient administration of the proposed Act. Clause 24 gives certain exemptions from stamp duty. Clause 25 is a formal financial provision. Clause 26 is a formal provision dealing with the summary disposition of offences. Clause 27 is a general regulation making power. The agreement is, as has been mentioned, set out in the second schedule to the Bill, and is quite detailed and self-explanatory.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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

It follows upon representations that have been made to the Government relating to the recent legislation providing for full adult franchise in local government elections and polls. These representations have centred upon aspects of the property franchise. The Government considers that a case does exist for somewhat widening this franchise. It has, therefore, been decided to enable both non-resident owners and non-resident occupiers to vote in local government elections and polls. Under the existing legislation the right to vote is conferred on a non-resident ratepayer if he is the sole ratepayer in respect of the property: if there were a number of non-resident ratepayers, they had to elect a nominated agent.

The new amendments extend the provisions relating to non-resident votes so that they apply both to ownership and occupation. The Government is most anxious that

the legislation should meet with the maximum possible general acceptance and should be as easy as possible to administer. The Bill therefore introduces a number of machinery amendments to simplify and facilitate administration, and seeks to place several minor points, upon which doubt was entertained in some quarters, beyond the reach of argument.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes two amendments to section 5 of the principal Act. It was considered that, where a person is to be nominated for local government office, it may cause difficulties, especially in the case of the first elections to be held under the new system, to wait until the formalities of enrolling have been completed. Accordingly, the Bill provides that a person is an elector (and therefore eligible for nomination to local government office), if he is entitled to be enrolled as an elector for the relevant area, whether or not he has actually been so enrolled. New subsection (10) is inserted out of an abundance of caution to avoid any possible argument that, upon the commencement of the new provisions, a member of a council who does not happen to be an elector for that council is disqualified from office.

Clauses 4, 5 and 6 make amendments to the principal Act consequential upon the introduction of the new definition of elector. As the definition now embraces those who are entitled to be enrolled, there may be difficulty in establishing at a given time just how many electors there are in a specific area or ward. Thus, there may be problems in administering provisions that require a request for a poll to be supported by a stipulated proportion of the electors for a specific area or ward. These amendments seek to overcome this problem by relating these proportions to the total number of assessments in the area or ward in question.

Clause 7 makes a typographical correction. Clause 8 expands the qualification for enrolment as an elector in the manner that I have described above. The existing Act provides only for the enrolment of a non-resident ratepayer when he is the sole ratepayer in respect of the property (subject to some exceptions that I need not go into here). The Bill provides that a person is entitled to enrolment whether he be a non-resident owner or a non-resident occupier of ratable property. Of course where there is more than one owner, or more than one occupier, the provisions of subsection (3) will apply, and all the owners or all the occupiers must elect an agent to vote on their behalf at elections, meetings, and polls.

It will be noticed that subsection (3) is amended to enable the joint owners, or joint occupiers to nominate an agent, although one or more of their number already has a vote by reason of residence within the area or ward. New subsection (8) provides that, where a nominated agent holds several separate nominations he may vote in respect of each nomination. This provision is inserted to dispel any doubts or argument on this matter.

Clause 9 enables the voters' roll to be prepared in respect of a ward only. In the case of some polls or elections a voters' roll for the whole area may not be necessary. Clause 10 corrects a printing error and substitutes the phrase "returning officer or deputy returning officer" for the phrase "person presiding at the polling place". The former terminology is more widely recognised and accepted in local government circles.

Clauses 11 and 15 amend sections of the principal Act which relate to the right to vote at elections and polls. The purpose of the amendment is to make it quite clear that the voting rights are subject to the provisions disentitling electors to vote where their qualifications arise after

the closing day fixed in respect of the election or poll, and also to the provisions enabling an elector to exercise more than one vote where he is entitled to vote both in his own personal capacity and as a nominated agent, or in respect of a number of separate nominations.

Clauses 12 and 16 are consequential upon the amendments that provide for the compilation of a voters' roll in respect of a ward only. Clauses 13 and 17 amend sections dealing with the declaration of an election or poll. At present the returning officer is to make the declaration at the "close of the election" or the "close of poll". It is considered that these provisions would be clearer if they stated that the declaration was to be made at the "close of counting".

Clause 14 amends section 457 of the principal Act. This section at present provides that any lease of park lands must be approved by a meeting of electors. The Adelaide City Council grants many short-term leases of park lands in each year, and it is manifestly inconvenient for each such proposal to be referred to a meeting of electors for the area. The amendment therefore provides that a lease of up to three months does not require the approval of electors.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Proceedings Act, 1972-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: 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

It makes several miscellaneous amendments to the Crown Proceedings Act. The most important of the amendments empowers the Attorney-General to intervene in any proceedings in which the interpretation or validity of a law of the State or Commonwealth is in question or in which the legislative executive or judicial powers of the State or Commonwealth are in question. The amendment is rather similar to recent amendments made by the Commonwealth in the Judiciary Act of the Commonwealth. The Government believes that where important questions either as to constitutional powers, or as to the interpretation or validity of laws of general application, are subject to judicial determination, the Crown should be entitled to intervene for the purpose of submitting argument.

Because the Crown's intervention may cause the parties to the proceedings additional costs, the proposed amendment enables the court to award costs against the Crown in favour of the private litigants reimbursing them for those additional legal costs. The Bill also contains a provision making clear that, in proceedings to which the Crown is a party, the court has the same power to award costs in favour of or against the Crown as in proceedings between subjects. The long-standing practice of the Supreme Court has been to treat the Crown in this manner. However, it could possibly be argued that the general words in section 5 of the Crown Proceedings Act are not sufficient to take away the Crown's long-standing prerogative position. The amendment is designed to place this matter beyond the reach of argument.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts the new provision that places the Crown in the same position as a private litigant in regard to costs. Clause 3 corrects a printing error in the principal Act. Clause 4 enacts the new provisions entitling the Crown to intervene in proceedings in which the interpretation or validity of a law of the State or Commonwealth or the legislative executive or judicial powers of the State or the Commonwealth, are in question. Where the Crown does intervene it is to have the same rights of appeal against a decision given in the proceedings as a party to those proceedings. Whatever the result of the proceedings, the court is empowered to award costs against the Crown to compensate the parties for additional costs incurred by them in the consequence of the intervention.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Because the debate on nuclear resources was chopped off so suddenly when several members still wanted to speak, I will now air part of my views. The debate we heard this evening was not exactly a balanced one, although one or two speakers contributed substantially. I was especially impressed by the contribution of the Minister of Mines and Energy, who had a rational approach and did his best to present both points of view, the middle-of-the-road point of view. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Light also made impressive contributions.

No doubt modern society is using vast quantities of energy and at present it is almost entirely fossil fuels. I am told that about 230 000 calories of fuel are used each day. We are not even considering the amount that developing nations will use, although they form the larger part of the world's population. They will not have access to the fossil fuels that we have used, yet we have not made provision for any alternative fuel other than the one which is obviously available and which could serve as an interim fuel for at least the next 25 years. We have not considered that possibility in our mind-closed wisdom. One-third of the world's energy is used to convert into heat, one-third is used in transport, and one-third is used in conversion into electric generated power.

The heat we produce could still be obtained from known resources of oil, gas, and coal, and in that regard Australia is well off, because we have sufficient coal to provide for our needs for a century or two yet. However, our reserves for transport, as the Minister for Mines and Energy has pointed out, are totally inadequate and are available for between 20 and 40 years at the outside from known sources. Concerning static power in the form of electricity, apart from Australia, which as I have said is fortunate, the rest of the world will be crying out for resources when we have not adequately provided for our own energy needs, apart from those of the expanding and developing world. What happens by the year 2000? We hope we will have thermo-nuclear fusion, which is less polluting than fission energy, and hope that we can harness the sun, wind and waves, and that we will have reserves of geo-thermal energy, in which regard New Zealand is

fortunate. The results of hydrogen technology, which is in its infancy, provide a good chance of providing unlimited resources.

We have had a slow investment of cash and time in terms of research and experimentation. In other words, we have done little although we have known that a crisis was imminent. Meanwhile, everyone must admit that, of the available ample resources, nuclear energy is the only known alternative. We have not considered that we may use this as a stop-gap approach for the next 20 to 25 years: not as a massive world-wide commitment but as a sensible alternative in order to give breathing space while we devote more time and money to the essential research that will give us the solutions. The motion we debated earlier precluded any use for the world's needy. We will never be so absolutely safe that we will not have an accident, that there will not be a terrorist attack, or that there will never be things like theft taking place. We cannot estimate what will happen, because human nature is not calculable.

To say that we will do it when it is safe means that it will never be done, as the Premier admitted on television earlier this evening. We have closed the door in spite of the fact that the world's needy have to be considered. India and Japan are already desperate for energy, and they are among the world's most populous nations: Japan in proportion to its land size and lack of other resources, and India with its massive 600 000 000 to 700 000 000 population. They are already nuclear powers, and India has only about 4 per cent of its country surviving on industry. There is massive room for development there, but little power resources are left for it. Non-peaceful nuclear energy is already a world nightmare, but look at how much Australia has of known world resources. It has about 12.8 per cent, but if we add the Communist resources which are not declared it would probably come down to about 8 per cent of the world's reserves.

What position are we in? It is illogical to assume that we with only about 8 per cent of the world's known resources will influence the rest of the world unduly. However we may consider safety aspects and the rest of the humanitarian matters which have been discussed, we are a small fish in a large ocean. Most of the insecure measures have already been taken, so we are closing the door after the horse has gone. What could we do if we allowed our uranium to be mined and exported? We could put that money towards the absolutely essential research that has to be done in providing alternative means of fuel not only for ourselves but also for the rest of the world. This motion permanently denies any possibility of that happening.

Mr. Olson: How many lives are you prepared to sacrifice in the meantime?

Mr. ALLISON: About 100 000 lives are lost each year by people driving motor cars. Four lives have been lost so far from nuclear accidents, so the argument is completely irrelevant. In an aircraft accident in the past few days 500 lives were lost. The argument is not logical. There has not been a nuclear melt-down, and there is little chance that terrorists could make nuclear weapons by stealing nuclear material. There is little possibility of nuclear theft, because the nations acknowledge that we need security around our nuclear bases. This is increasingly obvious from the Fox report, the Flowers report, and the Rasmussen report.

Details can be picked out from those reports to support either the pro or the con argument. Where do we go from there? We have talked briefly about waste disposal.

Waste can be stored in stainless steel in liquid form, it can be vitrified into glass blocks, or fired up towards the sun and disposed of in the sun's great heat, or it can be put into very stable land masses on the ground or in the deep ocean trenches. However, there is no guarantee that the world will not suffer a severe earthquake. There are few areas free from catastrophe, so I suggest it should be kept in a stable land mass, and there is every possibility that in the interim 25 years, during which time we might use nuclear power, we will find alternative uses for the waste material, so it will not have to be disposed of permanently.

There is also the problem of the disposal of old nuclear power stations. It is proposed now to entomb the Oyster Creek nuclear power station in New Jersey. A sum of \$1 300 000 is being put away each year for the next 20 years and, with compound interest, it will then amount to \$100 000 000, and that money will be used to cover the power station in concrete and earth. It will be left that way for 100 years.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Why are they doing that?

Mr. ALLISON: Because of the potential danger. It cannot be dismantled, so they will entomb it, just as the Pharaohs were entombed. There is a joke about the Pharaoh's curse, so perhaps this will be something similar. The Rasmussen report has been used to quote the worst possible case and the lightest possible case. It has been used to support and to oppose the use of nuclear energy resources. Over the next 25 years we will need an alternative source of energy, and I suggest that human needs in that 25 years will outweigh the considerations by in some ways hypocritical conservationists, because they have not come up with an alternative to starvation for power and starvation for food, which will be far greater world catastrophes in the next 25 years than the shortage of fuel will be. No-one has thought about that simple humanitarian aspect when literally millions in the world are below the breadline and already at starvation level. These are the people whom we, in our wisdom, are trying to lift up at the same time as we are denying them the use of our nuclear resources. It seems hypocritical. I do not know the answers to the world's problems, but we can look at those in the interim 25-year period.

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

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I shall speak not about the Fox report or the Ranger inquiry but about the Horton report. I felt sure that, at the university last Saturday morning when the Libraries Association put on a seminar, the member for Mount Gambier would be there. I believe he is a librarian and has the interests of people and libraries at heart. Unfortunately, not one member of the Liberal Party was in attendance at the seminar, although several members of the Labor Party were there and pledged their support for the Libraries Association of South Australia in an endeavour to allow the people of South Australia to be adequately served by libraries.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They might have been out campaigning.

Mr. WHITTEN: I could understand that; they would need to be.

Mr. Allison: Not—

Mr. WHITTEN: Since I have been affected by industrial deafness caused by noise pollution, I am unable to understand what the member for Mount Gambier is saying in his falsetto. It is now two years since the Horton committee was set up by the Whitlam Government in 1975, and it is 12 months since its report was submitted. The

Fraser Government has not seen fit even to look at the report or to implement its recommendations in any way. Some of the recommendations of the Horton committee affect my district. Port Adelaide has no public library, and in the whole of the western region of Adelaide there is only one. The Horton committee recommended that \$20 000 000 a year should be spent on libraries, with \$2 000 000 being spent in South Australia. The Fraser Government has seen fit to put a brake not only on welfare payments and pensions but also on libraries. The wages aspect is something different altogether. If the Horton committee report were to be implemented, I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier would benefit in his district. Not only the disadvantaged areas would benefit. There is only one public library in the whole of the western region, and not one in the whole of the Federal District of Port Adelaide. In the western region there is the equivalent of one-fourteenth of a book for every person. The institute library in Port Adelaide is quite a good one, but it does not cater for the people. Libraries should cater for all people, the young, the ethnic community, with fact and fiction.

Mr. Gunn: There has been some fiction here tonight.

Mr. WHITTEN: Members of the Liberal Party could improve their education. The report recommended that institute libraries should be converted to public libraries or be closed down. I believe that the institute libraries should form the basis of the public libraries in the various districts. I would hope they would supply records, tapes, and cassettes, and cater for the ethnic community. The public libraries in South Australia do not cater for ethnic communities as well as they should. In my district of Port Adelaide I have a large ethnic community with many Greek people. They are great people, but they cannot go to a library for information because there are no books in their languages.

Mr. Mathwin: Why not send to Greece and get some?

Mr. WHITTEN: The Greeks are great people, and we should be catering for all migrants, even having books catering for Cockneys. There is no need for a great edifice. Libraries are for use, not for show. The institute libraries could be developed as public libraries if the report could be implemented, but I cannot see that being done whilst we have this rotten Fraser Government. There is no doubt that it does not cater for the people.

Mr. Allison: In 1935, a report showed the deficiencies in those State libraries—

Mr. WHITTEN: Why does the honourable member not get behind the Libraries Association?

Mr. Allison: I am a member of it.

Mr. WHITTEN: He should get behind it. Before long he will be one of those people who will need to get off his hind feet and say that he believes the Horton report should be implemented. He says that the Libraries Association has his support. What sort of support is it? Why not get to Fraser and tell him to do something to benefit the people, instead of just sitting there and paying lip service to Fraser and saying that whatever he says has to be correct? I am pleased that the Minister of Education recently announced that for Port Adelaide (and I believe Henley Beach) a mobile library will be made available to the people. There is also a condition that after 12 months of operation the councils in the area must be prepared to make some move in relation to a public library. The mobile library will be a great thing for the disadvantaged area of Port Adelaide, because books will be made available from the State Library so that all people can read them instead of their being kept on North Terrace, with people having to come into the library. I believe the State Library

should operate in a much different way. I believe the library should go to the people instead of the people having to come to the library. If the councils do not make a move in relation to a public library, the mobile library will be withdrawn. This is where many people can do much good. If they contact their local councillors and say that there is a need for a library in the Glenelg, Port Adelaide or Henley Beach area, those councillors will then submit to some sort of pressure, and subsidies will be made available by the State Government. This is what should happen, but it is not happening at present. There is a great need for people—

Mr. Mathwin: Speak to your council: that is the place to go.

Mr. WHITTEN: I do not know how you get through to some people, especially a librarian from Mount Gambier, who should well know what the need is for people in the community. Surely he should get up and support me. Instead of waffling on like he did about the Fox report, he should talk about what can be done for people and what Fraser can do for people, because we know full well that the Liberal Party will not do anything unless Fraser tells them what to do.

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

Mr. VANDEPEER: (Millicent): I want to put my opinions about the uranium debate, an opportunity I was not allowed this afternoon. This Government has said that we would have wide discussions on the subject, and my complaint is that the Government brought on this motion today with very little notice. I was disappointed that the Government did not adjourn the debate on motion and allow it to come up again at a future time so that a sufficient number of members would have the opportunity to express their opinions about a problem that is probably the greatest problem this country has faced since the First Fleet arrived at Botany Bay. I do not say that as a joke. I am serious; it is a very great problem. The Minister of Mines and Energy in his speech led me to believe that he was in favour of mining and processing uranium. When one reads the motion it is quite surprising that the Minister should rise, speak and give anyone that impression. He has denied in the past that he promoted the proposal to have an enrichment plant here in South Australia, but while on his overseas tour he took the trouble to have three copies of the report, which the Government prepared on the subject of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, with him. I wonder why he took those three copies, if he was not going to promote the idea while on that overseas tour. He said that copies were supplied to anyone interested. I think that, with photostat machines that exist today, there are probably many copies of that report floating about the various departments in Europe, the United States and Great Britain. He also said that many overseas people could not understand why we were so concerned about nuclear waste, because they considered they had overcome the problem. I do not believe that anyone has overcome the problem of nuclear waste. I know they are working hard on it and doing much research, but that seems to me to be the chief problem with uranium; it is the nuclear waste that we are concerned about. I am sure, since reading the Fox report and since having to study the British report (the Flowers report), that nuclear reactors have reached the stage where they are very safe. The member for Mitcham is not here, but I would take him to task for saying that he did not think anyone in this House had read the Fox report. I have taken the trouble

to study it and have read it from beginning to end. That report, in its principal findings and recommendations on page 185, states:

The hazards involved in the ordinary operations of nuclear power reactors, if those operations are properly regulated and controlled, are not such as to justify a decision not to mine and sell Australian uranium.

I think that that sums up the Fox report. That statement, to me, virtually says that we should get on with the job of mining and selling our uranium. The report explains that there are hazards and problems associated with the waste material. Because of the problems with waste material, I do not believe that the world as a whole should proceed flat out into nuclear energy. We should be spending a considerable amount of our resources on investigating solar energy. In Australia we have led the way in some fields of solar energy research. I understand that the Sydney University has produced reflective material that is a major breakthrough in collecting solar heat. It allows the heat to be collected at 200° Celsius, and even on a cloudy day, when sunlight has been reduced considerably, this new type reflector will collect heat at a temperature of 120° Celsius. This is considered to be one of the major breakthroughs in solar energy research in the world.

We are progressing in that field, but we need to put much more time and money into it. What we provide is only a drop in the ocean concerning the finance for such projects as solar energy research. I have been informed that the United States has collected \$100 000 000 to research projects dealing with solar research in that country. Our research projects would cost only a very small percentage of that \$100 000 000. We must continue if possible and allocate some of our resources to that research. In the meantime, we are so short of energy throughout the world that I believe we must also continue with the nuclear energy programme. By doing so we will preserve the petroleum supplies of the world, which are finite resources that will not last for ever; they will probably last only another 20 or 30 years. Somehow this supply must be prolonged. We do not know to what use we will put petroleum in future. Many synthetics and household goods are manufactured from petroleum. If we

use up our petroleum supplies making electricity or driving motor vehicles then, in 50 or 100 years, we may regret very much doing so, and the people of that time will perhaps curse us for our wasting petroleum.

Somehow we must conserve in the ground some of this resource to enable future populations to have the advantage we now have from the chemicals and synthetic materials produced from petroleum. We must therefore adopt nuclear energy, but we must take adequate precautions in doing so. Reports relating to this subject consider that nuclear energy is a relatively safe form of energy. The Flowers report considered that nuclear reactors are safe since it was recommended that they be built close enough to urban areas to use surplus heat to heat houses in those areas. At page 117, that reports states:

It is Government policy that future commercial reactors should all be acceptable in principle for "near-urban" siting although it is intended that the first few reactors of a new type should be sited remotely so as to gain practical experience of their characteristics. We agree, and would go further. Because of our views on the desirability of using the waste heat from power stations for district heating, we should wish to see nuclear stations developed that could be sited sufficiently close for this purpose to areas where a large enough heat load exists; this would dictate siting within about 30 km of the urban areas involved. The need for transmission cables would also be reduced, and hence their adverse effects on amenity. We acknowledge, however, that urban siting would present some conflict with security considerations and this aspect would have to be considered in deciding policy.

With such statements being made by that English Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution we must be fairly satisfied that nuclear reactors which have been developed are reasonably safe. It is only waste fuel from these reactors about which we are really concerned. I admit that nuclear waste is a problem, but I have faith in our scientists that in future they will overcome the waste problem. I am of the view—

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

Motion carried.

At 9.45 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 31, at 2 p.m.