

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, December 1, 1977

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a petition signed by six land salesmen, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Land and Business Agents Act to enable those who had applied for licences under the Business Agents Act prior to May 31, 1973, and had been granted licences subsequently, be entitled to be appointed as a land agent or, alternatively, to provide that, where a person was licensed under the Business Agents Act after May 31, 1973, and had since been employed continuously as a land salesman, he be enabled to be licensed as a land agent, provided that he obtained from his employer a certificate of proficiency and provided proof of continuous employment as a land salesman from May 31, 1973.

Petition received.

QUESTION

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

SHOPLIFTING

In reply to Mr. **KENEALLY** (November 23).

The Hon. **PETER DUNCAN**: The honourable member has asked that I set out guidelines on the rights of customers and shopkeepers in relation to suspected shoplifting. The following information on the searching of bags and chattels of customers at supermarkets and shops is supplied for general information.

There is no legal objection to the management, or any employee of a supermarket, or other retailing store requesting a customer to permit inspection of personal bags or other containers or chattels. If the customer consents, no offence is committed, nor would there be any right of civil action on the part of the customer, provided the inspection was carried out in a reasonable manner and not so as to give rise to a defamatory imputation.

It is not considered that the customer is obliged to permit inspection unless, prior to entering the supermarket or other store, he or she was informed that a condition of being permitted to enter the premises was that a search of personal bags or containers would be permitted by the management or an employee of the store. This condition could be communicated by a notice clearly setting out the condition of entry and being in a conspicuous position so that the customer's attention would be drawn to it before entering the store, or part of a store, wherein an inspection might be made.

Whether a customer has received such notice and whether or not the condition that the customer will permit a search to be made can be insisted upon by the management or the employee, will depend largely on the facts of each particular case, but if the management or employee can establish that the condition of entry was brought to the customer's notice and a search was carried

out, even against the customer's will, it is unlikely that the customer would succeed in any possible civil action for assault or for false imprisonment, if the customer was detained for a short space of time while the search was being carried out. Nor would it appear that any criminal offence would be involved. However, it must be clearly made a condition of entry that a search will be permitted and that the notice and form of such condition must be placed and worded in such a way that the customer sees it and that the condition has the effect of absolving the management and its employees from any liability.

A cashier or shop assistant could be guilty of committing the offence of assault where he or she searched a customer's bags and other possessions against the will of that customer where it had not been made a condition of entry that a search would be permitted. In addition, such employees could be involved in a civil action for damages for assault and possibly false imprisonment at the suit of such customer. Where an employer had given instructions to search, irrespective of the consent of a customer, and no condition of entry that a search would be permitted existed, the employer or management could also be involved in such proceedings.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: EXAMINATIONS COMMITTEE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. **D. J. HOPGOOD**: At the recent State election the Premier in his policy speech announced that the Government would establish a committee of inquiry to consider the adequacy of the present provisions for public and school certificate examinations. Some time ago the terms of reference of this committee were released to the House, and I would refer honourable members to the relevant page of *Hansard*. The membership of the committee is now settled and it comprises Mr. A. W. Jones, Chairman (Mr. Jones was previously Director General of Education in this State), Dr. C. Steele (Deputy Director, Sturt College of Advanced Education), Mr. M. A. O'Brien (Director, Education Services, Education Department), Mr. D. J. Anders (Executive Director, South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research), Mr. J. Menz (well known South Australian businessman), Dr. E. Mills (representative of the Public Examinations Board), Mr. D. Morley (representative of the South Australian Institute of Teachers), Professor E. S. Barnes (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Adelaide University), and Mr. D. H. Forder, as both member and Secretary of the committee. Mr. Forder, before his recent retirement, was Headmaster of Westminster School, and prior to that had had a distinguished career as a headmaster of secondary schools in the Education Department.

HANSARD PULLS

The **SPEAKER**: It has come to my attention that some honourable members have been taking the *Hansard* pulls from the Chamber as soon as they are placed on the tables, and some members have even taken out pages and thrown the rest of the pages into the waste-paper baskets. These *Hansard* pulls are for the use of all members during sittings of the House, and must not be removed from the Chamber, especially before the House sits.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: URANIUM

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the following motion to be moved without notice:

That this House condemn the South Australian Government for its deceit and hypocrisy in allowing exploration for uranium with a view to its future development by mining and enrichment, while publicly maintaining the Australian Labor Party's stance of leaving uranium in the ground,

and that such suspension remain in force no later than 4 p.m. Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

That this House condemn the South Australian Government for its deceit and hypocrisy in allowing exploration for uranium with a view to its future development by mining and enrichment, while publicly maintaining the Australian Labor Party's stance of leaving uranium in the ground.

I have taken this step, which is a motion of no confidence in the Government, because of the developments which have come to the notice of members of the Opposition and of this House over the past few weeks. I do not intend to go in any great detail into the history leading up to these developments and to this motion. All honourable members will recall that the Premier and the Government in the past have been ardent advocates of the use of uranium. The Premier has been quoted as having said that it is inevitable that uranium will be exported. He has talked in the past about the responsibilities that we have to export uranium to Japan and other customer countries. The Minister of Mines and Energy has also, on a number of occasions, talked about uranium mining and uranium enrichment.

Everyone has been familiar with the tremendous about-face which occurred earlier this year when, suddenly, the Labor Party's public attitude to uranium went completely on the defensive and it was decided that uranium would be left in the ground. There is no question that, at the Perth conference, the change in attitude became even more noticeable. The Premier himself took an active part in the motion dealing with this policy, which can only be interpreted as "leave uranium in the ground" and spoke volubly on that subject. It was noticeable at the Perth conference of the Labor Party that neither the Federal President (Mr. Bob Hawke) nor the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) spoke on that motion, and indeed they were most uncomfortable about it.

Indeed, members will recall that, after that motion was passed, the Federal President (Mr. Hawke) had to be pulled into line because of remarks he made that were reported on the electronic media. It was not to be wondered at that at the Federal election a policy would be put forward by the A.L.P. which highlighted its "leave it in the ground" policy. It was not to be wondered at that the Premier of this State should be chosen as the person to put forward the "leave it in the ground" philosophy of the Labor Party. He was chosen because the Labor Party believed that his credibility Australia-wide was very high indeed and that he had been a strong proponent of the use of uranium and, inasmuch as he had at least said he had changed his mind, he would have considerable impact on the people of Australia.

Those advertisements made by the Premier have been running since the inception of the Federal Labor Party's campaign, but it is remarkable that they have now disappeared and are no longer being used by the A.L.P. campaign committee. The reason, of course, is that market research has shown clearly that there is a major credibility gap as regards the Premier of South Australia,

his public stance and utterances on leaving uranium in the ground, and the actions and activities of his Government. That credibility gap is becoming all too apparent throughout Australia. The Premier is seen clearly as holding double standards on this issue. Even more damning is that certain members of his own Party have now become so disturbed at his double dealing that they are threatening to take action in Parliament to force him to change his Government's continued support for uranium exploration and possible future development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: That members opposite feign surprise does them great credit, but it does not fool anyone. The left wing of the A.L.P. wants to force the Government to withdraw all exploration licences where uranium is or may be involved. It is what the left wing, the Attorney-General's pressure group, wants to do. That is undeniable.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That is a total misrepresentation and a lie, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Attorney-General to withdraw "lie".

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am happy to withdraw it.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly not what the right wing and the fence-sitters, of which the Premier is the leader, want to do. The Minister of Mines and Energy, and the Minister of Education (the previous Minister of Mines and Energy) on the right wing certainly do not want that to be done, nor does the Premier, who is fence-sitting and hoping to get the electoral best of both worlds, but he is getting to be known for wanting to get the best of both worlds, and he has been foolish enough to go on nation-wide television demonstrating that he wants to have the best of both worlds. It is because of this threat of action within the House that the Upper House is not sitting today, even though there is considerable business on its Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about the Upper House in the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is certainly a problem to be sorted out by the Labor Party, which is clearly split asunder. Uranium is the issue, and the Premier's participation in Federal A.L.P. uranium advertisements is the cause. This is basically what has brought the split out into the open.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation and interjecting from both sides. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. TONKIN: The Premier's action has produced the obvious recent panic in A.L.P. ranks. Until this, Cabinet discipline has been just enough to prevent the split from showing, although everyone in the House has observed with great interest the general discomfiture of the Minister of Mines and Energy and his eagerness to justify continued uranium exploration and investigation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're just—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will have a chance to speak later.

Mr. TONKIN: Now, the split has come into the open for all who wish to see it. Statements made by representatives of the left and right wings of the Labor Party demonstrate a total lack of cohesion on the issue of uranium and Government policy. The Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy support exploration and are keeping up with technology, although both of them are unable to say of what value this knowledge will be if the A.L.P.'s policy of keeping uranium in the ground (which they publicly support) is maintained. Obviously, they are having two bob each way: they still believe that uranium will be mined

at some time, and I believe that they think that it will be mined at some time in the not too distant future, in spite of what has been said. This is an inescapable conclusion.

The Minister of Mines and Energy argues that it is really the supply of uranium to a customer country that is his major concern: he has said that several times, on March 30 this year, in reply to questions since, and publicly. On the other hand, representatives of the left wing of the Labor Party believe that exploration is totally contrary to the A.L.P.'s adopted policy, the one so widely publicised by our fence-sitting Premier. I challenge the Attorney-General to deny that.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I will.

Mr. TONKIN: We notice a query from the Hon. F. T. Blevins on November 22, in which he clearly showed his concern on this matter, and he asked the Minister to find out whether uranium exploration was taking place at Plumbago.

Mr. Keneally: Is he on the wing as well?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: I understand that he is a leading light in the Attorney-General's left wing pressure group. There is little wonder at the honourable member's concern. Since that time we have noticed, and, in fact, we could not help but notice, that exploration licences have continued to be issued by the Minister of Mines and Energy, and that, in many cases, these involve exploration for uranium. A list from the Mines Department current as at November 1, 1977, concerns exploration licences, and several of these licences have been issued to companies whose major concern is the search for uranium. Indeed, some of these companies have the word "uranium" in their title. I will not go through them, but there are many of them.

Uranerz, part of a large West German nuclear power authority, has been granted licences to explore in the Adelaide Hills, and about 200 notices of entry have recently been issued by that company. It is interesting to note that we understand that this action was taken without the knowledge of Cabinet and of several members of the Parliamentary Labor Party. Both the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy deny that these licences were issued to Uranerz specifically to look for uranium and, technically, they are correct. This is a large, world-wide concern, and it is interested only in nuclear energy. It is absolutely ridiculous to suggest, as the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy have suggested, that this company is searching for anything other than uranium.

Representatives of Urenco, a United Kingdom uranium enrichment plant, recently visited South Australia. They visited Whyalla, looked at the Redcliff site, and had detailed discussions with senior officers of the Premier's Department. They have seen the Premier, he says, to be warned that they have no chance of going ahead with uranium enrichment in this State. However, I understand they have been more than happy with the reception that they have received here.

Why did they come? Why have they had discussions? Was it simply to contribute to South Australia's knowledge of uranium matters? Are they, as Mr. Peacock has suggested, considered by the Premier to be a philanthropic society? They have come to Australia, and South Australia specifically, because they believe they can undertake uranium enrichment in this State. It is ridiculous to say that they have had no encouragement or believe there are no prospects here, and yet still come.

No wonder members of the left wing of the Australian Labor Party, who hold their views fervently, are disturbed, and I am not surprised that they have been finally motivated to threaten action, after hearing the Minister of Mines and Energy's attitude on this matter of

licences. They have also heard, obviously, following the Hon. Mr. Blevins's question, of what is happening at Plumbago. This initial query involves the area of the Olary province and mining leases Nos. 263, 330, 331, and others. The company Esso has about 20 men stationed in a mining camp on Plumbago Station, with drilling equipment, a bulldozer and large numbers of stored sample bags. Uranium has been found, and the quality confirms the predicted richness of the Olary province, something most geologists freely admit. That company is expanding its operations in that area. The left wing members of the A.L.P. are entitled to question the Government's sincerity and actions as a whole. Now, they have threatened to take action because at the same time as all of this is going on, the Premier publicly, repentantly (in a sanctimonious sort of way) and totally supports the A.L.P.'s policy of keeping uranium in the ground. I think that this hypocrisy would have been the final straw.

On whatever side of the uranium debate one may be, it is the hypocrisy and fraud of the Premier of South Australia that stands out like a beacon. No-one can say one thing and do another without expecting to be found out. If somebody is fool enough to go on nation-wide television advocating one stance while at the same time taking action as a Government which is directly contrary to what he is preaching as Premier, he deserves to be found out and will be found out, too; and he has been found out. He has been found out on a nation-wide basis.

No wonder the A.L.P.'s advertising, featuring the Premier on the "leave it in the ground" policy for uranium, has been withdrawn. No wonder the split between the left and right wings of the Labor Party is beginning to show up again and, embarrassing though it may be, the only thing that is stopping that split from widening into a chasm is the prospect of a Federal election on December 10. This will not in any way affect the result of that election, because the people of Australia will not vote for Labor Party hypocrites; but it is the South Australian Government that is being hypocritical and a fraud and a sham in this regard, and it hurts members of the Opposition to know that the South Australian Government is acting in this way and is being condemned by all sections of the community.

For that reason, I have moved the motion, which amounts to a motion of no confidence. The Government cannot back away from it, or try to squirm out of it. It is being challenged with hypocrisy and deceit, and in my view should not enjoy the confidence either of this House or of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition has moved a motion of no confidence in the Government. He has said that the ground of that is that the Government is guilty of hypocrisy and deceit. I have never heard a more hypocritical, empty, shameful and deceitful speech in this House in my life—

Mr. Millhouse: The fact is, you're both equally to blame.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:—than the one that has just been delivered by the Leader of the Opposition. He made a whole series of statements which are completely without basis, and I intend to deal with them. First, he has said that there is something inconsistent in the Government's action in relation to the exploration of uranium and keeping up with uranium technology, in relation to the policy of the Labor Party, as expressed by this Government and adopted subsequently by the Federal conference of the

Labor Party. He very carefully did not quote the policy, or what he himself had voted for in this House, and that was as follows:

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.

The words "mining or treatment" were specific and were specifically included because they were so. The Leader of the Opposition voted for that, as did every member of the House. There was not any exception then about this because, of course, to refuse mining or treatment was the basis on which we could ensure that uranium was not supplied to a customer country, and the unsafe aspect that we were looking to in that resolution was the supply of uranium to a customer country. That is the stance of the South Australian Government. It is the one which I have advocated publicly nation-wide, and it is the one that is maintained. There is absolutely nothing inconsistent in it at all.

Mr. Chapman: It's getting you into a fair bit of trouble.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is suggested that somehow or other this is giving me some trouble in the Labor Party. I can only say that the Leader in this matter has indulged in his usual untruthful, baseless, and shameless fantasy. The Leader, of course, did not cite one scintilla of evidence for all this fanfaronade of allegations that there was some great split in the Labor Party, that there was some great trouble, and that the left wing (whoever they are supposed to be) were against the right wing (whoever they are supposed to be).

The Leader of the Opposition did not cite any evidence whatever on which to base that statement. It did not matter that he did not have any evidence—he went on and made the allegation because it does not matter to the Leader that he has no evidence for what he says. All his duty is this afternoon is to tell any untruth because it is part of the Liberal Party's election campaign.

It is not the case, Mr. Speaker, that the polls are showing any difficulty for the Labor Party on this issue. The whole of the Liberal Party's campaign on this matter has not gone to the gravamen of the matter. It does not reply to the question of whether, in fact, it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country. It is on shaky ground about that. The whole thing that the Liberal Party has tried to do is attack me personally in order to distract people's attention from the real issues. It does not matter how many untruths they tell. The Leader of their Party federally never minds about untruths: it is his constant outlet. He has infected the Leader of the Opposition in this State, as is quite obvious this afternoon.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is there any antidote for the Liberal Party disease?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will find out, because the Leader, lacking any evidence, challenged the Attorney-General to support the Government's policy on this matter.

Mr. Tonkin: I asked him to deny that there was a split.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He will do both of those things.

Mr. Tonkin: Good, you told him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I have not told him anything. The Leader of the Opposition issued a challenge, and the Attorney-General came to me and asked whether he could participate in the debate in order to reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Mathwin: He wants to help you dig in your back garden.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order; he has interjected on three occasions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader of the Opposition then says that it is the Labor Party's policy that uranium will be left in the ground for all time. The Labor Party has never expressed that policy. It has not been put forward, even by the proponents of the moratorium petition on uranium.

Mr. Chapman: The press will write—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible at this stage to know for all time what can or cannot be done about uranium. What we can know—

Mr. Chapman: Here comes the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —is that the specific provisions of the resolution for which all of the members voted were quite clear, as follows:

The 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 shall occur in South Australia.

Members laugh at the motion for which they voted. Obviously, the Opposition was so disturbed about having voted for this resolution that it immediately demanded to know that the Government was not winding up its investigations into uranium technology. The answer was that it was not doing so. That apparently caused some disappointment on the Opposition benches, as Opposition members thought that they would have a go at the Government on that matter. Now, they suggest that there is something wrong about keeping the knowledge about uranium.

Then, the Leader of the Opposition says, "Well, Urenco came here. The Premier has explained what was told to them." Statements have been issued by the Director of Mines and the Director-General of Trade and Development, both of whom were present at that interview, confirming what I have said. The Leader of the Opposition does not bother with the evidence, but says, "Urenco must have got some other assurance from the Premier." He does not know what it is. He has not the slightest evidence from the company, yet he will make the allegation regardless of its having no basis.

The Leader of the Opposition then suggested that there was something going on in the Esso exploration licence area. The position is (and this has been clearly answered) that, of the four companies specifically named (that is, Rock Drill, Thompson, Esso and Nietzsche), only Esso is an exploration company. The other three are drilling contractors. There are four exploration licences currently, including parts of Plumbago Station; three are held by Esso, and one by Mines Administration Proprietary Limited and Carpentaria Exploration Company Proprietary Limited.

One area partly within the station is currently under application by Carpentaria for an exploration licence to replace portion of an expired exploration licence. The exploration licence allows the holder to explore for all minerals, excluding precious stones and extractive minerals. However, the area covered by one of the Esso licences includes the Crockers Well and Mount Victoria uranium prospects, investigated originally by the South Australian Mines Department.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That was 20 years ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, 20 years ago. Some

small uranium concentrations have also been located elsewhere. They have only an exploration licence. No mining licences have been granted for uranium. Specifically in the terms of the resolution of this House and in the terms which I used on nation-wide television, no mining or development of uranium has been allowed or is taking place in South Australia. Opposition members know that very well.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We know what the debate is all about, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course members opposite know what the debate is all about: it is about an endeavour by the Liberal Party to misrepresent the position as far as the Federal election is concerned, and nothing else. It is a Federal election exercise designed to put abuse at me personally on the basis of no fact whatever but in the hope that the newspapers in this State, which have refused to print the Government's replies on this issue (both the *News* and the *Advertiser* refused yesterday to print the Minister's reply to the attack made by the Leader of the Opposition)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They wouldn't show the evidence of his tampering.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Regarding the evidence given to this House of the Leader's deliberately misrepresenting what took place at the Australian Mineral Foundation, not a word of it got into the daily press, although the untruthful, quite mendacious attack made by the Leader of the Opposition was printed, because those newspapers are supporting the return of the present Federal Liberal Government, and so are going along with its policy.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. The honourable Premier.

Mr. Mathwin: Points demerit scheme!

The SPEAKER: Order! That is the final warning. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The plain fact is that the Liberal Party has been most upset by what has gone on national television on my part. It has no answer, so what it then tries to do is misrepresent me just as it represented me in the morning paper on the subject of pay-roll tax. Every Opposition member knows that the pay-roll tax incentive which I condemned—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the motion concerning pay-roll tax.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not develop that matter further, other than to say that it is clear that the Liberal Party does not mind what untruth it tells in the course of the election. If it can misrepresent a situation to the public, that is the course it will take, and that is the whole purpose of this exercise this afternoon. It was a shabby, shameful, and extraordinary performance from the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Prior to that, I thought that he would have some pricklings of conscience about using his office in the House for the kind of course that has been followed by his Federal colleagues. Obviously, he has no conscience at all.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Premier waxed loud and long about misrepresentation, but it is only since the Labor Party has made up its mind on its current public stance on uranium that the motion which was passed by the House earlier in the year has become such a big deal. He knows perfectly well that the complexion that he seeks to put on that motion is completely at variance with the

sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition during that debate. To round off the picture so that the public record will be straight and to refresh the Premier's memory, I will quote what the Leader said during that debate. The Leader made perfectly clear what was the Opposition's stance in relation to the motion. As recorded at page 3038 of *Hansard* of March 30 this year, the Leader said:

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.

The Leader went on to say:

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.

In all this public posturing, the Premier conveniently forgets to mention that, since then, that second Ranger report has become available, and on the basis of it the Federal Government has decided that it has a reasonable and legitimate course in which to make a firm decision. It was on the basis of that report that the Opposition in South Australia believed that safeguards did exist. In fact, a short time ago we had a public declaration by a former Governor of South Australia, despite the stance that he has taken in the past day or so, that it is perfectly safe now to dispose of nuclear waste. Speaking with Margo Marshall, Sir Mark Oliphant stated:

I believe that the great danger that humanity faces is the possibility of nuclear war. The waste problem, in the sense that the radioactive waste from nuclear reactors can be safely stored, has been solved—I have no doubt about that whatever.

It is all very well for the Premier to get up here and wax loud, long and eloquent about the hypocrisy of the Opposition and to put a completely wrong inflexion on the debate that occurred in this House. He well knows that the journalists and commentators were completely confused about what the Government was saying in the amended motion, and it was not until, on television that evening, when he was bluntly asked, "Does this mean that there is a complete ban on uranium mining?" that it was clear. It was not clear from anything said that afternoon. The answer was, "Well—

Mr. Venning: "Well, er,—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On television, the Premier said, "Well, er, yes, it does." I think it is perfectly clear that the Premier chooses carefully selected quotes. He will quote the terms of a motion and read into them what suits him at the time, but he does not go too carefully into the debate and the interpretation put on it in this House and by the media, although he made the position clear later by saying, "Well, er, yes, it does mean a ban on mining." The Labor Party has been doing back-flipping and somersaulting in relation to the uranium matter. The latest copy of the rules, platforms, and standing orders of the Australian Labor Party, South Australian Branch, as amended last year, states the following under the heading of "Mining":

The State control and development of uranium deposits

with adequate protection of employees engaged therein from the effects of radiation, and a vigorous effort to develop and utilise all sources of atomic energy for industrial and power purposes.

The Labor Party is back-flipping but the only problem is that all members of the Labor Party have not flipped backwards. We know that several people in that Party have not done that as conveniently as the Premier has done to get cheap capital out of the question of uranium and to get the votes of people whom he is seeking to bring into the fold, regardless of whether he agrees with what they are saying, whether the Minister of Mines and Energy agrees, or whether Mr. Hawke agrees.

We know that Mr. Hawke does not agree with the A.L.P.'s current stance. At a Federal meeting of his Party in Perth he said that he believed uranium mining should proceed and that we had a moral obligation to supply uranium to underdeveloped countries. I have already quoted his speech in this Chamber twice since then, and I will quote it again. I emphasise that these are the comments of Mr. Hawke since the last backflip of the Labor Party. When speaking to university students in Melbourne, Mr. Hawke stated:

If we keep ours in the ground, all that happens is that alternative suppliers fill the requirements of those countries which not into the future are going to make the decisions but who are already fundamentally committed to this as a source of power.

And so he goes on. He asks whether we are going to ban the mining of iron because it is used to manufacture armaments; are we to ban the mining of coal because it is turned into oil for warfare. It is a wise statement by the Federal Leader of the Labor Party. However, he has been pulled into line by some of the unions. He has been told to shut up on the uranium issue. We know that the Labor Party is posturing. We know the attitude of its Federal Leader, Mr. Hawke, and we know who is indulging in the cheap politicking in this election campaign.

The Premier says there is no evidence, but about 20 or 25 men are actively exploring in the North of this State, and they have found uranium at Plumbago Station. These men are actively exploring, which gives the complete lie to the nonsense of the Labor Party that it is not interested in uranium mining and that there will be no uranium development in South Australia in the foreseeable future. What nonsense! Only a week or two ago we had the Uranerz disclosure. A blanket licence was given to explore a large area of the Adelaide Hills, the only area exempt being reservoir reserves. That is bad enough, but Uranerz happens to be a subsidiary of the largest West German uranium company, and it has taken out a licence covering a large slab of South Australia to explore for uranium. That is enough to put a dent in the Government's credibility. The further evidence is that the company is now on the job with bulldozers and mining and drilling equipment over large tracts in the North of South Australia. At Plumbago Station it has about 25 men actively searching for uranium, and they have now found it.

Esso and other companies are involved in this exercise with up to 25 men on their pay-roll, so we are not talking about peanuts. We are not talking about a company merely trying to find out a bit more about uranium so that the Premier can become the best equipped person in Australia to say that it is not safe to mine it. How silly can one get? The Premier is justifying all this activity in South Australia (the activity of Uranerz, the activity of Esso in the North, the activity at Roxby Downs) which involves uranium by saying that, through these companies spending hundred of thousands of dollars (it will probably run to

millions of dollars), the South Australian Government will be equipped to say that it is not safe to mine uranium. How silly can the Premier get? How gullible does he think the South Australian public is?

The Premier has not answered what the Leader said this afternoon in any way: instead, he has merely indulged in his usual tactic of seeking to belittle the Opposition. We know that the Labor Party, through the Mines Department, is pressing ahead with extensive exploration for uranium in South Australia. Also, we know that members of the Labor Party are concerned. They cannot shrug off the concern which Mr. Blevins recently expressed in another place. He was obviously surprised that something was going on up North, and he said:

Some information was given to me, the accuracy or veracity of which I cannot vouch for.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member whether he is quoting from the *Hansard* report of another House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a speech by the Hon. F. T. Blevins, M.L.C. I believe it probably is, but I am not certain of that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall not quote from the *Hansard* extract but, of course, it is perfectly obvious that Mr. Blevins was surprised that there was activity in the North of the State. It is also perfectly obvious to the public at large, from sources maybe other than *Hansard*, that Mr. Blevins was surprised that a union official had said that he had delivered petrol to Plumbago station, and the union official was extremely surprised to ascertain that there was activity there in connection with uranium. It is no surprise to me that the union official passed on that information to Mr. Blevins and that Mr. Blevins has expressed his surprise in this connection. For the Premier to suggest that there is no consternation amongst members of his Party about this activity is obviously sheer and utter humbug.

The Labor Party does not know where it is going in relation to uranium. We know there is a division in the Party; we know that the Premier has adopted what he likes to suggest is a responsible stance: that there are some things that should be above politics. From memory, that was his last spiel. I was quite amused with the national advertisement of the Premier rummaging around in his cabbage patch with his organic fertiliser (that is how it opened), and then he came and—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe there is anything about organic fertiliser in this motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The motion refers to the Government's hypocrisy. I know what is happening in the Labor Party, and I found that advertisement highly amusing. There he was in the vegetable patch, and I will not mention organic fertiliser, because that would be out of order. Then we came to the crunch—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not believe there is anything about vegetable patches, either.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: With respect, I know there is not. The advertisement was concerned with uranium mining—

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sticking to the television advertisement that featured the Premier in a star turn for the A.L.P. in relation to uranium mining. I believe that that is highly relevant to the matter that we are discussing. Having moved away from his domestic chores, the Premier went into his spiel about uranium and finished up with the pious statement that some things ought to be above politics. If ever there was a Party that was squeezing

every bit of politics it could out of the uranium issue, it is the A.L.P. It is all right for the Premier to put his interpretation on a motion that went before the House, which the media could not understand, on which we put an interpretation that was explained clearly by the Leader, and which I believe I have repeated this afternoon that we well know what the position was when the Ranger report was issued, which subsequently it was. Let the Premier not accuse us of doing a back flip, because I have quoted the Labor Party's stance throughout the whole of 1976, when its only concern was to look after the health of uranium miners. The Party was going to exploit uranium. We understood that the State was going to own it, but we understand that that would be a condition for a socialist Party, anyway. We have not done a back flip. The pronouncements we have made are entirely consistent with a statement I quoted in the House that was made by the Leader when speaking to that motion. It was that we would not make a firm decision on that matter until the second Ranger report became available. It is now available.

The Federal Government has made decisions on the basis of that report, and so have we. The Premier should not quote out of context. He is always keen to accuse other people of doing just that, but that is precisely what he is doing. I support the motion because I believe it sums up adequately the stance that has been adopted by the Government in relation to uranium in this State. It is a position of complete hypocrisy and complete deceit.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): After the organic fertiliser distributed—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must stick to the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall, Mr. Speaker. After the material, then, equivalent to organic fertiliser distributed by the Leader and the Deputy Leader this afternoon, I move to amend the motion as follows:

To leave out all words after "House" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

1. Condemns the hypocrisy of the Liberal Party members of the House of Assembly in their apparent unqualified support for the development of uranium almost immediately after voting for the March 30, 1977, resolution passed by the House of Assembly; and
2. Condemns the Leader of the Opposition for tampering with material issued to the press and for his fraudulent misrepresentation of the facts and the position of the South Australian Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the amendment being put by the Minister, quite unusually to a motion of no confidence, is a direct negative of the motion before the House. I seek your ruling.

The SPEAKER: It is not a negative, and it can be amended.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yesterday, I demonstrated very clearly in this House that the Leader of the Opposition had tampered with a brochure describing a seminar to be held at the Australian Mineral Foundation and, having tampered with that brochure, as he admitted himself, he had issued a version of the brochure in his press release which modified the subjects to be studied at this seminar in terms of his own adjustments. That position is quite clearly stated in yesterday's *Hansard*. It was made quite clear on the relevant pages of *Hansard*. It was set out yesterday, but it was not reported in the press,

either in the *News* or in the *Advertiser*.

The first point I want to make is this: on Tuesday of this week, the Leader of the Opposition, in the course of asking a question, made an attack on the South Australian Government which was completely false and accused the Government of sponsoring a seminar to encourage development of uranium in South Australia—absolutely false. That was published in the *News* and published in the *Advertiser*. When yesterday I presented further evidence, demonstrating in detail how the Leader of the Opposition had tampered with the brochure, and produced a photostat version tampered with by the Leader which was issued to the press, and then a further press release was issued which quoted the modified brochure, and demonstrated quite clearly that the Leader had falsified information in order to make his attack on the Government, the *News* and the *Advertiser* printed nothing. I challenge both papers now to print the facts.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: Absurd.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: What are the circumstances in which we supposedly have an open press, when false attacks made by a member of the Liberal Party are printed and the truth is found out subsequently and is not printed? Let me deal with some of the matters raised by the Leader. First, I refer to the position regarding allegations of Esso's almost mining uranium. Let me make it quite clear that at present, out of 32 companies holding exploration licences in South Australia for minerals, four have as their principal objective uranium.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you answer my Question on Notice when I asked this a fortnight ago? You haven't given me the answer yet.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is getting information now.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All the presently known deposits of uranium in the Olary province were discovered in the 1950's by the South Australian Mines Department. No new deposits have been found in the Olary province since that time.

At the time, the deposits that were discovered were too low-grade to be worked. There is now, and has been for a few years, a renewed interest, but the grade of presently known deposits is low by Australian standards; the ore is relatively refractory, and it would be difficult to treat. It is not likely, even if at some subsequent date uranium mining were permitted, that anything would develop there. It also should be pointed out that the terms of the resolution moved by the Premier and passed in an amended form unanimously by this House are absolutely clear. The attempt by the Deputy Leader to suggest that they have got to be subject to interpretation is absolutely absurd. The resolution refers only to the mining and treatment of uranium; it does not say anything about exploration. It states:

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.

That resolution is absolutely unequivocal. Even the most simple-minded member of the media could understand it. It is obvious that it requires a moratorium; that is what it says—there shall be a moratorium on the mining and treatment of uranium. That means that there is a ban on the mining and treatment of uranium until the Government is satisfied that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You didn't read the Ranger report, then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has had his opportunity so speak.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and he made a mess of it. This is a report by the Director of Mines, who understands clearly what the position is. It must be pointed out that, with the current ban on the mining and export of uranium in South Australia, exploration specifically for this mineral has been drastically reduced. While there are still current exploration licences that involve exploration for uranium and while additional exploration licences have been issued, in fact the interest in exploration itself has been reduced. That is the fact of the matter, as seen by the Director of Mines.

Even the member for Mitcham, when he proposed an amendment, proposed a moratorium. His amendment was not in the terms of leaving uranium in the ground forever: it was in the terms of a moratorium, and a moratorium presupposes that any ban on the mining and treatment of uranium may be lifted. It may not be lifted; it may last forever, but it gives rise to two future possibilities—to go ahead or not to go ahead. As a resolution, it says nothing whatever about a ban on exploration.

The Leader of the Opposition voted in the South Australian Budget for a \$20 000 provision for further studies into uranium enrichment. He saw it in the Budget, but until the Federal election campaign he said nothing about it. He knows full well, and has known full well all along, that it has been the Government's policy that, while there is a complete moratorium on the mining and treatment of uranium, there is not a ban on exploration or investigations. We have a basic right, anyway, to know what the resources of this State are, and it is absolute nonsense for the Leader, the Deputy Leader, the member for Mitcham, or anyone else to say that it is inconsistent for the Government to allow exploration while there is a moratorium on the mining and treatment of uranium.

Any simple minded logician could say that the Government's position is completely consistent with the motion that was previously passed. As for the Leader's nonsense about a so-called split in the Labor Party, I do not propose to reveal anything that has taken place at Caucus meetings, but I can reveal what has not taken place: the matter of uranium has not been raised or discussed, not a word has been mentioned. Are we to have a situation in which the Leader of the Opposition can make up any fairy story he likes, spread it around, and have it printed in the press and put us in the position of continually having to reply to such fairy stories? Are we to have the press printing the Leader's fairy stories, and not printing the replies?

Is that to be the situation? How degrading is the Leader of the Opposition going to make our politics and political debate in this State? How much lower will he get and to what extent will he continue to use his fertile imagination to make up and spread outright falsehoods, and even to distort material in order to do that? If the standards of the English House of Commons applied to the Opposition in this State, the Leader of the Opposition would have to resign.

Mr. Whitten: Do you think he would do that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I do not. Concerning Esso in the Olary province, let me make clear that no mining has been undertaken by Esso in this or in any other area. Mining is not permitted under the terms and conditions of an exploration licence and, under the present ban on uranium mining in South Australia, no mining leases for these minerals are being granted. One would have to have a mining lease before one could exploit any

uranium deposit.

The material referred to by the Leader that is stored at Yunta is a selection of samples of cuttings from exploration drill holes put down on an exploration licence held by Esso, and is being held there temporarily pending transport to the laboratory for routine analysis. During the exploration phase of the Radium Hill operations by the Mines Department more than 20 years ago, many holes were drilled and sampled and the samples were stored in bags for transmitting to the laboratory. The procedure of drilling and sample storage now being used by Esso is the same as that employed by the Mines Department on the Radium Hill project. It is exactly the same, and any suggestion that mining is being undertaken is complete and utter nonsense. It is an activity that is purely related to the exploration that is now going on, a reduced exploration effort because of the moratorium that has been applied.

I also point out some fundamental facts relating to the development of any uranium resource, if it were to be developed. It is generally agreed that to set out to discover uranium it will take about five years from inception to the project about to be commenced, and a further three to five years for the feasibility and development study to take place before actual production occurs. In relation to any exploration effort that may be going on at present, it would not be technically feasible in normal circles, even if the moratorium were lifted, for any production to occur for another six or seven years, or so. It is nonsense and false to suggest otherwise.

I find it, and my officers have found it, as I explained yesterday, fairly intolerable that every action is subject to such gross misrepresentation, and we shall no doubt hear in a moment from the member for Mitcham, who will indulge in it all over again, from his point of view. He will be wanting to tip a bucket on both the Government and the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is surmising what the member for Mitcham will say.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and I am dead on. The position of the member for Mitcham is something that should be stated. He allegedly would leave uranium in the ground for all time, and yet his votes in this House have been only for a moratorium.

Mr. Millhouse: What the hell are you talking about?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The votes in this House of the member for Mitcham have been only for a moratorium. He has not presented a proposition to this House at any stage, to my knowledge, that uranium should be left in the ground for all time, even though that may be his actual position; I do not know. His Party and Mr. Chipp are in favour of a moratorium. There are plenty of members of the Australian Democrats, as the member for Mitcham well knows, who are prepared only to support a moratorium and nothing further at this stage; and, as the member for Mitcham, if he was even a simple-minded logician, would appreciate, a moratorium on mining and treatment does not imply a moratorium on exploration. That is the position. For the member for Mitcham, for the Leader of the Opposition or for any other member of the Opposition to suggest that Government policy is in any way inconsistent with the resolutions of the House or with what has been previously stated or what was stated by the Premier on television is absolute rubbish and is purely distortion for political purposes—nothing more, nothing less.

I believe we should not allow debate in this House for ever to get into the gutter of misrepresentation and distortion. All that happens as a consequence of that is that any statement made by a political leader or political

representative ultimately carries less and less weight. The ordinary member of the public who speaks to us—for example, about the Leader of the Opposition—simply says, "He is not worth listening to because we cannot rely on what he says." Unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues are damaging themselves as well as degrading the level of public debate in South Australia.

This is a most unfortunate situation because it turns public debate in this place into a charade, into a sort of lower grade version of the charade that goes on in the House of Representatives, where members of Parliament raise matters in the way that the Leader has done, not because he is interested in the people of this State (he is more interested in knocking them than in anything else) but purely because he wants to support the Fraser Government and we are in the middle of a Federal election campaign. That is the only reason for the distorted attacks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition on the Premier and on the South Australian Government. In the Federal election, he is desperately seeking to support the Prime Minister and, if the Prime Minister falsely represents the position of the South Australian Government and of the Premier, then Little Sir Echo has to follow and do the same thing.

Unfortunately for the reputation of this House, the public of South Australia is increasingly saying that what goes on in this House is irrelevant. They are increasingly saying that the tactics of the Leader of the Opposition are directed at talking down South Australia, talking down any kind of development that goes on in this State, and damaging the fundamental economic situation within the State. The opinion of many people in South Australia is that the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues want to damage the South Australian economy and that, if the Opposition can talk it down in any way whatsoever, that is what it will do. This has gone on for long enough, and I believe that while it is traditional in relation to a no-confidence motion that no amendment is moved, the situation is now so serious in terms—

Mr. Tonkin: You've said nothing about the original motion, and you know it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have answered everything said in the original motion, as well as anything that has been said by the Leader or the Deputy Leader, because anybody with any effort at analysis can understand the phoney case that has been put up by the two leading members of the Opposition. The phoneyess of this afternoon is not an isolated instance: it has gone on and on, and it is for that reason in particular that it is time, and appropriate, that a no-confidence motion should be amended and that this House should publicly carry a resolution condemning the Liberal Party members who, the day after they voted for the moratorium in this House, on instructions from Canberra tried to get out from under, and everyone knows that to be the case.

When we have a leading political figure in South Australia, a member of this Parliament, willing fraudulently to misrepresent the facts, alter documents in the way that they are presented in the press, and create a new set of so-called facts in order to substantiate some trumped-up charge that will suit the political purposes of the Liberal Party, then it is time to condemn that person in the strongest possible terms, and it is for that reason that I have moved the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): If I could, I would amend this motion to censure both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party, as they have both been quite deceitful on this issue of uranium. I will deal first with the amendment

that has been moved by the Minister, and I certainly support the first part of it, which condemns the hypocrisy of Liberal Party members in their apparent unqualified support for the development of uranium almost immediately after voting for the motion on March 30.

I do so for two reasons, as it is perfectly obvious that those members have switched their line from the vote they gave in the House on that date because their Federal colleagues have adopted a policy of favouring the mining and export of uranium. For no other reason that we have been given publicly, the Liberal members in this House now support that policy. I challenge any member of the Liberal Party who is present this afternoon to say that he does not support the policy that is enunciated by Doug Anthony, the Deputy Prime Minister, on this issue.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: They're Fraser's minions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is complete silence, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that you will note it. Not one of them will now say that he does other than support it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I know, but I am sure that they would have risked incurring your wrath, Sir, on that issue, if any of them had not been in support of Doug Anthony. So, we can take it for granted that they do now support it. That shows the measure of their hypocrisy. The other thing that shows the measure of the hypocrisy of Liberal Party members is the fact that, as I said in the House 10 days ago and as the Premier said again on Tuesday, the Leader of the Opposition signed a uranium declaration at a shopping centre because he did not have the guts at that time, in the presence of Young Liberals, to refuse to sign it. This is what it said and what the Leader of the Opposition signed:

The people's right to decide: the final decision on the mining and export of uranium must rest with the Australian people after a full public discussion.

It then sets out the dangers that the Fox report pointed out. Whether or not the Leader of the Opposition crossed out the request for a moratorium, and whatever his reasons for doing so may have been (I gave the reasons the other day: not because he thought that there should be no moratorium but because he said at the time that it should be of an indeterminate length and not of a certain length), the fact is that he signed, without alteration, the rest of that document, and he now goes back on it. So, certainly the Liberal Party and its Leader are guilty of hypocrisy in this matter.

Regarding the second part of the motion, I suggest to the Minister with respect that it shows some paranoia on his part. It was a small issue. Probably what happened was that the Leader of the Opposition made notes on the seminar programme (I was handed a copy of that programme, without notes, incidentally) which was given to a member of his staff and handed on to the press, and the mistake was made innocently on the Leader's part. I should have thought that that was obvious even to the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is making far too much of that matter. I thought yesterday when he started speaking of it here that he was protesting too much. So, I am not enthusiastic about the second part of the amendment. However, for the sake of the first part, which, in my book, cannot be denied, I intend to support it.

The issue of uranium is, in my view and in the view of many of us, the supremely important issue in the election, whether or not the people of Australia are prepared to recognise it. I regret that, instead of a sane and sensible debate on the issue among all of the political Parties, it has

been reduced by both the Liberal and Labor Parties to the same level as other issues in the campaign, that is, one used simply to score points, each off the other, and we are seeing that again in the House on both sides this afternoon.

I must admit that it was I who pushed for a debate on this issue in the House about 12 months ago by oral questions and Questions on Notice, and got from the Government an undertaking that, before the end of that session, there would be a debate on the issue. It was out of that debate that came the resolution which has been so much bandied about in the House ever since.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You did change your mind on the subject.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I did not change my mind on it.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You were pro-uranium.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was never pro-uranium.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Attorney-General wants me to take up more time on the issue, I point out that, even in 1975, I was anxious personally to put in the Liberal Movement policy speech a passage condemning the mining and export of uranium, but I was dissuaded from that course by my then colleagues, Steele Hall and others. I do not know whether the Minister is prepared to accept that, but I assure him that that is what happened in 1975. I was confirmed in my view when I went to the Ranger inquiry in 1976, and no-one who sat through that last week of the inquiry could, in my view, be other than confirmed in opposition to the mining and export of uranium. That is my personal position.

I was pleased that 10 days ago I was able to spark off this issue, at least in South Australia (and I take some modest credit for making the issue of some liveliness nationally), by my speech in the Address in Reply when I referred to the exploration licence given to Uranerz. I think it was that issue which started this whole matter. I was hoping that there would be some rational widespread debate on the issue amongst all the political Parties, and that is why I launched it in that way in the House 10 days ago. The Minister who has just spoken paid me the compliment of spending much time on my attitudes to this issue, even before I had spoken. He misrepresented them, of course, but at least he believed that I had something significant enough to say to try to rebut in advance what he thought I was going to say. I will read from the policy document of the Australian Democrats what our policy is on this issue so that there will be no mistake about it for the future. The document states:

The Australian Democrats believe that the establishment throughout the world of safe and renewable energy supplies must have absolute priority in our planning for the future. We regard nuclear energy in its present form, with the waste disposal, proliferation and terrorism problems unsolved, as the desperate resort of the clever but unwise. We are therefore opposed to the mining and export of uranium. We would use our possession of uranium to give us a voice in world energy planning, initiating a national programme of research and development of safe and inexhaustible energy sources, and pressing for international programmes with the same objective.

Don Chipp, in his policy speech, said straight out that we were in favour, as we are, of an indefinite moratorium on the mining and export of uranium. That is our position on the matter, and it was because that position must have been known to the Labor Party and to the Premier that I was particularly angry when I saw for the first time (in the *National Times* of, I think, two issues ago) the advertisement featuring the Premier and supporting the

Labor Party's election campaign, because that advertisement is patently dishonest in what it says, and the Premier must know that, even regardless of the exploration licences that have become such a hot topic since then. Well knowing the Liberals had changed their mind, the Premier stated:

On uranium, I'm asking you to vote as the Liberals did in South Australia, to play it safe.

The whole thrust of the advertisement is that the Liberals in this State support a moratorium on the mining and export of uranium, and he knew perfectly well, when he participated in this advertisement, that they had changed their mind and that what he was saying was quite inaccurate and completely misleading to people who read the advertisement. The writers of the advertisement went on (and, we must assume, with the Premier's authority):

When this, the full story on uranium, was placed before the South Australian House of Assembly, to their everlasting credit, every elected member—Liberal, National Country Party [I was not rated as being important enough even to get a mention in the advertisement]—everyone voted with the A.L.P. to play it safe.

He knew that they had changed their mind. He knew that I, then as a member of the new Liberal Movement and now as an Australian Democrat, had also voted against it and, indeed, as I have said, really promoted the debate that led to the motion being passed. Then, what made me even more angry were the next two sentences:

In this coming election, I ask you, whatever your political persuasion, to please do the same. I'm aware that can only mean to vote with the A.L.P.

That was outright and deliberate misrepresentation of the position, because the Premier well knew, and the Labor Party must have known when that advertisement was prepared, that the policy of the Australian Democrats was for a moratorium. In fact, Don Chipp had twice introduced a motion in the Federal Parliament on this matter. Incidentally, it was the same motion. This shows the hypocrisy of the Labor Party: on the first occasion, members of the Labor Party had to bloody-well vote against it and then—

The SPEAKER: I want the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Which one?

The SPEAKER: "Bloody-well".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry about that. It makes me so angry. Of course I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows better than that, and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have withdrawn. I have said so.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has not withdrawn. I hope he does so, unconditionally.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course. I have said so twice.

The SPEAKER: I want the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Should I stand when you are standing, or not?

The SPEAKER: You are reflecting on the Chair, and I ask you to withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Withdraw what?

The SPEAKER: To withdraw the word "bloody-well"

Members interjecting:

Mr. Millhouse: I cannot get up while he is standing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been waiting for you to sit down so that I could get up to say that I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! On many occasions when I am on my feet, the honourable member has remained standing. I am sorry that I may have done the wrong thing

on this occasion, but I think the honourable member should practice what he preaches.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As well as withdrawing it I apologise for using the word "bloody". But it made me so angry to see that advertisement and what had been written in it that I hoped you would pardon my language. The point I was making was that Don Chipp, in the Federal House, twice introduced the same motion opposing the mining and export of uranium. On the first occasion, Labor members were obliged to vote against the motion, whatever their views might have been privately. On the second occasion, because they had had their Perth conference, they were all obliged to vote for it.

If that is not playing politics and showing that members of the Labor Party are bound by their policies, whatever their personal convictions may be, I do not know what is. That actually happened in the Federal Parliament on this issue, and on a motion, introduced by my colleague, Don Chipp, concerning this matter. If you believed that I went too far by using a word that I should not have used, Mr. Speaker, my reason for doing so was my intense anger that that should have happened.

I do not want to take up all the time of the debate, but there are a couple of points I want to make. First, the Leader of the Opposition has made some rather absurd suggestions this afternoon that there is a split in the Labor Party. It is obvious to anyone who has had any Ministerial experience what has happened. In fact, these exploration licences granted to Uranerz were issued by the Minister of Mines and Energy without reference to Cabinet. Once they had been issued the Government had to back up the Minister. I wondered whether the licences might have been issued by the department without the knowledge and concurrence of the Minister, but reference to the *Government Gazette* of July 14 shows that that is not so, because the notice of proposal to issue the licences is signed by the Minister (H. R. Hudson, Minister of Mines and Energy).

There is no doubt that the Minister must have known about the issue of those exploration licences, and he did that off his own bat, apparently, according to what the Premier said the other day, without reference to Cabinet. So far as I am concerned, that is as far as any possible split can go. There is no doubt that the Minister is in favour of the mining and export of uranium. He is bound by Party policy, but he went as far as this, and then the whole of the Government was caught by it, and that is the explanation of that situation.

One other issue (and I hope the Attorney-General will deal with this when he speaks) is becoming of greater and greater significance in this debate. Indeed, it is a matter that the Government has studiously avoided—the question of civil liberties. In his address recently in Canberra to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, the Attorney canvassed the issue of civil liberties. I remind members that these will be issues, whether or not the problems of safety, proliferation, terrorism, and especially the safe disposal of waste are solved.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: They are related to terrorism.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True, and that is why they are so important. The problem of civil liberties will arise after the other problems have been solved. The problem of civil liberties will remain with us after the problems of safe disposal of waste are solved (if they ever are) and the problem of proliferation of weapons is solved. I was first impressed by this aspect when I heard the Archbishop of Adelaide say that it was important that there should be the most stringent safeguards on the production of uranium and the like.

I realised then that stringent safeguards must mean

control and surveillance of people, and that is precisely the line taken by the Attorney, and that is the problem that cannot be solved. If we go into uranium mining and a nuclear society, we will have what we would regard as a police State, and we cannot get away from that. The Premier has studiously avoided answering questions on this matter. Recently, I asked the following Questions on Notice:

1. Is the only problem arising out of the mining and export of uranium from South Australia that of waste disposal and, if not, what other likely problems are there?
2. What action, if any, does it propose to meet any such problems?

The only answer the Premier would give me is as follows:

The problems concerned with the mining and export of uranium were fully canvassed in the House of Assembly debate on the matter.

At the same time I asked two other questions which have not been replied to by the Premier and which were on the Notice Paper next to the question to which I have just referred. Those two questions were designed to see what the Government thinks about the issue of civil liberties and whether the Attorney-General was enunciating the Government's policy on this matter when he spoke the other day.

This is not something that is canvassed in the advertisements or that has, until recently, been prominent in people's minds, but these were questions which I asked and on which, so far, I have not received answers from the Government. I do not believe that even the Government could say that the answers required statistical information or that it was too busy to answer them for other reasons. My first question was as follows:

What action, if any, has the Government taken in its policy concerning the exploration and mining of uranium, of the problems of retaining civil liberties when enforcing safeguards against accident with, or theft of nuclear materials, or proliferation of nuclear weapons?

The second question was as follows:

Does the Government agree with the views on this matter expressed by the Attorney-General in his speech to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science in Canberra in November, 1977?

There has been a studious avoidance to answer the two questions. One does not need to be Einstein to know why—the Government is embarrassed on this issue. If what the Attorney-General has said is correct, and I believe it is, it does not matter whether the problem of waste disposal is solved because we will still have in acute form the problem referred to by the Attorney. My other question was as follows:

Was the Attorney-General enunciating Government policy on the mining and export of uranium in his speech to the Society . . . and, if not, in what respects was what he said not Government policy?

It will be interesting to see whether the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Premier, and others have the internal fortitude to give a straight and frank answer to those questions either in this debate or next Tuesday before the House gets up.

In my view those questions refer to what, in the long run, is the greatest problem concerning this subject. If I had my way I would vote for the first part of the amendment and I would vote for the motion in its unamended form because, as I have said, both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party are guilty of deceit and worse on this subject, which is of supreme importance to the future of Australia and mankind.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General):

Unfortunately, the House, from my viewpoint, has again heard a debate on the periphery of this subject. The Opposition has skated around the issues without coming to grips with the whole question of uranium mining and export. We heard the Leader of the Opposition start the debate with an extraordinary string of allegations and innuendoes, none of them based on fact or on the situation as it applies either to the issues or to the situation within the Government. I reject the allegations that he made that there is any hypocrisy or split within the Government on this question.

The issues are clear as far as the Government is concerned; we have made our policy as crystal clear as it could possibly be. The Minister of Mines and Energy is the Minister in charge of the Mining Act, the Minister to whom its administration has been committed. He is the Minister who receives applications for mining exploration licences and he must, under the provisions of the Act, exercise his discretion about whether those licences are to be issued. Nothing in the Mining Act provides that these matters must go to Cabinet. That sort of suggestion from members opposite is purely mischievous because the provisions of the Act do not require that at all.

The Minister receives applications, and he cannot simply refuse them without any grounds at all, or he would soon find himself in court being required to explain his actions. He must have grounds on which mining exploration licences are refused. It seems patently reasonable that, when he receives an application from anyone wanting to explore for minerals in South Australia, he should look at that application and, if it complies with the necessary requirements regarding the protection of the environment, and so on, it should be granted.

It is obvious, and I should have thought that it was only reasonable, that anyone seeking to explore for minerals in South Australia should be given a mining exploration licence in general terms. All the mining companies that have operations in this State know this Government's policy full well. It must be abundantly clear, even to the most dull-witted person in the industry, that this Government and Party are opposed to the mining and export of uranium in the present circumstances.

The decision of private companies to continue exploring for uranium is being made of their own volition. This Government has made it perfectly clear that, as long as the present circumstances prevail, it will not permit the development, the mining, and the export of uranium from this State. I should have thought the Government's policy was well known. One could say, from one point of view, that more prominence has been given to this by the Premier's having gone on national television.

It is farcical to suggest that anyone in the mining industry does not understand full well the import of the Government's policies at this time and is not well aware of them. The suggestions of the Leader of the Opposition that there is any split over this issue in the Government, whether in the Cabinet or in the Party room, were fantasy on his part, and I reject them utterly. My position in this matter is well known, and I support the action of the Minister of Mines and Energy in relation to the issue of exploration licences, because it is the policy of the Government that we should continue to find out just what are the resources of South Australia in this area. If companies want to spend money doing that, well and good.

I want to refer now to the attitude of the Australian Democrats. The member for Mitcham told us that the Democrats want to use our resources of uranium to influence world attitudes on the subject. How in the hell can we do that if we do not know what are the resources?

It is impossible for Australia to use such influence if we do not know the resources, and the only way to ascertain the mineral resources of this nation is for us to carry out exploration.

It seems to me that the attitude of the Opposition is that we should take an almost Luddite approach to this, that we should put our heads in the sand, and refuse to have anything to do with it. This Government does not intend to take that extreme policy. It is the Opposition that has the extreme policy in this matter. Members opposite want to go ahead and mine and export the uranium, hellbent on making a few dollars in the short term regardless of the long term consequences to Australia, to the world, and to the whole of the human species. They have the extremist policy, and it irks them to think that the Government of this State is taking such a reasonable and moderate approach to the matter.

We are not talking in absolutes. We are saying, "Let us be cautious about the matter and concern ourselves with it for a moment." There is no need for Australia to panic into any hasty development of its uranium resources. We have to sit back and take a long hard look, to see whether the world can develop safeguards for the disposal of wastes and for the use of the product in a customer country. That is the attitude of the Government: a moderate and reasoned approach. It has caught the Opposition on the hop, because members opposite have had the extremist approach of develop or bust. They say, "Let's get the show on the road and start exporting uranium at the earliest possible time, so that a few of our financial backers and supporters can make a fast buck while the money is good."

That is the sort of attitude displayed by members opposite, and it has been displayed again this afternoon in the cynical way in which the Opposition moved this motion. It is from a cynical approach that it did so, and I cannot see any other reason for the Opposition's taking this line. There is no clearer issue between the major Parties in this campaign than the uranium issue; Opposition members know that. It is a tragedy that there has not been a much greater public debate than there has been on this issue. Opposition members have had the opportunity on every occasion the House has met this year to raise the question of uranium in a straight debate with the Government, but they have failed to do so because they do not want to deal with the issues at large, nor do they want to deal with the major concerns that are fundamental not only to Australia but also to the future of the world and the human race. The Opposition has a much more cynical attitude than that: it skates around the edge with no-confidence motions of this sort. Empty rhetoric is all that the Opposition is on about.

It is important that we should be dealing with the issues involved in the whole question of uranium mining and export. I am glad that this matter has been raised today, but unfortunately it has not been raised in the context of a full debate on the merits of the matter. Nevertheless, the issue has been raised again, and I believe the people of South Australia will have the opportunity through this debate to hear more about the whole question of uranium mining and export. For that reason, it is a good thing that this debate has occurred.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had the extraordinary cheek again to use Sir Mark Oliphant's name in this debate. This is the second time in a fortnight that the Deputy Leader has used Sir Mark's name in this matter, no doubt without Sir Mark's permission. I am sure, after receiving a personal letter from Sir Mark a couple of days ago expressing his views on uranium (I am sorry I have not got it here as I would be able to use it), that the Deputy Leader certainly did not have Sir Mark's

permission to use his name in this debate. Undoubtedly, if Sir Mark was here to speak for himself, he would roundly condemn the Deputy Leader for misrepresenting Sir Mark's views this afternoon. Fortunately the former Governor of this State has recently been a signatory to a pamphlet, *Uranium: The Great Deception*, which was published in Canberra yesterday. An article in today's *Age* concerning that pamphlet shows the shallow, hypocritical, and dishonest basis on which this motion and debate were triggered this afternoon. The Deputy Leader used Sir Mark's name in an unfortunate way.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I quoted from an A.M. broadcast.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Deputy Leader is getting upset now, because he knows he is being found out. The deception is about to be exposed. The article in the *Age* states:

Seven prominent scientists and conservationists, including a former Governor of the Reserve Bank, yesterday accused the Fraser Government of "deliberate deception" on the uranium issue.

Dr. H. C. Coombs, and nuclear physicist Sir Mark Oliphant were among the signatories to a pamphlet, released in Canberra yesterday, called *Uranium: The Great Deception*.

It then lists the other public figures. The article then says:

The pamphlet states that "there is no aspect of the Fraser Government record where deliberate deception is more clearly apparent than in the statements on uranium policy. This pamphlet illustrates their deception."

It is interesting to note that the pamphleteers did not limit their criticisms of the Fraser Government's deception to the question of uranium. They well recognised the deceptive nature of that Government *in toto*. The article states:

It says six false statements are made in Government brochures entitled *Uranium—Australia's Decision*.

That was the Government's propaganda put out on this subject. The pamphlet lists the "false statements" as follows:

Australia has an obligation to provide the rest of the world with a vital source of fuel and energy.

Australia will gain significant wealth through uranium sales.

Uranium mining and milling will make a substantial contribution to employment opportunities in Australia.

The pamphlet states that the three statements have been categorically denied by the Ranger Royal Commission, and it lists as false and misleading the following statements:

By selling uranium, Australia can ensure safeguards against bombs and terrorists.

Technology exists for safe management and ultimate disposal of highly radioactive waste.

The promotion of Aboriginal interests in the Northern Territory is one of the most important aspects of the uranium decision.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the suspension of Standing Orders expires at 4 p.m., I will now put the necessary questions.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack,

Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Gunn and Mathwin.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hoppood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Rusack, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Gunn and Venning.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

SHOP TRADING HOURS BILL

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S ALLEGATION

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The honourable member for Mitcham, in the Address in Reply debate on Tuesday of last week made a disgraceful suggestion that the former permanent head of the Environment Department and myself as Minister had been dismissed because of "some considerable scandal in that department". He further stated in relation to me that "because we have never had any explanation as to why he was replaced and given a complete sinecure", the Deputy Premier should make a statement to give the reasons for this alleged "sacking".

I am sure that all members of this House are aware of the petty-mindedness and viciousness of the honourable member for Mitcham, and I did not consider that such ridiculous statements emanating from him were worthy of a reply. However, on Tuesday afternoon, the honourable member, in a personal explanation, at least had the decency to apologise to Dr. Inglis for any hurt he "may have unintentionally caused him". He quite disingenuously said, despite the clear meaning of his statement in the Address in Reply debate, that he did not mean to imply that Dr. Inglis was involved in any dishonesty. I am grateful that he has at least, and at last, done the right thing by that particular officer in a personal explanation following the reply provided on Tuesday to Question on Notice No. 219 concerning Dr. Inglis's transfer. However, I am concerned that the honourable member has not taken the opportunity despite another reply to question No. 221 concerning the reallocation of portfolios in which I was involved, to make a similar apology so far as I am concerned. I have waited for two days since that time and hence I wish to make this explanation.

So far as the inquiry being conducted by an officer of the Legal Services Department into the trapping of birds is concerned, the facts of the matter are as follows: While on my way to a meeting of Conservation Ministers in Cairns on July 28, I read a letter which had been received by the

department a few days earlier from a person complaining about his treatment by officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Division concerning the granting of permits to keep protected fauna. I immediately called for a report on this matter. In fact, it was written during a stopover at Sydney Airport and handed to Dr. Inglis that evening in Cairns. That was on the Thursday, and I asked for a report on the following Wednesday. Dr. Inglis and Mr. Lyons were in conference until Sunday. In fact, Dr. Inglis and Mr. Lyons, the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Division, came to see me on the Thursday morning and gave as their explanation for the delay their preoccupation with another matter affecting the same area which was of considerable concern to them.

As a result of the subsequent discussion, I approved conversations which they had already carried out with the appropriate authorities and assured them that I wanted the inquiries carried out with the utmost thoroughness. I subsequently met the investigating officer on two occasions, the first to give him information from the writer of the letter which I had received in a personal discussion, and on the second occasion in September to get a progress report on his investigations. These were still continuing at that time, and I had no further report on the matter before I was appointed Chief Secretary. The honourable Premier had no knowledge of the matter when he took the opportunity afforded by the constitution of a new Ministry after the election to make a minor change in the allocation of portfolios, and there was no reason why he should have known about it.

The position is that Dr. Inglis and Mr. Lyons quite properly reported to me a matter that could have involved the integrity of some officers. I quite properly approved the appropriate investigation to determine whether any misconduct had occurred. It is therefore disgraceful for the honourable member for Mitcham to suggest that either the Director or I as Minister was in any way involved in what he has described as a scandal.

The honourable member for Mitcham (and I am required by the forms of this House so to refer to him) is quite unscrupulous in using this House to throw mud whenever he believes he may get a headline. On Tuesday, November 22, he said:

I do not as a rule ask questions without some reason for asking them. I have been told (and this question was designed to test the reliability of this information) that there is a matter of some considerable scandal in the Environment Department.

I believe that the honourable member is most irresponsible in making wild allegations merely, as he says, to test the reliability of the malicious rumours that he chooses to peddle.

His conduct reminds me of the famous quotation by Stanley Baldwin referring to power without responsibility. The honourable member has all the power of a member of Parliament and he is perched on the cross benches quite secure in the knowledge that he will never be in a position of responsibility.

Regarding the other suggestion, that my appointment to the honourable and responsible position of Chief Secretary represents being given a complete sinecure, this is too ludicrous for words. I point out to the House that the Chief Secretary is responsible, *inter alia*, for the Police Department, the Correctional Services Department, the Audit Office, and the Services and Supply Department, which includes such important Government services as the Supply and Tender Branch, the A.D.P. Centre, the Government Printing Office and the Chemistry Division.

For a man who has raised the important issue of Special Branch files to say that the Minister in charge of the

police, for example, occupies a sinecure is too ridiculous for words. I know that this "demotion" line has been canvassed by one of the local press lackeys. This uninformed scribbler stated that I was unpopular with the conservation movement, which is belied by at least five letters from different responsible bodies and many verbal comments expressing appreciation for my assistance and support in preserving the environment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will need to seek further leave.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I seek further leave, Sir, although I have only about one sentence to go.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is only to be expected, I suppose, that attempts will be made by members of the Opposition to make political capital out of one of the very few changes made in the Dunstan Ministry, but not one, other than the honourable member for Mitcham, has stooped to suggesting that it might be due to a so-called scandal involving me as Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Honourable members: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RATES AND TAXES REMISSION) BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1975; the Sewerage Act, 1929-1975; the Land Tax Act, 1936-1977; the Local Government Act, 1934-1977; and the Irrigation Act, 1930-1975. 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 gives effect to the promise of the Government to increase the maximum remissions of rates and taxes originally provided for by the Rates and Taxes Remission Act, 1974, and increased by the Statutes Amendment (Rates and Taxes Remission) Act, 1975. The remissions are available to pensioners who are holders of a pensioner health benefit card or State concession card and other persons in circumstances of financial hardship. The Bill increases from \$50 to \$75 the maximum remissions to be granted in respect of water or sewerage rates. It increases from \$100 to \$150 the maximum remission to be granted in respect of land tax or local government rates. The increases are to have effect in the next financial year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on July 1, 1978. Clause 3 sets out the arrangement of the measure. Part II, comprising clauses 4 and 5, provides for the increase from \$50 to \$75 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of water rates levied under the Waterworks Act.

Part III, comprising clauses 6 and 7, provides for the increase from \$50 to \$75 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of sewerage rates levied under the Sewerage Act. Part IV, comprising clauses 8 and 9, provides for the increase from \$100 to \$150 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of land tax.

Part V, comprising clauses 10, 11 and 12, provides for the increase from \$100 to \$150 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of local government rates and the increase from \$50 to \$75 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of drainage scheme rates levied under the Local Government Act. Part VI, comprising clauses 13 and 14, provides for the increase from \$50 to \$75 in the maximum remission to be granted in respect of rates levied under the Irrigation Act.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

One of its main purposes is to remove the discrimination contained in the Act against adults being trained to be tradesmen. Section 28 (2) of the Apprentices Act, which currently prevents any person over the age of 23 years being party to an indenture of apprenticeship, is contrary to the principle contained in International Labor Office convention No. 142. That convention provides, as follows:

The policies and programmes (of member countries) shall encourage and enable all persons, on an equal basis and without any discrimination whatsoever, to develop and use their capabilities for work in their own best interests and in accordance with their own aspirations, account being taken of the needs of society.

The Government believes that it is important that this principle should be given effect to. The Bill includes the necessary provisions to enable the Apprenticeship Commission to approve of a mature-age person entering into an indenture of apprenticeship. It is not expected that large numbers of adults will be trained. Experience in other States where there are no age limitations reveals that adult apprentices do not exceed 3 per cent of enrolments in trade-training courses.

It is appropriate that in introducing this Bill I make a few general observations on the current situation in respect of the training of apprentices. Notwithstanding the high level of unemployment and the uncertain economic climate, it is expected that the total number of first-year apprentices in South Australia in 1977 will exceed 3 700, which will be an all-time record. However, the number of skilled tradesmen added to the work force varies considerably from year to year, because of fluctuations in intakes, and is much lower than indicated by the intake figures, because about 15 per cent of all indentures are not completed.

In September, 1976, the results were released of a preliminary study of the skilled work force that used the 1971 census information as a base. It indicated that to the end of 1975 the national input of skilled tradesmen from all sources had not been sufficient to match losses through retirements, changes of occupation, and other causes. In South Australia, it was estimated that the number of skilled tradesmen in the work force declined by 12 per cent in those five years (the national figure was slightly higher).

While statistics of this kind need to be treated with some caution, they cannot be regarded as other than disturbing, and direct Government action to ensure that sufficient numbers of skilled tradesmen are being trained to meet the needs of the State when the economy improves.

The South Australian Government has already taken

several important initiatives in order to prepare for future needs. It recognised that, while much depends on the restoration of a high level of economic activity and employer confidence, the provision of additional training opportunities and the removal of negative influences inhibiting the recruitment and training of apprentices are vital to an improvement in the current situation.

To this end, in December, 1976, Cabinet directed all State Government departments to employ, in addition to their own requirements, as many apprentices as they had capacity to train. As a result, 117 additional apprentices commenced their indentures from the beginning of this year. The cost of training these additional tradesmen for industry is being completely met by the State Government.

Last May, Cabinet appointed an interdepartmental committee to report on and recommend the most efficient methods of selection and training of apprentices that could be adopted by Government departments and instrumentalities. It is hoped that action being taken on the committee's first report will enable better use to be made of training facilities in State Government departments and instrumentalities, with the result that 52 first-year apprentices will be trained, in addition to those to be employed to meet the Government's own needs. As a further move towards providing additional training opportunities, pre-apprenticeship training courses have been conducted in various trades this year.

In recent years the Government has taken steps to give all apprentices in country districts the same technical college training as is given to metropolitan apprentices. Since the beginning of 1976 all correspondence training for apprentices has been eliminated, and country apprentices now attend a technical college, either in the metropolitan area or in a country city. The Government subsidises the cost of board and lodging during their period of block release training, which is generally for a total period of 20 weeks during their apprenticeship, and pays the fares incurred by apprentices in travelling from their homes to technical colleges and return.

It gives me pleasure to indicate that, as a result of the action we have taken, it is now possible to delete from the Act all references to correspondence course training: this is one of the purposes of the Bill. As a result, it also eliminates from the Act the restricting technical school district concept now contained therein. This will enable the Director-General of Further Education to have much more flexibility in the provision of courses of instruction for apprentices at any approved place of instruction.

At present, all time spent by an apprentice in classes of approved instruction during normal working hours is reckoned as part of the time served under the indenture of apprenticeship. The Bill extends this provision so that time spent by an apprentice at such classes outside his normal working hours will also be reckoned as part of the time served under his indenture of apprenticeship. This is particularly relevant in respect of apprentice cooks and bakers who are normally employed on shift work but have to attend classes during the day in their own time.

It is at present possible for an employer to continue to employ a junior as an improver or juvenile worker on the promise to indenture him without notifying the Apprenticeship Commission. While this has not happened frequently, cases have occurred to the detriment of the youth concerned. The Government believes that it should be incumbent upon all employers to notify the Commission of any person in his employ who has applied to be apprenticed to that employer and the employer's response to such application.

The opportunity has also been taken to include

machinery amendments to simplify the work of the Apprenticeship Commission in achieving the objects of the Act but at the same time providing appropriate safeguards for apprentices. The penalties provided in the Act have been increased to bring them more into line with present day monetary values. I seek leave to have the Parliamentary Counsel's report on the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act, which sets out the definitions necessary for the purpose of the Act, and amongst other things provides a definition of "mature age apprentice". Clause 4 amends section 6 of the principal Act by correcting what has now become an incorrect reference to the body now known as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, South Australia Incorporated. Clause 5 amends section 13 of the principal Act, which sets out the general powers of the Commission. The most significant amendments made by this clause are to ensure that the power formerly contained in section 13(1)(i) is in harmony with section 14 of the principal Act, and power to approve courses of "off the job training" is vested in the Commission.

Clause 6 amends section 14 of the principal Act by bringing up to date a reference to the officer now known as the Director-General of Further Education. Clause 7 repeals section 17 of the principal Act by removing a now unnecessary power to declare technical school districts. Clause 8 amends section 18 of the principal Act by striking out obsolete references to technical colleges and by somewhat increasing the penalties provided for breaches of the provision of this section to accord with changes in money values. In the interests of clarity, subsection (3) of this section has been recast. Clause 9 amends section 19a of the principal Act by recasting subsection (1) of that section and by increasing the penalties for breaches thereof.

Clause 10 repeals section 19 of the principal Act, which is now unnecessary as no provision is to be made in the measure for correspondence courses. For the same reason, clause 11 repeals section 20 and clause 12 repeals section 22. Clause 13 amends section 23 of the principal Act by making clear that time spent at an approved course of instruction, whether inside or outside ordinary working hours is reckoned as time spent at work. Clause 14 amends section 24 of the principal Act and is a consequential amendment. Clause 15 amends section 25 of the principal Act by bringing up to date references to the Director-General of Further Education. Clause 16 amends section 25a of the principal Act by striking out a reference to correspondence courses.

Clause 17 amends section 26 of the principal Act, which deals with the form of indentures, by increasing the penalty for an offence against subsection (2). The penalty for an offence against that section is increased from \$100 to \$500. Clause 18 inserts a new section 26aa in the principal Act and will permit the entry into indentures of apprenticeships by mature age apprentices, as defined, subject to the approval of the commission and the unanimous recommendation of the relevant Advisory Trade Committee. The attention of honourable members is particularly drawn to this clause. Clause 19 amends section 26a of the principal Act by increasing the penalty for a breach of that section from \$100 to \$500.

Clause 20 amends section 26b of the principal Act by increasing the penalties in a similar manner. Clause 21

enacts in the principal Act a new section 26c which enjoins a prospective employer of an apprentice to inform the commission of any application he received from a prospective apprentice. Clause 22 amends section 27 of the principal Act by increasing the penalty for a breach of that section from \$100 to \$500. Clause 23 repeals section 28 of the principal Act, which, in effect, prevented mature-age persons from entering into indentures of apprenticeship. Clause 24 amends section 29 of the principal Act by extending by two months the period within which certain returns must be provided and by increasing the penalties for a breach of that section.

Clause 25 makes a formal amendment to section 33 of the principal Act. Clause 26 makes consequential amendments to section 35 of the principal Act and increases the monetary penalty from \$100 to \$500. Clause 27 repeals section 36 of the principal Act and substitutes a new section excluding reference to fees payable for the instruction of apprentices as these are no longer applicable. Clause 28 amends section 37 of the principal Act by increasing the maximum penalties that may be imposed under any regulation from \$100 to \$500. Clause 29 amends section 38 of the principal Act by making certain formal amendments to subsection (2) which is the evidentiary provision of this section.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the compensation of persons who suffer injury in consequence of the commission of offences; to repeal the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1969-1974; and for other purposes. 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

The object of this Bill is to provide for a new, and better, scheme for the compensation of innocent victims of crimes who suffer injury as a result of those crimes. The present Act has undergone a complete review in consequence of the criticisms that have been levelled against it over the years, both by members of the Judiciary and by the Law Society. The decision was made to provide a new Act altogether.

Certain major changes have been made to the present scheme, and various uncertainties have been resolved. The existing monetary limit of \$2 000 has been raised to \$10 000, an amount that is much more realistic in these inflationary times. However, where the amount of compensation exceeds \$2 000, a victim will only get \$2 000, plus three-quarters of the excess over that amount. It is made quite clear that a victim can only recover one amount of compensation for his injury, even though there may have been more than one offender, or more than one offence.

The right to claim compensation is extended to the dependent family of a victim who dies as the result of an offence, provided that the dead victim has not been awarded compensation under the Act. This entitlement will to some small extent alleviate the financial hardship suffered by families where a bread-winner is, for example, murdered. It is also made quite clear that this Act applies to juveniles. All persons who obtain an order for compensation will now be able to have that order paid out within a month by the Attorney-General. Thus, this quick method of recovery will be available to all claimants. The Attorney-General has a discretion to take into account, when paying out an order, all amounts that the claimant is likely to receive by way of compensation otherwise than under the Act, insurance, superannuation, etc.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Clause 3 repeals the existing Act. Clause 4 provides the necessary definitions. The definition of "injury" has not been changed. The definition of "offence" makes it quite clear that an offence is deemed to have been committed for the purposes of this Act even where the alleged offender has a specified defence, or is of an age where the law says he cannot commit an offence. Clause 5 provides that the repealed Act shall continue to govern an application for compensation in relation to injury arising from any offence committed before the new Act comes into operation.

Clause 6 excludes from the operation of this Act (as the repealed Act did) injuries which are covered by third party insurance, or by the nominal defendant provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, as the case may be. Clause 7 provides for the right to claim compensation under this Act. A victim may himself apply within 12 months of the date of the offence. The personal representative of a dead victim, or other suitable person, may (where the victim has not himself obtained an order) claim compensation for the financial loss suffered by the victim's dependent family. An application must be made to the court of trial, or where the offender has not been tried, to a District Criminal Court. Applications in relation to juvenile offenders, of course, will be heard by a Juvenile Court.

All orders for compensation are to be made against the Crown. Where compensation does not exceed \$2 000, the full amount may be awarded. Where compensation does exceed \$2 000, an order may be made for \$2 000 plus three-quarters of the excess over that amount. No order may be made for an amount less than \$100 nor more than \$10 000. The court is obliged to have regard to the conduct of the victim and may refuse to make an order, or may reduce the amount of compensation awarded, if it considers that the victim's behaviour contributed to the commission of the offence or to the injury. Upon making an order, the court must ascertain the means of a convicted offender, and also the payments to which the claimant may be entitled otherwise than under the Act.

Clause 8 provides that an applicant is only required to discharge the civil burden of proof (that is, it is not necessary for him to establish a fact beyond all reasonable doubt). The court may receive in evidence transcripts of evidence from other courts. Clause 9 provides that a victim may only obtain one order for compensation in respect of his injury notwithstanding that the injury resulted from a series of offences committed by one offender, or a number of offenders. Clause 10 provides that a solicitor may charge costs only in accordance with a prescribed scale. This will ensure that a victim does not find that his compensation is "eaten away" by high legal costs.

Clause 11 obliges the Attorney-General to satisfy an order for compensation within 28 days of the order being

made. The Attorney-General is given full discretion to take into account all payments the claimant may receive otherwise than under this Act. When the Attorney-General has made a payment under this Act, he may recover that amount of that payment from a convicted offender by summary process. The Attorney-General is subrogated to the rights of the claimant as against the offender, and all the rights of the offender in respect of indemnity or contribution by any other person.

Clause 12 provides for the payment of moneys recovered by the Attorney-General into General Revenue. Clause 13 ensures that recovery under this Act, or proceedings under this Act, shall not prejudice a claimant's rights of recovery under any other Act or law. However, if a person recovers any amount under this Act, that will be taken into account in any other proceedings for recovery of compensation. Clause 14 is the usual financial provision.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 29. Page 1071.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill appears to be for the purpose of placing beyond doubt the fact that Crown counsel, although not practising in their own right, can have the right to appear, and the measure seems to put the situation beyond doubt. I have inquired about the matter and I should like to say at the outset that officers of the Law Society have told me that there is some disquiet about the fact that the society council was given the opportunity to see this Bill only within the past 48 hours.

The council believes that this is not the normal conduct or liaison that should occur between the Government and the Law Society Council. It has been the usual practice for the council to have the opportunity to comment on Bills relating directly to the profession, particularly legal practitioner Bills. This is an established principle, or it should be, for the Government not only in relation to legal practitioners but also in relation to other professions and callings.

I understand that there is not to be a meeting of the council until next Monday night. The Attorney-General should take steps to defer the final consideration of this Bill until after the council has had the opportunity of meeting and considering the matter then. There is some division of opinion—

Mr. Millhouse: The Hon. Mr. Burdett was told just this morning what the legal profession—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN:—whether it is a good Bill or not, and there are several questions which arise and which must be answered before I can undertake on behalf of the Opposition to give any support to the Bill at all. It is important that we have the benefit of the council's advice. The Bill is important to both the legal profession and the public. Some members of the profession believe that the Bill is too wide, that it is a blanket provision, as it will enable any legal practitioner employed by the Crown in any department to have the right of audience. The example given is that there may be a legal practitioner, for example, employed by the Fisheries Department. The Director may wish to launch a prosecution—

Mr. Millhouse: You got that directly from Burdett.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN:—perhaps for improper reasons, and the

Crown Law Office may decline to act. However, the Director could direct the legal practitioner employed by his department to take the case if such practitioner had a right of audience. That is a possibility. This argument is not a strong one but, nevertheless, it must be answered. Presently, the matter could be overcome by the legal practitioner being the complainant. In fact, it is common that departmental prosecutions of this kind are conducted in the name of an inspector, or some other officer who, while having some expertise in the law, is not usually a legal practitioner. He has had no part in the actual investigatory work but, being the complainant, he has the right of audience.

That objection could be overcome in that instance. Also, the Bill is of more significance regarding the right of audience in superior courts. There is another proposition which has been raised and which should be raised here: should the Attorney-General, as the State's senior legal officer, have control of all Crown proceedings in the courts? It has been suggested that it is undesirable that the oversight of legal proceedings should be fragmented so that any Minister whose department employs legal practitioners should have the oversight of proceedings.

It is pointed out that the right of audience exists whether or not the Crown is party to the proceedings. This is a good point. The legal practitioner must be acting in the course of that employment; that is, employment by the Crown, and with the Attorney's approval. So far as I can ascertain (and this has been the result of inquiries that have been relatively superficial today, certainly not as a result of any deliberations of the Law Society Council) there has been no difficulty up to date: no difficulty has arisen in Crown Law officers having the right of audience in the courts.

I still believe that a far more detailed examination of this legislation should be conducted by the legal profession. For instance, is the reason for the Bill's introduction to give a legal practitioner employed in the proposed Corporate Affairs Commission a right of audience? That question should be answered.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The second reading explanation would answer that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TONKIN: If that is the reason, then the right of audience would more properly be included in the Act setting up the Corporate Affairs Commission, rather than being included in what amounts to blanket legislation, because that is what the Bill does. It is also possible that the Government may have in mind practitioners employed by the Legal Services Commission. I repeat that it is unfortunate and undesirable that the Council of the Law Society has not had an opportunity to examine this legislation; apparently, it has not been consulted in any way at all. Therefore, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Members will appreciate the number of times that I have raised in this place my concern for the lack of water in certain areas of South Australia, in particular in the American River township on Kangaroo Island. My questions to the Minister seeking an adequate water supply for that and other adjacent areas started in this House during 1974-75. Many times I have

raised that matter during Question Time, the Adjournment debate, and in Address in Reply speeches.

On Tuesday this week I directed yet another question to the Minister of Works asking for urgent attention to be given not only to the supply for those townspeople and the immediate adjacent areas but also in the interim to seek assistance for those who are bound to cart water from the nearest standpipe at the rate I mentioned at the time of \$25 for a thousand gallons. I appreciate and have done so for some time that the economics of this supply do not dovetail into the policy of the department wherein the Engineering and Water Supply Department seeks where possible a 10 per cent return on the capital involved in extension mains.

The Minister has, as he did on Tuesday, explained to the House that it does not necessarily follow that the 10 per cent criterion is required but that, in fact, there are about 38 to 40 districts in South Australia that are enjoying a service where that return on capital is not forthcoming. The disturbing factor about that is that, notwithstanding attempts for 12 or 13 years to gain a supply at American River, that town is not one of those 38 or 40. However, the Minister on Tuesday referred, among other things, to certain untruths. He said in the *Hansard* record, which is available to us at this stage, that the District Council of Dudley could if it wished enter into an arrangement for water to be carted to the area but that the council had not been in touch with him. He said that the council certainly had some responsibility in this matter, too. Furthermore, he stated that the council is competent if it so desires to do something about the situation. He said that it could approach him on the matter, but that it had not done so. I know that the District Council of Dudley has written to the respective Ministers for at least 12 years, maybe longer; indeed, I have a file of correspondence that reveals that that has been done.

Indeed, in the main those items of correspondence seek to obtain a water supply to the township. If the Minister, in his reply on Tuesday, was referring to the cartage of water as an interim measure until a supply may be available, he is still wrong, because on October 26, 1977, the Dudley District Council wrote to the Minister, pointing out the direction in which the community was heading this summer after a very dry winter in the area, and mentioning the difficulties that would be experienced, pleading with the Minister to assist the council in doing something about it.

On November 18, the council again wrote to the Minister and a copy of that correspondence is available. The Minister's department has acknowledged receipt of the correspondence; indeed, the November letter to which I referred specifically stated that the council was seeking to discuss the matter with the Minister and seeking a subsidy or some form of assistance to cart water in this immediate period. The Minister's reply, whether or not he was talking about cartage, was a reflection on the District Council of Dudley, a responsible local government authority that has applied itself since the beginning of local government in this State. At this stage, as it may well have been an oversight by the Minister, a slip of the tongue, or an error to enable him to escape the responsibilities of the truth but, whatever the reason may have been, I ask the Minister publicly to retract his statement and his reflection on the district council and to advise the district council accordingly. Another element of his reply is most disturbing. When he was explaining to the House on Tuesday the lack of economics in this whole scheme, the Minister said:

The Government has considered this situation several times. Only this morning I asked the department what was

the current cost of this scheme on the short route—
For many years two main extension routes have been discussed, known locally as the short route and the long route. The short route is from the airport near Kingscote, to American River via the Nepean Bay subdivision. The long route departs from the main at Parndarna and goes via the Rowlands Hill Highway, through the MacGillivray and Haines rural districts and thence to American River. The reply continues:

Only this morning I asked the department what was the current cost of this scheme on the short route, and was told it was now \$1 100 000. I also inquired about the values of the properties for one mile on either side of the pipeline and in the township area that would be served. The honourable member would be interested to know that the value of the properties in 1971 (and the figure can be escalated) was \$1 100 000. What I am saying is that the supply of reticulated water to some of these areas is so uneconomic that it would pay the Government to buy the properties concerned.

I have been in this House for four and a half years, and I have never heard a Minister of the Crown so loosely handle the facts and make statements to this House that are so far from the truth.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He was informed by—

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Attorney may interject if he wishes. The Minister may have been informed by his department, but, if that is the sort of valuation placed on the properties in the area on which the department is calculating whether or not the project is economic, I can understand why American River has never had a water supply during the 12 years or so it has been requested. One family alone in the American River township has enterprises I suggest conservatively amount to at least the \$1 100 000 the Minister gave this House as the value of the properties in the whole of the American River township and of the 20-odd farm properties one mile on either side of the short route.

It is on that sort of information that this House has been misled in the past and not recognised the desperate need and the justification for the service to that township area. There are many other factors to which I could refer that add to the support for the Government's expenditure in this direction. Both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government have a massive investment in the areas to which I have referred: the Commonwealth's telecommunications services, the Electricity Trust's services throughout the area, and the State Government's considerable investment of Loan funds in enterprises in and about the township to which I have referred. Although it is one of the fastest growing and most attractive tourist sites in South Australia, if not beyond, it has been shelved on the one hand and promoted with tongue in cheek on the other by the Premier while on the island from time to time and on the mainland when he is spruiking about the great job his Government has done.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I wish to refer to a problem existing in my district; namely, traffic noise on Salisbury Highway caused mainly by the many heavy vehicles using that highway. Perhaps it may be said that Salisbury Highway is not a major highway; nevertheless, it carries many heavy vehicles travelling to the Eastern States and Western Australia. They use the highway simply because it is quicker to do so, turning on to Waterloo Corner Road at the end of Salisbury Highway and out through Angle Vale. This enables the vehicles to avoid heavy traffic; probably some of them are dodging weighbridges. Further, it reduces the number of traffic lights at which the

vehicles might have to slow down or stop.

I studied traffic noise during my overseas trip earlier this year. The noise of heavy trucks needs particular attention. I have long believed that the noise of heavy trucks is different from other noise; it is hard not to have this belief if one lives next to a major highway. I was therefore reassured by what I learnt overseas, where research has been done to measure the impact of the noise of heavy vehicles. Two problems arise from the noise of heavy vehicles; first, that noise is louder than the noise of cars. The United States Environmental Protection Agency says that one truck with a bad muffler can make as much noise as 90 or 100 cars, while the Noise Advisory Council of the United Kingdom states that a single heavy vehicle produces about the same amount of noise as do 10 cars.

Equally important, heavy trucks produce a different type of noise; the tone is substantially different, and there is some evidence that this difference in tone between the noise of trucks and the noise of ordinary vehicles can cause much distress to residents. The Swedes have done studies showing that, on a road carrying 20 per cent trucks and 80 per cent ordinary traffic, the abolition of trucks reduces the overall noise level by five decibels; taking into account the special way in which these figures are drawn up, this means reducing the noise level by between one-third and one-half.

Another interesting thing that they found was that there need not be a great fleet of trucks roaring down a street to cause real distress to a significant number of the residents. One heavy truck passing along a road in the middle of the night is sufficient to disturb the sleep of more than 10 per cent of the residents. That is not to say that they have to wake up to be disturbed, for on this point the report states, "Noise can disturb sleep by causing the depth of the sleep to change, even though it may not wake the person concerned." Of course, we know that the by-products of disturbed sleep include a wide range of emotional and mental effects. Residents who live alongside noisy highways might not have to question how much they had to drink the night before: their foggy head could be the result of a noise cocktail of Macks.

It seems to me that there is an urgent need for more research to be gathered and more data to be collected so that we can start to look at this problem in South Australia. A great variety of issues is involved here, and the worst possible course of action would be to enact hasty legislation which had not been properly thought out and which would ultimately cost the community dearly in social and economic terms. So I hope that the various departments of the Government, as well as researchers in other areas of the community, are starting to give this matter serious attention with a view to drafting some legislation on the question.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I express concern in relation to immigration problems. No doubt most members have experienced difficulties from time to time when constituents have asked for assistance in reuniting their families, especially in the case of Europe. The immigration policies now being conducted were first introduced in the dark years of Labor Administration, when the then Minister slashed the migrant intake. That action caused much hardship and many problems. The other day I was disturbed when a constituent of mine gave me a couple of letters that he had received. It is obvious that a scheme is operating in Korea to entice people to come to Australia, with attempts being made to overcome and by-pass immigration problems. I believe these letters are important, and the first one states:

Please allow us for writing this letter to you, Sir. We really

want this letter will not disturb your business. You might wonder how we got your address, but a friend of mine living in Australia gave us your address, telling us that it would be advisable for us to apply for a position in your company as motor mechanic.

My constituent operates a second-hand motor vehicle business. The letter continues:

As a matter of fact, we have long time wanted to find a chance of working in such a wonderful and advanced nation like Australia. We have been working as motor mechanic for a long time and have our licence of motor mechanic issued by Korean Government. We have been enjoying a good reputation as motor mechanic and even our present employer would often advise us to come and work at your company. Speaking of wages, we wouldn't much care about, for your possible employing us in your place has already paid much wages. We can speak English fairly.

I am not criticising the letter, but it seems to me that there is an organised campaign by a person or persons in Korea to have young people apply to various used-car dealers seeking sponsorship to Australia. I am not so much concerned about the question of wages, but that would be one of the matters of great principle for the State Government. The letter continues:

Our plane tickets, travel expenses and boarding, etc., shall entirely be covered by us. In case you are interested in our personal history statement here in enclosed, all you need to do is draw up a job offer that will make us eligible for an immigration visa interview.

Once you got us a glory of working at your place, we will do our best to be a welcome addition to your worthy business, Sir. Praying for your excellent health and looking forward to your favourable reply, we remain.

That is signed by Gi Hyuc, Lee. With it comes a personal history statement—his name in full, when he was born, his residence in Seoul, Korea, his present address, and his seeking the position of motor mechanic. Then there is his education and military service; he served at the motor pool company, ROK Army, and got discharged with honour. Then there is his experience as a motor mechanic. Then we see "Reward and punishment", which apparently in these Asian countries is considered as something; he has not any. Then there are the duties he prefers.

There are the two letters in this instance. It is an issue I have taken up personally with the Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, who informs me that one great problem in the country at present is increasing the immigration intake, and the other problem is to be able to assist existing migrant families in Australia to be reunited with the remaining members of their families. I am disturbed to think that obviously somebody overseas is acting as an agent in other countries, particularly Asian countries, and giving those people false hope that they can easily migrate to Australia. Business people who probably would not be aware of the problems of immigration are being approached and, reading between the lines in this case—"speaking of wages, we would not care much about"—it is obvious the situation is being created that people are prepared to come to this country without worrying much about wages. This is totally false, and I hope that our immigration authorities, and even our Premier, as Minister of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, and this State Government, will see that we are not prepared to allow this sort of situation to arise in Australia.

I was disturbed to receive a letter in my letterbox in the last few days about the activities of the Federal election campaign, particularly in my area. It is a very poor show

when a member of Parliament cannot even put up a sign supporting his colleagues without its being torn down from his front lawn. This letter from the Labor Party member for Hawker, Mr. Jacobi, was totally misleading. He has a crack at the Prime Minister and says he knows he must try to get in as quickly as possible before the Australian economy gets even worse and unemployment assumes intolerable proportions. Jacobi goes on to try to scare the public by claiming that unemployment will reach about 480 000 people. He says there will be 200 000 school leavers, half of which will not be able to get jobs.

This is the old scare tactic of the Labor Party, and I would not have thought that Mr. Jacobi would stoop to this sort of tactic, because he is held in reasonable regard. Unfortunately, it is something that has come across the whole election campaign, where people representing the Government in this Chamber are trying to demoralise the young people and the electors of this country by saying, "You will not get jobs; the economy will get worse", etc.; but let us remind members who actually started the whole issue. The member for Whyalla groans, but he cannot deny the fact that, when it started in those dark years of 1972 to 1975, in relation to unemployment, in December of 1972, 136 000—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. BECKER: In December, 1972, 136 769 people registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service. In December, 1975, after three years of Labor rule, there were 328 705 people registered—a rise of 191 936, or 157 per cent.

Only one group of people can take the responsibility and blame for those figures, and that is the Labor Administration. We all remember the statement made by Clyde Cameron that he would resign if unemployment reached 250 000 people. Clyde didn't resign, he was sacked. That was a bit of a tragedy for South Australia, because we saw a Minister from this State being demoted but, even so, the Labor Party is the Party that created the situation. It removed the tariffs, destroyed Australian manufacturing industry, and now it is making all these statements that will further undermine the confidence of the Australian people and workers.

Mr. Groom: Are you going to vote for Steele Hall?

Mr. BECKER: Of course I am.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. BECKER: I would like to know who the person is who keeps ripping the sign down on my front lawn. If I catch him he will not be able to vote. This has really been a disgraceful campaign. It think it is a pity when members of any political Party cannot campaign without interference and without material being taken out of letter-boxes. I have letter-boxed material myself and then received a report within 12 hours that people have not received that literature. It is these tactics occurring in Hawker that are not doing the Labor Party any credit. It has never happened before, and I only wish that those responsible would act more responsibly about the campaign, because they are certainly losing support, as well as credibility, as a result of supporters removing signs from private property.

Motion carried.

At 4.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 6, at 2 p.m.