

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 16, 1978

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

PETITION: POLICE COMMISSIONER'S DISMISSAL

Mr. **MATHWIN** presented a petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia, praying that the House resolve that it lacked confidence in the Premier's handling of the dismissal of the former Commissioner of Police and that a full and proper inquiry of the matter be commissioned.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEMBERS' ACTIONS

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister for the Environment)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN**: My attention has been drawn to actions by two members of this Parliament, one a member of this House, of which I believe the House should be acquainted. I have received information which I consider to be absolutely reliable and which I can substantiate. On Wednesday last, February 8, the member for Murray approached an officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, during the course of a general conversation, the honourable member invited the officer to meet him at Parliament House to answer questions about happenings in his division. The officer declined the invitation.

Yesterday the **Hon. Martin Cameron, M.L.C.**, contacted another officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service and invited that officer, together with the officer who had been approached by the member for Murray, to attend a meeting after 5 p.m. today at the **Hon. Mr. Cameron's** house.

I am absolutely astounded that members of the Opposition would stoop to this sort of tactic in an attempt to obtain information which they would obviously hope to use to the detriment of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The two members to whom I have referred must have been fully aware that, in acting as they did, they placed in jeopardy the careers of the officers concerned. They would be fully aware that the provisions of the Public Service Act specifically prevent officers of the Public Service acting in such a way. Section 58 (i) of the Public Service Act provides:

If any officer otherwise than in the discharge of his duties directly or indirectly discloses to any person information acquired in the course of his duties except by the direction or with the permission of the Minister, he shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to such punishment as may be determined under section 59 or section 64 of this Act.

The two members of Parliament concerned have therefore invited and encouraged two officers of the Public Service to violate the terms of the Act under which they are employed, and as such I regard their actions as both callous and reprehensible. Members of all Parties in this House will be aware of the proper channels through which they can obtain information by personal contact with the Minister concerned, by telephone, by letter, by questions with notice and by questions without notice. Honourable members will also be aware that when they have raised

matters with me I have authorised officers to provide such information and have often put the members in contact with those officers. I believe that every fair-minded member in this House will find objectionable the furtive manner in which the two members to whom I have referred have acted in this matter.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WOTTON: The Minister has accused me of trying to seek information from an officer of his department and, I understand, of trying to arrange, in conjunction with a member in another place, a meeting this evening with that officer.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran interjecting:

Mr. WOTTON: If the Minister did not say that, I will forget about that matter. However, it is completely untrue that I asked a member of the Minister's department to meet me because I was seeking information about his department. I spoke to that officer during a demonstration in front of Parliament House last Tuesday. I have spoken previously to that officer about matters other than those relating to his duties. I have known that gentleman for some time, and I suggested to him that I would like to discuss matters with him. Neither the Minister nor the officer concerned can prove in any way what I had in mind, if I had in mind anything at all.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I'll tell you a bit more about the meeting tonight if you want to know.

Mr. WOTTON: I would like to hear a bit more about the meeting tonight if the Minister can do so. I believe I have been accused falsely today, along with the accusations made in the Ministerial statement yesterday to which I will refer at a later date. I believe the allegations made today are false.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They are not.

Mr. WOTTON: I would like—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is making a personal explanation, and I hope he is heard in silence.

Mr. WOTTON: I would ask the Minister to prove that I invited a member of his department to discuss matters relating to that department, and I would also like him to prove what those matters were. Until he can do that I believe the allegations made by the Minister are false.

QUESTIONS**SECURITY SERVICES**

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Premier believe there is any possibility that the isolation of South Australia's security services from other security organisations could create a base in this State for terrorist activities? The Labor Party's emasculation of Special Branch in this State has been widely publicised and, therefore, such a possibility must exist. It is reported that South Australia has already been left out in the cold by security organisations throughout Australia which are reluctant to exchange any information because of the fear of Government interference in intelligence matters.

Special Branches of all States, except South Australia, are represented in Sydney for the Commonwealth heads of Government regional meeting. South Australia, with a Special Branch consisting of only two policemen and lacking the benefit of co-operation with other security organisations, must be considered a most attractive place to would-be terrorists. It is certainly not beyond the realms

of possibility that this State could become a haven for terrorists and other extremists—a fact that causes people in the community considerable concern.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader's incursions into cloud cuckoo land are ceaseless. He has said that it is reported that the South Australian Police Force is isolated on security matters, but he does not cite the authority for that report, because there is no authority for such a report. I have checked with the Commissioner of Police. There is no isolation of the South Australian Police Force on security matters. The Commissioner spoke to the senior officer of ASIO in this region this morning. There is no provision for a lack of flow of information to our Police Force on security matters from that source or from any other source. The reports in this morning's paper to which the Leader refers carefully did not cite any authority, and I suspect that it was because there was no such authority.

The facts as known to the Commissioner of Police completely belie any such suggestion as the Leader has made. Yesterday in the House I pointed to the fact that the Commissioner is already setting up a more efficient operation in the security area. He has police officers who are capable of acting in the security area in a perfectly proper way, and there is no basis whatever for the Leader's supposed fears or for the suggestion that our Police Force is in any way isolated on this matter.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Transport provide any information in relation to a proposed ferry service to operate between Glenelg and Kingscote; would such a service affect the viability of the *Troubridge*; and would any reduction in the number of passengers carried on the *Troubridge* cause an increase in freight costs? The *News* on Thursday, February 9, contains an article headed, "Daily run to island by fast ferry", as follows:

A high-speed ferry will start a daily service between Glenelg and Kingscote, Kangaroo Island, next month. A spokesman for Gulf and Island Shipping said today the company hoped a \$200 000 converted police patrol boat will depart from Singapore for Adelaide in about 10 days. He said the ferry would leave Kingscote at 6 a.m. six days a week and arrive at Glenelg at 9.15 a.m. It would depart from Glenelg for the return trip at 6 p.m. and the return trip ticket price would be about \$26. The 80-seat ferry would cruise at 80 knots.

I think there may be some discrepancy between the speed of 80 knots and the 3½ hours stated as the duration of the trip. Last year, the settlers on Kangaroo Island were greatly concerned at high freight costs, and they said that their costs for transporting livestock and wool were out of proportion to freight costs on the mainland of South Australia in getting produce to market. I am concerned that any reduction in the viability of the *Troubridge* operation could cause the Kangaroo Island settlers a great deal of hardship.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Whether or not the service will start is probably known only to the people responsible for the press announcement. I have made plain the Government's position on this matter many times. The Government will do nothing at all to prevent any person who wants to do so from introducing a passenger service or a freight service to Kangaroo Island. As I have said many times, if anyone wants to run this service he is welcome to do so, as long as he picks up the losses in the same way as the Government is doing. If these people are purchasing a vessel and fitting it out to run a service from Glenelg to Kangaroo Island, I wish them well. Others have tried this

and have failed financially. The ferry service across Backstairs Passage likewise has been cut out because it could not be sustained financially.

The only position the Government would take in this matter would be to require the owners of the vessel to comply with the normal safety requirements and the berthing and wharfage arrangements. If they do that, the Government will not concern itself one iota in relation to the service; indeed, if the passenger service were removed from the *Troubridge*, obviously there would be a review of the activities of the *Troubridge*, but it must be remembered that that vessel is being run at a loss to the State simply to provide a service to Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Chapman: And to Port Lincoln—be fair.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not there to provide a service to Port Lincoln. It goes to Port Lincoln, as the honourable member would know, to try to reduce the losses that otherwise would occur.

Mr. Chapman: You don't provide a service there?

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

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Running to Port Lincoln assists with the financial arrangements. The honourable member should know—and I suspect that he does know—that the losses would be greater if the *Troubridge* did not go to Port Lincoln; otherwise, the vessel would not go there. The honourable member should have read that in the reports provided to him by courtesy of the Government over some time.

RECREATION GROUNDS LEGISLATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say what is the loophole in the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act which the Minister stated publicly may exist and should be closed so that the rates may be—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is presently before the House, and the honourable member is presumably wanting to canvass a Bill which is currently the business of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid that this Bill is now before the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act Amendment Bill; I am referring to the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act, which has been in operation since 1910. I am not referring in any way in my question to the amending Bill that is currently before the House.

The SPEAKER: I will listen intently to the honourable member's question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will start again. What is the loophole in the Recreation Grounds Taxation Exemption Act which the Minister stated publicly may exist and should be closed so that rates may be levied from sporting bodies who use park lands under the control of the City of Adelaide or elsewhere?

The SPEAKER: I rule that the honourable member's question is out of order.

SOCIAL SERVICE PAYMENTS

Mr. BANNON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare tell the House of any action being taken by the Government to alleviate the hardship caused by the Federal Government's increase in the waiting period for, and the changed method of payment of, unemployment

benefits? In a sense this question is supplementary to that asked yesterday by the member for Napier, who was drawing members' attention to the acute staffing problem being suffered by the Social Security Department in this present crisis situation. My question is directed to another facet of that situation of hardship and crisis to the unemployed, namely, the fact that the waiting period for Commonwealth benefits has been increased. Benefits are now paid in arrears. Therefore, as was pointed out by the Minister in November last year, a newly unemployed family man could be in a situation in which he was given one pay in five weeks—on the eighteenth day of unemployment and then on the thirty-fifth day. At that time the Minister took up with the Commonwealth Government as a matter of urgency the question of how funds might be provided to assist in the emergency in which people in this State find themselves short of funds.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The action taken by the Government through me as Minister has been of two types. The practical step taken to assist people who are suffering the hardship referred to by the honourable member has been that the Community Welfare Department, through its financial assistance scale payments, has been making money available to families, in particular, and in some cases to single persons (those who have a demonstrated need), related to immediate hardship, in an endeavour to tide them over the iniquitous waiting period that they are called on to undergo under the present Federal Government ruling. At the practical level, the Government recognises that people have a need and is actually doing something about it by making some finance available to people. The other step has been that, as the Minister responsible for welfare in this State, I have made a number of approaches to the Commonwealth Government, through Senator Guilfoyle, for consideration of the plight of these people.

The actions I have taken date back to before the actual arrears payment system commenced. Yesterday, I said that there seemed to be some differences in attitude of various Commonwealth Ministers, but that the Federal Minister responsible, I am bound to say, has been listening to my proposals, which include the provision of a Commonwealth financed emergency fund, which should be used to directly alleviate the hardship that can occur with respect to the arrears payment of unemployment benefits. In fairness to the Commonwealth Minister I say that she has not eliminated this possibility: on the contrary, at an earlier conference I had with her and other Ministers she agreed that there was some merit in the proposal, and set up, with the concurrence of other State Ministers, an officers' meeting that was held in Tasmania some time ago to ascertain whether this kind of funding and payment could be made to people in these circumstances. It should be noted that voluntary organisations throughout Australia are making similar representations to the Commonwealth Government to those which are coming from the States, including South Australia, on this question. Their reserves are being denuded and they are finding an increasing demand for direct financial assistance from people experiencing hardship.

At last Friday's conference in Sydney of the Welfare Ministers discussion was carried on on this topic, and support was forthcoming in general from all Ministers, especially from Tasmania, New South Wales, and, I am glad to say, from the Minister in Victoria, who is willing to transcend politics in this matter and consider genuine welfare requirements. The Commonwealth has indicated that it is willing to consider an amount that may be used in this way, and I expect to hear from the Federal Minister

further on this matter. In essence, the proposals are that a limited fund be available for disbursement through both State and voluntary agencies, and I am sure that the honourable member will allow me to point out that there is an important role to be played by voluntary agencies in this matter.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: In the continuing discussions on a petrochemical works at Redcliff, can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the fact of an impending major extension of petrochemical capacity in Victoria has caused any concern to the possible operator, even to the point of a possible withdrawal from further discussion? No member would do other than support the creation of further industrial development in South Australia if it is possible, particularly one related to the use of petrochemical materials which are available in Australia and which are in short supply throughout the world. It is possible that, with a new plant at Laverton in Victoria using new techniques and providing the market which was previously to be provided by the development to be undertaken at Redcliff, the likelihood of a market for any supply developed at Redcliff would be in question. It is on the basis of this impending development in Victoria that I ask the question, recognising that an operational market and outlet for the eventual supply is all-important in the economics of the exercise.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure of the geographical position of Laverton in relation to Altona. I presume therefore that the honourable member is talking about the Altona proposition. At this stage, there are three possible propositions for various kinds of petrochemical development: one is Redcliff, the second is Altona, and the third is Botany Bay, involving I.C.I. Which of them proceeds at this stage, it is not possible to say. All I can say is that discussions are proceeding between State and Commonwealth officers and Dow. Further discussions will take place soon, and everything is being done at the South Australian end to ensure that the information required by the Commonwealth Government for a decision to be made with respect to any infrastructure for Redcliff can be made. This information is being provided as rapidly as possible. There is the closest co-operation and support from the producers, Delhi Santos, in that endeavour.

The producers are also in discussion with Dow about matters of price, and the feasibility of the project is being advanced as rapidly as possible. That is all I am able to say now. Clearly, if Redcliff goes ahead, it could have an impact on Altona or Botany Bay or vice versa. The matter is of some concern, particularly as a decision on Redcliff cannot be made until the Commonwealth Government makes certain decisions:

Dr. Eastick: If Altona goes ahead, Redcliff won't?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is worthwhile pointing out, as we have pointed out to the Commonwealth, that the impact of Redcliff on our balance of payments is significant: it amounts to a net favourable impact on the balance of payments of about \$225 000 000 a year. The impact of Redcliff is much more significant than any impact that either Altona or Botany Bay could have. We have pushed ahead as rapidly and as hard as we can with the Commonwealth the issues in relation to Redcliff, but we require decisions from the Commonwealth about what it is prepared to do about financing the infrastructure.

Final decisions are not possible from Dow about how it will proceed until that information is available. That is the

position now. I can assure the honourable member and others that, so far as officers of the South Australian Government are concerned, every possible effort is being made to ensure effective co-operation and to ensure that the Commonwealth interdepartmental committee on this subject gets the appropriate information that it requires.

SHARKS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Marine consider whether further action can be taken to reduce problems caused by people fishing for sharks off local jetties? I am aware that it is an offence under the Marine Act for people to dump blood or other material off jetties to attract sharks. However, constituents of mine pointed out that earlier this week, while some younger surf-lifesaving club members were swimming near Grange jetty, a youth caught a shark from the jetty. This caused great concern, as the shark was caught near the swimmers. I understand that the police were contacted, but it was difficult to establish a case against the person concerned because, in the confusion that reigned, it was easy for him to dump the incriminating material, so that evidence for a conviction for the offence was lost. What people tend to say is, irrespective—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: What I should have said, Mr. Speaker, with your leave, is that the persons concerned indicated that, even though the existing law makes it an offence to dump blood and other material, the very bait that is used to catch sharks is also likely to attract them to the area and cause danger to swimmers. Perhaps that aspect could be considered, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is true that this is a worrying problem. Although provision exists in the Marine Act to prosecute people who are apprehended in this type of action, I think the honourable member will appreciate the difficulty of having sufficient staff to observe every action. However, a patrol officer is specifically engaged in the metropolitan area to make observations of this kind. I shall be happy to examine the points raised by the honourable member to see what can be done.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Education say whether South Australian teachers college or university students who elect to take an additional year of study to increase their teaching qualifications will be advantaged or disadvantaged by their actions? I refer to those third-year students who elect to study for a fourth year to complete a degree, diploma, Bachelor of Education, etc.

In view of the reported 1 200 to 1 400 qualified teachers who are now unemployed, many students appear to be caught in an apparent bind where, in order to compete with highly qualified staff already in the labour market, they elect to study for an extra year possibly with no real prospect of employment at the end of it. Does the Minister recommend any course of action? Perhaps in his reply he might refer to the criteria I know he has established for the appointment of new staff and say whether those criteria take care of such students?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not sure that I can give a direct reply, because the question relates to two matters. First, the people who take on extra study will clearly have upgraded their qualifications, and that will give them some

competitive advantage as against people with lower qualifications. Regarding the latter part of the honourable member's question, there is no doubt that academic qualification is one of the criteria which are taken into account by the staffing people in the department when determining who shall get a job. The other side of the problem is simply the matter of whether the staffing situation next year will be more difficult or easier than it is this year. That is very much related to the problem of the number of qualified people who have applied for jobs this year and who did not get them, and who will apply for a job again next year.

The honourable member may be aware of some of the disagreements which the States have had with the Commonwealth as to the assumptions inherent in the documents prepared for the Australian Education Council about this matter. The argument is clearly not on the basic demographic information. There is no argument about that, and no argument as to the assumptions by the States as to the extent to which they can increase their teaching establishments, because the Commonwealth has simply had to accept from the States whatever assumptions the States were working with. Rather, the argument has been simply over this factor of the percentage of what we might call the disappointed applicants who will return in the following year and, in so doing, will be competing either with those people who have extended their course for a year or those people who will be coming out in the normal course of events.

This is a grave problem and I will see whether it is possible to get some refined figures that I can make available to the honourable member. The A.E.C. assumption was that the wastage from those who were disappointed would roughly be equivalent to the wastage in the teaching force itself. I am not aware of the basis of that assumption or any rationale for it at all, but that was the assumption in the A.E.C. report, and it may be way out. Certainly, the figures from the States would suggest a lower accumulated surplus at the end of the decade than is in the A.E.C. report. I have to disappoint the honourable member in this respect; I do not think I can give direct advice to the hypothetical individual on whose behalf the honourable member has spoken and who wants advice whether or not he should prolong his course. It has to be worked within those two parameters, namely, the higher academic qualification on the one hand and, on the other hand, the possibility of an indeed more difficult employment situation in 12 months time.

REYNELLA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. DRURY: Can the Minister of Education say what action the Education Department has taken to solve the problem at Reynella Primary School caused by inadequate playing space? On a recent visit there, I was informed by the Deputy Principal that the school had a total area of only three acres on which to cater for the needs of about 640 students. Knowing that the normal size of other schools in the area is about 10 acres, I should be grateful for any information the Minister has on this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have a good deal of information on this matter, because I represented the area in which the old Reynella school is situated before the mantle passed with so much distinction to my colleague.

An honourable member: For the better?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, the change has been for the better for the people in the district. The Education Department has an acquisition programme in relation to properties adjoining the school. The actual plan of

acquisition, I am sure, would have been made known to the Principal of the school, because I seem to recall having discussed it with him about 12 months ago. Some acquisition has taken place; for example, what was formerly known as the Reynella Methodist Church was purchased by the department some time ago and is now part of the school property. There is some open land across a back street that, I believe, is formally the property of the Minister of Transport, and I understand that discussions are proceeding. This land abuts the Reynella by-pass, but it would be necessary to have a road closure before we could formally incorporate that land into the school property, for obvious reasons.

That leaves the difficult question of several houses, which are currently occupied and some of which are of reasonable standard. It is not the department's intention to proceed with any compulsory acquisitions but, as these properties become available, we would certainly negotiate for purchase.

RURAL INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE BRANCH

Mr. RODDA: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is proposed to upgrade the present office accommodation, into which the Rural Industries Assistance Branch has moved, on the first floor of Grenfell Towers? Complaints have been made to me by various applicants for assistance about the lack of privacy and confidentiality that exists in this accommodation. I was given to understand that it is not possible for a person to go in there and bare his soul on his private financial affairs or to discuss financial arrangements when seeking assistance, without being overheard in that office. I had occasion last week to go to the branch to discuss a constituent's problems, and I was amazed to see that the only privacy between senior officers and officers in another interviewing office was a set of partitions about 1½ metres high. Conversations are audible, and it is highly embarrassing for applicants to have to go into that atmosphere when seeking assistance. I ask the Minister to discuss the matter with the Minister of Agriculture, and to see to it that these conditions are upgraded to afford privacy and maintain the confidentiality of discussions for people seeking assistance from this organisation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it the honourable member is complaining not about the standard but about the suitability of the accommodation for such interviews. I can accept that there is a point, especially when people want to discuss their private affairs and feel embarrassed about being overheard. I shall discuss the matter with my colleague to see what can be done for the honourable member or for his constituents and others.

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister for the Environment say whether it is possible for his department to promote the location of further collection depots for beverage containers within the metropolitan area? I specifically instance the lack of suitably located collection depots within the inner north-eastern suburbs. The nearest collection depots servicing constituents in my district are at Holden Hill or Wingfield, both points being a considerable distance from the suburbs of Hillcrest, Greenacres, Klemzig, Windsor Gardens, and so on. As there appears to be a need for additional depots to service these suburbs, will the Minister investigate whether initiatives can be taken to establish a depot in the area I have mentioned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall have the inquiry investigated by the unit that caters for this matter, and I shall bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works say what mismanagement interstate has allowed the salt slug to enter the Murray River, as reported in this morning's *Advertiser*? The article states that a salt slug flowing down the Murray River would increase salinity levels in the Riverland over the next month, and quotes that as a comment of the Minister of Works. I refer also to Position Paper No. 6, headed "a National approach to drainage and salinity problems in the Murray Valley", and I agree with the contents of this paper, as follows:

This paper describes a substantial breakthrough in Murray River salinity control. It concerns working relationships between the three Murray River States and the Federal Government on salinity control matters. The change has long been sought by South Australia and will now enable the drainage and salinity problems of the Murray Valley to be considered as a whole rather than as a number of areas in isolation.

In view of the progress that has been made, can the Minister say how the present slug was allowed to enter the Murray River and what problems it will cause in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I cannot say. I have no information about what has caused the slug. I do not know whether or not it was unavoidable, but I shall make inquiries about that. As the honourable member has pointed out, much progress has been made in this matter. For the first time, a relationship exists between States that will enable us to consider quality as well as quantity of water. Since a period before Christmas, I have been attempting to arrange a meeting between Environment Ministers (or their equivalents) in Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia, as well as the Ministers responsible for water resources. I have been trying to arrange for the Ministers to meet, to travel along the length of the Murray River, and to meet at Renmark towards the end of the journey so that all Ministers, whether they are concerned with the environment or with water resources in the various States, are made aware of the problems at first hand.

I have made, I think, three attempts to have this meeting take place, without success. I hope that on, I think, April 14 we will be able to get together, but that has not been confirmed, although we are in the process of negotiating that date. I want to indicate to the honourable member that I am certainly serious, and I know that the Minister for water resources from Victoria is serious also, but there seems to be some reluctance on the part of New South Wales to allow the matter to proceed as rapidly as we would like it to proceed. We are doing everything we can to get together on it and, if there is a problem, to overcome it. I will inquire about the specific cause of this slug and let the honourable member know.

FOREIGN ADOPTIONS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare inform the House whether there has been any progress towards uniform Australian recognition of foreign adoptions? I am aware, from media reports, that the question was raised last Friday at a meeting of welfare

Ministers. Can the Minister tell the House anything about the outcome of those discussions?

Mr. Chapman: Can you—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In order to relieve the mind of the member for Alexandra, I ask him to note that I am using only one page of notes. Progress was made on this question at the annual conference of social welfare Ministers in Sydney last Friday. The conference reached agreement on draft legislation which will enable Australian recognition to be given to all lawful adoptions concluded in foreign countries. This draft legislation will be considered, probably today, at the conference of Attorneys-General of the Australian States, the Commonwealth and New Zealand in New Zealand. The conference also agreed that a working party of senior welfare officers from the States, with a Chairman from my department, will visit selected overseas countries to investigate the drawing up of official adoption agreements. When these agreements are finalised, and uniform legislation is finally adopted, the complications which have surrounded the recognition of many foreign adoptions for many years should be largely eliminated.

RAIL SERVICE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister for Transport say, following reports of a \$17 000 000 luxury rail service in last Tuesday night's *News* and Wednesday morning's *Advertiser*, whether a contract has been let and all orders made, and, if so, what is the value split of imported and locally produced goods and, in respect of the imported goods what efforts were made to source these goods in Australia? How many new jobs will be created in South Australia? What steps were taken before placing an order with Comeng Limited to persuade them to increase their rather limited manufacturing facilities in South Australia so that they could perform a larger part of the contract in this State? In addition, has any application been made by the Government, or anyone acting on its behalf, to seek the remission of customs duty normally payable on imported components under the terms of the Australian Customs and Tariff Act, 1966? Having heard and read in recent years of numerous grandiose schemes by the Minister, I desire to be fully satisfied that all of the relevant homework has been done in respect to this current proposal and that this time everything has been done before the announcement was made in the press.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the honourable member for giving me a copy of his question. I hope that his colleagues will not complain that it is a Dorothy Dixier, because there are seven parts of this question, or seven questions in one. I will try to answer them one by one. I can confirm that the contract has been let. The tender documents have all been signed and, in fact, that was the statement that I made to the media on Monday, I think, or Tuesday.

Mr. Chapman: In your last reply to me you said not to take any notice of the media.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly agree that the honourable member should not take any notice necessarily of what is written in the media, but if he listens to what Government members say on radio or television that can be taken as gospel. The second question refers to the value split of imported and local goods: I do not have that information available. The engines and transmission gear are being imported from West Germany because no similar equipment is available in Australia. Most of the

rest of the order would, I expect, be made of Australian materials. No imported material will be used if Australian material of sufficient quality is available. The next question was about what efforts were made to source the goods in Australia: we called for offers from manufacturers and they were made aware of Government policy in relation to our preferences; we can do no more than that.

New jobs will be created in South Australia as a result of this. I do not have the actual number, but perhaps it would be of interest for me to say (but I cannot quote figures in money terms, because it is not the policy of the Government to divulge the actual tender price, for obvious reasons) that 54 per cent of man-hours associated with building the passenger cars will be South Australian labour and 44 per cent of the time related to the building of the driving cars and, as a total of 140 000 man-hours will be involved, the honourable member could do a quick sum in order to work out what South Australian man-hours will be involved. They will be quite substantial. Regarding the question about persuading manufacturers to increase their rather limited manufacturing facilities in South Australia, I query the words "rather limited manufacturing facilities".

Mr. Chapman: That is compared with an interstate place.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have about half in round figures, and that is not too bad: it will be 54 per cent and 44 per cent of the two types of cars.

Mr. Venning: It should be better.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For once I agree with the member for Rocky River, and it would be 100 per cent South Australian workmanship if Peter Nixon allowed the Islington workshops to put in a tender. He would not permit that place to put in a tender.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is straying from the answer, but interjections are out of order. A complaint was made yesterday concerning the use of Question Time but, every time a member interjects and the Minister replies, fewer questions can be answered than members would like to be answered.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The final question refers to an application being made by the Government to the Commonwealth Government for remission of customs duty. This application has to be made by the importer and not this Government. When we imported Volvo buses we tried to get a remission of customs duty from the Federal Government. We had the importer make all necessary applications, but we were rejected out of hand by the Commonwealth Government and had to place import duty on the Leyland and Volvo buses we had just bought. We will ask Comeng to apply to the Commonwealth Government for a remission, and we will support that application. However, I cannot be optimistic that the Commonwealth Government will look with favour on South Australia on this issue. Perhaps the member for Alexandra could help us by suggesting to Mr. Nixon that he may be kinder to us on this issue than he was in the matter of buses.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. VENNING: Why did the Minister of Works mislead me and the people of Kadina in relation to his receiving a deputation in relation to establishing the Public Buildings Department branch away from Kadina? The Minister may recall that I went to see him at his office asking that he receive a deputation from the people of Kadina because of their concern once they heard that the Public Buildings

Department branch at Kadina was to be re-established away from Kadina. Those people pointed out to me that Kadina now has the headquarters of the mid-North Police Division, branches of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, the Community Welfare Department and the Public Buildings Department and a new building for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Kadina also has Commonwealth buildings for the area management of Australia Post and Telecom Australia. New buildings have just been completed in Kadina for the Social Security Department, the Electoral Department and the Commonwealth Employment Service. Why did the Minister mislead me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is again asking his question. Members complain about time-wasting.

Mr. VENNING: When I went to the Minister and asked him to receive a deputation from Kadina he said, "Well, it's too early to look into this matter. Leave it for the time being." I left it until the Minister got his report. I then got a letter from the Minister, the final paragraph of which states:

I would mention that, although the office is being moved to Clare, the department will continue wherever possible to apply its policy of engaging contractors resident in the area. In the light of this explanation, I consider that no good purpose would be served in meeting a deputation from your constituents.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I fail to see where I misled the honourable member. I cannot follow his reasoning. I said, "I haven't a report on it. Let me get a report and we will consider it." I got the report and wrote to the honourable member stating, "Look, this is the situation." There is nothing to prevent the honourable member's bringing a deputation to me now if he wishes to do so. I cannot see where I have misled the honourable member. If he believes that I did, I regret that. However, if he wishes to bring a deputation before me now, and if there is any point in doing so, as I have pointed out to the honourable member, I will receive it.

MODBURY CORRIDOR

Mr. WILSON: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government has decided to commission an environmental impact study into the effects on the Torrens River of the North-East Area Public Transport Review? The Government is now considering recommendations of that review for motor transport along what has become known as the Modbury corridor. As far as it goes, the Modbury corridor seems satisfactory environmentally until it reaches the area bounded by the districts of the Premier, the member for Gilles and mine, where the proposed line of the corridor crosses the river six times. Environmentally, that could be disastrous.

The Torrens River Co-ordinated Development Scheme, Stage 1 report by Hassell and Partners, which was carried out under the aegis of the Minister, after talking about the freeway, states:

Even less demanding public transport systems will impact the river. Transportation gains may not offset the loss in resource and amenity value of the river, which is irreplaceable.

When Hassell and Partners carried out their study on the Torrens River, they did not take any cognisance of the Modbury corridor. On that topic, they state:

For the purposes of this stage of the study an assumption was made that no transport facility would be provided along the river. Alternative concept diagrams were prepared on this basis.

That is obvious from the Torrens River report because, at one stage, the Modbury corridor, which has been fitted in on top of Hassell and Partners' report, goes through a children's playground.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The answer is "Yes". In fact, a number of organisations have already been notified that that will be the next step.

TOBACCO

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what action has been or is being taken by the Government to enforce section 80 of the Community Welfare Act, which prohibits the sale of tobacco to minors? Does the Government regard section 80 as being necessary and desirable for the protection of children and, if this section is not being enforced, why is it not being enforced? Section 80 of the Act provides:

Any person who sells, lends or gives, or offers to sell, lend or give, to any child under the age of sixteen years any tobacco, cigar or cigarette shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding twenty dollars.

It is clear, even to the casual observer, that children under the age of 16 years are obtaining cigarettes from retail outlets and smoking freely in public. Observation of children aged from about 10 years upwards on their way to and from school or gathered in groups in public places show that not only is the law being consistently and blatantly broken but also that the law is so poorly administered that obviously many people are not even aware of it. On a recent visit to Tasmania I noticed that sales outlets for tobacco, including newsagents, supermarkets and delicatessens, displayed signs warning that it was illegal for them to supply tobacco to minors. There is no evidence, to my knowledge, of such signs being displayed by retailers of tobacco in South Australia. Tobacco continues to contribute each year to the death of about 8 000 Australians from heart disease and about 3 500 from lung cancer. In view of the health hazards involved in smoking, and in view of the urgent need for preventive health measures and good health education, especially among children in relation to drugs, it is imperative that the Government enforce section 80 of the Act, and that it does so effectively.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Perhaps it would have been better to direct the question to me, because the enforcement of the law is a matter for the police, and the police come under my jurisdiction. I very much regret that tobacco is being made available to minors. As a nation, we would be much healthier if tobacco was not available to adults as well as to minors. It seems to me that many aspects of the tobacco industry at present are absolutely deplorable. The way it is promoting fitness and health and at the same time ruining the nation's health is a shocking commentary on our society. Certainly, minors are entitled to the full protection of the law at least to discourage them from starting the habit. I will get a report for the honourable member as to the steps that are being taken to see that the law is enforced.

WATER CARTAGE

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Works say what arrangements have been made for the payment of subsidies to farmers for the cartage of water in drought stricken areas? I raise the question because I understand that limited discussion has occurred on this subject and that Federal politicians have been reported in newspapers

as having said that freight subsidies are available for primary producers who are obliged to cart water. Can the Minister therefore inform the House whether this State has arranged for any rebate to be made available to the landholders concerned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I sent minutes to the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for the distribution of drought relief in South Australia, some little while ago inquiring about payment for this matter, because I had had requests made to me as Minister of Works for water to be carted. I have received a reply which said, from memory, that such a situation would be catered for under the drought relief provisions. Several days ago the Minister issued a circular which outlines the cases in which payments will be made. From memory, I cannot relate these to the honourable member, but as soon as I can get a report for him from my colleague I will do so.

JUVENILE COURTS

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say when the juvenile courts legislation will be brought before Parliament and whether it will be in the form of new legislation or amendments to the present Act? Has further consideration been given to the setting up of a committee to carry out continuing investigations into the operation of the Juvenile Courts Act and associated matters, as recommended strongly by the Royal Commission into that Act? In August last year the Premier announced that Cabinet had decided to draw up a new Juvenile Courts Act in line with the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner (Judge Mohr) and that it was hoped to have it before Parliament last year. In his report, the Royal Commissioner urged the setting up of a committee comprising a magistrate and a judge from the children's court and an independent chairman to carry out continuing investigations into the operation of the Juvenile Courts Act.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will consult the Attorney-General, who will be responsible for the introduction of that legislation.

Mr. Millhouse: He told me it was coming in this session.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not suggesting that it is not coming in. The Attorney-General will be handling the juvenile courts aspect of the matter and I will be handling the necessary parallel amendments to the Community Welfare Act which will both—

Mr. Millhouse: They are coming in this session?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: They are on the way.

Mr. Wotton: Will it be new legislation or amendments to the present Act?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member will find that out. There has been a fairly long break known universally throughout Australia as the Christmas holidays, during which the House was not sitting. I understand they were not working in the Parliamentary Counsel's office during that period, either. That is not meant to be a derogatory comment, I am simply saying that there has been an intervening long holiday break. As far as I know, there has been no change in the Government's plans, and the legislation will be coming forward.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from February 14. Page 1502.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I oppose this Bill because the central issue in it, as is apparent in the Minister's second reading explanation, is to give effect to the State Labor Government's policy in relation to uranium mining and treatment. The basic provision of the Bill indicates clearly that the South Australian Government's policy on uranium is completely out of touch with reality and will severely damage our reputation and competitive position in relation to the rest of Australia. We know perfectly well that there is a division of opinion within the Labor Party in relation to the mining, processing and export of uranium and that the left wing of the Party has had a victory in South Australia.

All evidence rationally assessed would indicate that we should proceed, given the stringent safeguards adopted in the Federal Government's policy. It is a fact of life that we in South Australia do not live in a little world of our own but that we are in an Australian context and indeed a world context in relation to this whole question.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They don't sound like your words!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Indeed, they are my words. I took the opportunity, as members on the Government side do from time to time, of putting my thoughts to paper so that they would be clearly understood by members opposite. The South Australian Government's policy is parochial, selfish and dictated in the main by base political motives.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They sound like your words.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad the honourable member recognises my sentiments. We have in this country an obligation to an energy-hungry world to do what we can to improve the lot of under-developed nations and to fulfil the increasing energy needs of the world, and the only way of doing that on a global scale at present is by the development of nuclear energy. Total energy consumption has been expanding about 5 per cent a year since 1960. The world population is increasing at about 2 per cent a year, while current known recoverable oil and gas reserves are expected to last only to the beginning of the next century. The gap between supply and demand will surely develop and widen.

Major alternative sources of energy will soon be needed. In fact the energy needs of the developed world would not be satisfied at present without nuclear reactors already in operation. We know that they have played an important role in Great Britain for very many years, as they do in many other European countries and indeed in Asia. Whether we like it or not we are in the nuclear age. This Bill seeks to implement the misguided policy of the Labor Party in this State, which is for a moratorium on the mining and handling of uranium. Their "leave it in the ground" attitude is slightly modified, since the Minister can allow uranium and radio-active ores to be extracted, but they must then be stockpiled. Part of the original argument was that it was unsafe to handle the ores, but the Government appears to have made this modification of the policy. Obviously it will be handled by the miners and stockpiled.

It is a fact of life that there will be no development at all at Roxby Downs if uranium there is to be stockpiled. The copper deposits in these circumstances will be virtually worthless. This has been made perfectly clear by the mining companies concerned. The Labor Party made a

great deal of play towards the end of last year and during the Federal election campaign of the fact that we supported a resolution before this House in the following terms:

That this House believes 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.

What the Premier and other Labor spokesmen have conveniently forgotten is that since then the second Fox Report has become available and the Federal Government has enunciated a policy based on that report that insists on satisfactory arrangements being made with customer countries in relation to safeguards.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell us what the safeguards will be?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot give the safeguards verbatim off the cuff, but I can certainly provide the member for Mitcham with a copy, for his benefit. I should have thought that if the member for Mitcham was so interested in this matter he would have sought them out for himself.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I will take you up on a copy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is quite unrealistic for the South Australian Government to think that it can live in isolation from the rest of Australia or the world. A great deal of work was initiated by the Premier in relation to an enrichment plant for South Australia and discussions continued throughout last year in this regard. The Premier claimed he had stolen a march on the other States and that we would be the first to get such a plant. With all the attendant employment and economic benefits, the hard cold facts of life are that, given the Government's present stance, the chances of South Australia's gaining such an industry are remote indeed. We have only to compare the attitude of the Western Australian Premier and his Government and that of Queensland, which the present Administration criticises at every opportunity, to realise we are now just not in the race. It is interesting to note that the attitude of the A.W.U. in Queensland (where of course there is the benefit of the experience at Mount Isa) is rather more enlightened than that of the left wingers in charge of policy determination in South Australia.

The Federal Government's policy was endorsed during the December election by an overwhelming majority of the Australian people. Purchasers of uranium will be required to observe strict safeguards. In particular sales will be restricted to those countries that agree to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency. In the case of non-nuclear weapons it states that only those countries that are party to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, which is designed to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, will be eligible to purchase Australian uranium.

The Federal Government and indeed the majority of Australians are satisfied that there are adequate control, safety, physical security and nuclear safeguard measures to eliminate fears associated with nuclear power generation for peaceful purposes. The only fear of the former Governor of this State (Sir Mark Oliphant) was in relation to the possible use of nuclear weapons in warfare, but he now acknowledges that technology exists for the safe handling of nuclear waste. This seems to me to be the major question that has exercised the minds of the public in this State and elsewhere, and my own mind. My reservation in relation to uranium mining enrichment and export has been in relation to safeguards but, having been satisfied in that regard, I do not believe there is any reason

for the Government to press on with this legislation or with its misguided policy. The Australian uranium industry will be properly regulated and controlled with the establishment within the States of uniform national codes of practice. For the South Australian Government to press on with the major provision of this legislation in isolation is stupidity. Federal Government legislation has been foreshadowed, and I quote from the *Advertiser* of January 25, 1978, as follows:

Federal officials are preparing a Bill on future nuclear activity in Australia. It will cover health, transport of uranium ore and all aspects of mining and milling. The Minister for the Environment (Mr. Groom) said yesterday that work on the Bill, which would spell out national codes of practice, was well advanced. He was speaking before leaving from Melbourne for a tour of the Alligator River region of the Northern Territory.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Will the Alligator—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We will not go into that matter. The Minister is trying to divert attention from what I am saying. He knows that what I am saying is perfectly true, and in his own heart he probably agrees with me. The report continues:

Laws to protect the region were well in hand, Mr. Groom said. "I expect the legislation will be ready for introduction in the coming session of Parliament," he said. The legislation will provide for close supervision of mining activities in the region, which includes large areas to be set aside as national parks. Two Acts are to be amended to allow the first stage of the Kakadu National Park to be proclaimed and to allow Aboriginal reserves to be incorporated in the park. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Viner) said yesterday that an anti-uranium mining spokesman seemed intent on deliberately twisting the facts about the Government's future policies.

That highlights the absurdity, when we are dealing with a national issue in regard to which exports, etc., will be subject to national decision, of pressing on in isolation with the misguided and out-of-date policy of the South Australian Government.

I will now briefly examine the past activity of the Government in relation to uranium mining and its enrichment policy and will show what a change has occurred in a relatively short time. On January 30, 1976, a report commissioned by the South Australian Government was reported on in the *News*, as follows:

A State Government report states that:

- (a) Redcliff is the best site in Australia for a \$1 400 000 000 uranium mining and processing enrichment plant;
- (b) the plant would generate an income of \$426 000 000 a year when fully operational;
- (c) it would employ up to 800 workers during the eight-year building programme;
- (d) it would provide direct factory employment for 1 550, support a \$50 000 000 a year centrifuge manufacturing industry in Adelaide and support a town with a population of 4 650;
- (e) the plant would return more than 10 per cent a year on capital investment.

Some of the reasons advanced as to why Redcliff is the best site in Australia are:

- (a) its proximity to Port Pirie;
- (b) its central location in relation to uranium deposits in Queensland, Northern Territory and Western Australia;
- (c) its isolation from violent weather and naval attack;
- (d) the nearby power and transport infrastructure;
- (e) its closeness to the heavy metal and chemical production of the iron triangle.

The *News* of July 1, 1976, stated:

Mr. Hugh Hudson will be seeking overseas financial assistance for the proposed Redcliff plant.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's untrue!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let the Minister say so.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I have said so about three times already, and you choose to ignore it every time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the right of reply.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister is not accusing me of lying, but he is accusing the *News* and the *Advertiser* of lying. A report in the *Advertiser* of July 1, 1976, stated:

Mr. Dunstan said that his Government would be bound by both the conclusions of the Ranger inquiry (conducted by Mr. Justice Fox) and A.L.P. policy.

We know that they cut across one another. We know that it is the A.L.P.'s policy that has been predominant in the whole exercise. Indeed, Mr. Justice Fox might just as well not have completed his report as far as they are concerned. It is on the basis of Mr. Justice Fox's second report that the Federal Liberal Party's policy has been established. The *Advertiser* report of July 1, 1976, continued:

The report had been initiated after the former Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) had indicated his preference for a uranium enrichment plant in the Spencer Gulf area.

The article goes on to say who drafted the report. A report in the *Australian* of July, 1976, stated:

Mr. Connor's plans to finance an enrichment plant had been to borrow money from the uranium buyers—principally Japan—and inject into the plant via the Australian Industry Development Commission. This would ensure Australian ownership. Mr. Dunstan is reported to have said, "I would still prefer that all the money came through the A.I.D.C. However, we would be ready to go along with any plan that ensured Australia had a majority and controlling interest."

In terms of the Bill, I suggest to the Government that its pronouncements in relation to the Redcliff uranium enrichment plant are a pipe dream. Further, it would appear to me that Queensland would be way out in front in any efforts by an Australian State to obtain a uranium enrichment plant. I say further that that is a result of the policy enunciated last year by the State Labor Government, to the extreme disadvantage of the people of this State. I will now quote what one of the spokesmen (Mr. Bob Ryan, of Queensland) had to say last November after coming to this State and examining the policies and activities of the South Australian Government. He said:

There has been a deal of nonsense spoken by Mr. Dunstan recently about the attitude of the South Australian Government towards uranium. It is well known that his Government is actually encouraging uranium exploration in the State; but few people would know that the Government has carried this to the point of sponsoring a seminar in Adelaide on December 8 and 9 that will devote a good deal of its time to this very subject. But quite apart from this indirect involvement, the South Australian Government is continuing the planning for a uranium enrichment plant in the State.

I invite the Premier to deny that he has a high-powered Government committee carrying out a preliminary feasibility study for a uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff. This committee has continued its work despite the Government's supposed ban on uranium mining and development announced on March 30 last. In short, Mr. Dunstan's attitude has been hypocritical. Behind the scenes he is working for uranium development and enrichment in the State—obviously because of the jobs and prosperity that would go with it and well he might, for apart from the Gidgealpa-Moomba development, the State has not seen a significant new project since Mr. Dunstan came to power.

So let's not have any more of this mealy-mouthed hypocrisy from Mr. Dunstan. He supports uranium development and so do we.

Unfortunately, the Minister will no doubt challenge what has been said in that statement by Mr. Bob Ryan, but the cold, hard fact of life is that the enactment of this Bill will make a complete farce of any negotiations which the Premier and his Government might still be conducting in relation to this enrichment plant and, indeed, any activity in relation to uranium mining, enrichment and export.

Mr. Tonkin: Unless, of course, they are going to make secret deals.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know what was the Premier's stance during the Federal election campaign, and his attempts to discredit the Federal Government and to jump on to this emotional band wagon in relation to the dangers of uranium mining were laughed out of court. The Premier's efforts were completely ineffective.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you mean when he was digging in his cabbage patch?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The honourable member's recollection serves him well. There was that shot of the Premier digging in his organic vegetable garden, free from all adulterants, with the little face peeping around the corner of the pergola uttering some wise statements about dangers. It proved completely ineffective, and the hypocrisy of the Premier and of the State Labor Government in trying to stir this up at that time was perfectly evident and apparent to the public. I point out—I do not know whether the Government is aware of it—that a survey was carried out by McNear Anderson Public Opinion Polls. From memory, I think it was in June or July of last year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Make up the figures; it doesn't matter.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not do that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It would be consistent with the rest of your speech.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall quote the figures resulting from this survey. The question asked was as follows:

Should uranium projects in the Northern Territory, Western Australia, and South Australia, go ahead or be stopped?

Mr. Slater: A loaded question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I would say it was clearer than the referendum question the Government put to the people on shopping hours. A person of even the meanest intelligence or someone who is even semi-literate would understand that question. If the honourable member has any trouble, I shall explain it to him later. The survey showed that 65 per cent of Australians were in favour of the projects going ahead; the percentage in South Australia was 66. There were two other questions. The first was as follows:

Should Australia develop nuclear power for peaceful purposes?

The Australia-wide percentage in favour was 70, and the South Australian percentage 65. I have just mentioned the second question. The third question was as follows:

Is the Federal Government right or wrong in encouraging the export of uranium?

The Australian response was 51 per cent, and the South Australian response 47 per cent. Those opposed to the question (and this is the only figure from which the State Government could take any comfort) totalled 44 per cent of South Australians questioned. An outstanding majority answered in favour of the first two questions and a substantial majority in favour of the third, the remainder not having made up their minds. This poll was conducted

in, I think, June last, and much water flowed under the bridge between that time and the recent Federal election. It is not unreasonable to assume that a far higher percentage would have answered the question affirmatively towards the end of the year than would have been the case in June, when all the stirring was going on. In June last, I must say that I was far from convinced of the rightness of going ahead, because I had some doubts in relation to the handling of radio-active waste.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You changed your mind the day after you took the previous vote?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has not been listening to what I have said. The Government likes to tune this up. We had the second Fox Report and the policy enunciated by the Federal Government, which gave due weight to the recommendations of the Fox Report, and we know that the Labor Government in this State has chosen to neglect the recommendations of that report and to stick to its own misguided policy which has been carried by the left wing of the Party.

The poll indicates further that in pressing on with its policy the Government is running counter to majority opinion in this State. In his explanation of the Bill, the Minister made it quite clear that the other amendments are minor in his judgment and that this is the central issue. In those circumstances, we have no option but to oppose the Bill. It will inhibit employment prospects within the State in future. I should like to quote a reply given in the Federal Senate on April 21 last to Senator Keeffe by the Minister for National Resources. The question was as follows:

How many people are likely to be employed directly in uranium mining and associated industries if all major Australian uranium mines were to be brought into production?

The answer from Senator Withers was as follows:

The Minister for National Resources has provided the following answer to the honourable Senator's question:

The Australian Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that for a typical uranium mine with a capacity of 3 000 tonnes U₃O₈ per annum the estimated work force could be:

Mining operations, supervision, administration, etc.	250 to 300
Employment in a regional township and nearby areas associated with the uranium mine	250 to 300
Provision of equipment, goods and support services to mining operations (a number of these being on a part-time basis)	750 to 900

Supplement No. 1 to the Ranger Environmental Impact Statement said that in respect of the construction stage of that project up to 600 people could be involved on site with possibly another 1 400 people in service industries.

So, the South Australian Government apparently is prepared to turn its back on any future employment prospects in relation to this industry. The Roxby Downs project simply will not get under way if the State Government adheres to this policy. It is a fact, and the Minister knows it, that it will not be possible to mine copper or any other mineral in that deposit whilst this policy, which is to be enacted in legislation, is current. No company will undertake that development and stockpile uranium. Uranium is an integral part of the whole economic feasibility of that development. I am no expert on the potential of Roxby Downs—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Hear, hear!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I knew that would elicit a smart interjection from the Minister.

Mr. Tonkin: He is in a very uncomfortable position. He really doesn't want to do this, yet he is forced to.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he is. We know perfectly well that he is in a straitjacket, built and designed by the left wing of the Labor Party. It irks the Minister to be there, but he is stuck. It has been said that the potential for the Roxby Downs development could rival that of Mount Isa. It would be a very foolish Government indeed that would turn its back on the possibility of such a development. Clause 6 of the Bill effectively bottles up any uranium enrichment and sales in South Australia. It is the central clause, the one that precludes any mining, development, and export of uranium from the State. I should like to refer briefly to the position of the Soviet Union, which is in contra-distinction to what is contemplated in this legislation.

I quote here no less an authority than Mr. Pat Clancy, who I think from memory is an acknowledged communist: I recall his name being used in connection with the fiasco of the building of the Ansett Gateway opposite this establishment, where at the last count there had been about 56 stoppages. The building cost twice what it was estimated to cost. The cause of the stoppages was a clash between, I think Mr. Pat Clancy, a Soviet communist union leader involved, and the other building industry official involved, who happened to be a Peking communist. That is how I remember Mr. Pat Clancy. After he had been to see his friends in Soviet Russia, in an article headed "soviet N-waste 'answer'" that appeared in the *Australian* on January 25 this year he is reported as saying:

Russia is satisfied it has an answer to its uranium waste problem, according to the influential left-wing union leader Mr. Pat Clancy.

I think he is a communist union leader, one of those on whom it is now legitimate to have a Special Branch file, even according to this Government. The report continued:

Mr. Clancy, the Federal secretary of the Building Workers Industrial Union and a member of the 18-man A.C.T.U. executive, returned yesterday from a lengthy stay in Russia. He said in Sydney yesterday: "The Russians are now satisfied that in the conditions operating in their country uranium is able to be safely used and the waste safely disposed of."

Let us make no mistake about it: not only are the Russians well to the forefront in the use of nuclear reactors but also they are well to the forefront in the development of breeder reactors. The report continues:

Mr. Clancy said Russia had adopted an extensive period of public discussion in which the uranium question was widely debated. About 3 000 000 speakers had addressed meetings throughout the country during a nine-month period.

Russia solved the problem by brainwashing the people over a period of nine months by having 3 000 000 speakers going about the country justifying the development of nuclear industry. The report continued:

Asked about Russian reaction to Australian union attitudes on the question, Mr. Clancy said: "Their attitude is that it is a matter for Australian unions alone to decide."

That is the case in a democracy, but I doubt whether it was the Russian unions alone that decided that. They would not have decided the question there. Let us point out what another person, who is no doubt considered to be an extreme right-winger by members opposite (and I do not know much about this gentleman)—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You'll make something up.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will not make it up; I will quote what appears under the heading "About the Author":

Dr. Peter Beckmann is Professor of Electrical Engineering at the University of Colorado. He publishes the monthly

newsletter, *Access to Energy*, Box 2298, Boulder, Colorado, 80302.

The gentleman who wrote this article is attacking, quite trenchantly, the recommendations of a committee set up under the Ford Foundation to try to back-pedal a bit on the United States nuclear industry. I think that is probably a reasonable summation of what the article is about. He has something to say about the American situation in relation to Russia. I point out to this House that the South Australian Government situation is a completely different one—it is a step further back along the line than, indeed, is the American one. The article states:

What the Ford Foundation suggests in this area that is totally unrelated to nuclear electric power is not merely unilateral disarmament; it falls little short of capitulation to the Soviet refusal to limit strategic arms on any but their own terms, to their policy of going feverishly nuclear while fanning opposition to nuclear power in Western Europe and Australia, and to their policy of stepping in with nuclear supplies when the United States will not or cannot provide them.

That puts a different slant on Mr. Clancy's visit to Russia. The Russians are going hell for leather in developing their nuclear reactor resources. In fact, if members opposite like to take the time to read further in this brochure they will see that it states that the Russians are going well and truly into breeder reactors, yet Mr. Clancy says that it is all right for the Russians to charge ahead and develop their nuclear reactors, uranium mines, and so on, but back here in Australia we must let the unions decide; he says that in South Australia the unions are on the right track because they say, "don't touch it". If we are in a position of weakness in this matter on a global scale, the policy of this Government makes it just that much weaker.

Mr. Groom: Haven't you got a policy?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for—

Mr. Tonkin: Don't worry about him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We must give him some material to read. Speakers from the United Kingdom, including prominent union officials and members of the present Labour Administration, have made it perfectly clear that uranium is necessary (in fact, essential) for the United Kingdom to continue to supply the energy needs of that country. In fact, the United Kingdom, as we well know, was one of the first countries into the atomic age with its plant at Windscale, and so on. We know that it needs a supply of uranium. Where will it get it? If we are to adopt the South Australian policy on an Australia-wide scale, where will they get it? They will have to go to Soviet Russia to get it. It is perfectly clear that there is a demand, not only in Britain but also in Europe, for our uranium. I quote again from recent statements made by people concerned in this area. Under the heading "Our uranium 'vital' to U.K.", an article published on January 23 this year states:

Britain must have access to Australian uranium in the early 1980's to meet its energy needs into the next century, the West Australian Minister for Fuel and Energy, Mr. Mensaros, said yesterday. He said the permanent head of Britain's Department of Energy, Sir Jack Rampton, indicated this during talks they had in London. "Britain is looking to Australia—and rightly so—to help them maintain their nuclear industry," he said. "The British Government, the Opposition and Britain's trade unions are all strongly behind further development of nuclear energy and reliable sources of uranium from Australia."

The report continues in similar vein. I will not quote again, because it has been quoted in this House before, the statements of the man referred to by members opposite when he arrived in Australia as a junior Minister. He

arrived at an embarrassing time during the Federal election campaign. He indicated quite clearly Great Britain's need for uranium from Australia. That was a source of embarrassment, particularly to Mr. Uren (that notable left-wing Deputy Leader, as he was then), who had to get busy and tear this man down by saying he was only a junior Minister who had no right to speak and that he was only a small cog in the wheel.

It is a fact of life that he was speaking for the British Government and in the main for the British trade unions, because they know that the country cannot continue to survive without its nuclear reactors and supplies of uranium from somewhere around the globe. Not everyone in the A.L.P. is quite as benighted as is the State Labor Government here, because, as I have said, even within the union movement there are some who are reasonably enlightened, particularly members of the A.W.U. in Queensland who know where their bread and butter is. Let me quote from an article published in the *Advertiser* on December 7 and headed "Uranium has to be mined, says unionist", as follows:

The Federal A.L.P. will have to seriously consider the mining of uranium within 12 months if it wins the election, says the Australian Workers Union. The general secretary of the union (Mr. F. V. Mitchell), who was returned to office in a national ballot for the union's Federal executive on Monday, said last night:

"It is A.W.U. policy to mine and export uranium and to use it in nuclear reactors provided all safeguards are used and provided it will be sold only to non-proliferation countries," he said.

That is precisely in line with the policy of the present Federal Government. The report continues:

People have very short memories. The late Rex Connor was going to mine and mill uranium and the Australian Government was going to buy it and sell it. That was the policy at that time. He was clearly going to do it. That policy really brought about the Ranger inquiry. The only thing that has changed since then is the Government.

We have had the Ranger inquiry and the Fox report—the uranium is still there, only there has been more found. There is a world energy crisis, but I don't think many people realise this. The Eastern bloc countries are going for their lives building nuclear reactors. So why not the Western world and, if necessary, Australia?

Economically Australia is in a very sad position. We have an economy in a deplorable state while we have a wealth in uranium stocks. One really laughs at the other.

The point well made by the enlightened Mr. Mitchell is that it was the policy of the A.L.P. and Mr. Connor to mill and mine uranium. The only difference was that under Mr. Connor's regime it was to be owned by the Australian Government. However, things have advanced further since then, and it is completely unrealistic for this Government to say otherwise. I can produce other quotes but I do not think it is necessary. However, I could quote reports of the European Common Market in which it was stated that it wants to buy our uranium, and also reports stating that West Germany wants to buy it. We know that we are in the nuclear age, and the only question to be resolved is whether the waste can be satisfactorily handled. We are satisfied that the safeguards in the policy of the Australian Government are satisfactory, and that fact makes nonsense of the Bill.

I believe that most of the other provisions of the Bill, although minor, are desirable. If one is to accept the policy of the State Labor Government (which we do not), one must accept clause 10 because it relates to retention leases, and that is only a reasonable and sensible provision if one accepts clause 6. However, I have pointed out clearly that

we do not accept clause 6, which would make somewhat unnecessary the need for clause 10. There are other provisions in which retention leases are desirable. One would not argue about the desire to allow fossicking to be carried on without a mining licence if it is not leading to any commercial sales, and one cannot object to some of the other provisions regarding the depth to which opal can be mined if it is found in a mine, and so on. When the member for Eyre returns from a deputation, he will have something to say about the clauses relating to machinery not being used in some circumstances.

In reading through the Minister's second reading explanation and checking the clauses, I found one or two inconsistencies in which the explanation did not tie in with the clause, but it will be more beneficial to query them in Committee. Although some things in the Bill are desirable, as the Minister said in his judgment they are minor, and the Opposition does not object to those aspects of the Bill. If one has to live with the Government's misguided policy, clause 10 would make much sense.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It makes a lot of sense whatever your policy: that's a stupid comment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In his second reading explanation the Minister has made no bones about the fact that the main purpose of the Bill is to give effect to this States Labor Government's policy in relation to uranium. In relation to the other provisions, he said:

At the same time the opportunity has been taken to attend to certain other aspects requiring minor amendment.

Therefore, I think our stance is clear, and we believe that the Government's policy is misguided. We know that the Minister in his heart of hearts would realise that the policy is misguided, because there is a division of opinion in the Labor Party. I have quoted leading union officials to that effect, and we even have the communist, Mr. Clancy, coming back from Russia and saying that what that country is doing is all right and that if we could get the unions on side it would be all right here, too.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is he a member of the Liberal Party?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, he is a member of the Communist Party, but I doubt whether he would vote Liberal. We have had a re-elected Secretary or President of the A.W.U. saying that the policy of the A.L.P. is nonsense. The division of opinion within the union movement is obvious, and also obvious in the Labor Party. Unfortunately, we have a situation in which people on the anti-uranium side are doing their cause much damage. We have had the Down-to-Earth Confest report: if anything did the anti-uranium lobby any damage, it was those people splashing around naked in the fountain in Canberra. It is sort of a national joke.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You can finish your speech now, because other members are here.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have never known the Minister to curtail his remarks either during Question Time or during his rather ponderous speeches in debate. The Minister should be the last person to chide any member for speaking too long.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm not talking about that, but you're saying nothing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Government wanted a filibuster and have us sit here for a week, it would put the Minister of Mines and Energy on his feet, because in his ponderous way he goes on and on grinding out the same stuff but with a different flow of words, and he does that more effectively than anyone else in the House. I reject that comment of the Minister. I have made our position clear.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said that 20 minutes ago.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps I could find another fresh quote. The Government has attempted to gild the lily and sugarcoat the pill, but the central aim of the Bill is the Government's stupid policy, and we oppose the Bill.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Whilst the Bill for the most part would seem to have features that are eminently desirable, or slightly desirable, clauses 6 and 10 are most important, and the Minister has said that they are the clauses that will have the greatest bearing on the future of mining in South Australia. I do not think that there is any question that we should oppose clauses 6 and 10 in this legislation, since they are directed straight towards the potential mining of uranium.

An argument that has been propounded by way of interjection is that the use of uranium in the world is declining, and that world markets are rapidly failing. I believe that, in the newspaper today, in a letter to the Editor it is stated that world use of uranium is declining so rapidly as to make mining non-profitable. If that is the case, industry will decide that there is no need to go ahead with mining in South Australia. The sheer economics of the issue will be settled by the need or lack of need for uranium. That is not an issue that requires legislation.

I see the legislation before us as a direct attempt to curtail any further exploration or mining of uranium. A subclause is built into this measure that permits any company to go ahead with the mining of uranium, provided it is prepared to stockpile that uranium or, if it is going to pass the waste products away, the waste must be of such low radio-activity that it is absolutely safe. That is fair enough. However, I cannot see any company being willing to expend many millions of dollars on exploration and mining programmes if the most significant portion of the mineral content, uranium, cannot be used. Moreover, clause 10 provides that the Minister has the right year by year to extend a lease to a company which may have discovered uranium but which, finding it uneconomical to mine, will therefore not be able to take any action in that regard. In those circumstances, I cannot see any company being willing to take that substantial risk and then for the potential use to be left in the hands of one man, the Minister, to say "Yea" or "Nay". That is just not on.

This move is largely against the Minister's own conscience. I believe he recognises, as well as anyone in Australia, the precise position at which various energy resources are and that, in the whole spectrum of energy resources, uranium is one resource that is impossible to discount. For that reason it may be that the Bill reflects that there could be considerable vacillation on the part of the Government in so far as we have an annual re-assessment built into it. Perhaps the Minister sees the possibility within a year or two of being able to say to any company, "Yes, we have plenty of uranium there. It is very rich: it is a mighty deposit, so go ahead with it." An assurance has certainly been built into this legislation to enable the Minister to do precisely that, in spite of the Minister's affirmation that that power has been included to protect the present State and Federal Government policies of leaving uranium in the ground.

We are faced with a few important questions which have been put constantly and which none of the protagonists towards uranium mining has been able to resolve. According to the World Energy Conference in 1974 the estimated exhaustion time of currently known fuel reserves is roughly as follows: crude oil, 37 years; natural gas, 38 years; brown coal, 194 years; and black coal, 198 years. The important automotive sources of energy are due to expire within the lifetime of our young children. There is no present guarantee that any potential

alternative source of energy will be proven viable within 10 to 20 years (that is at least how far we are away). It could be 30 to 40 years away, by which time we will be well and truly into the crisis period. Unless there is some form of insurance, the whole world could be up against it, and I believe the Minister is well aware of that, for he is a man of intelligence.

The rest of the world is taking out insurance in the form of nuclear development. Australia has two possibilities: first, that we completely cut out our source of uranium to the rest of the world, a policy that must encourage the rest of the world to consider using fast-breeder reactors, which have as one of their by-products enriched plutonium. Existing reactors are slow reactors, light-water reactors, and do not produce the dangerous element, plutonium. Given Australia's reluctance to supply the world markets with uranium, the rest of the world is forced towards implementing a programme of fast-breeder reactors. That is a major threat to many people who dislike the use of uranium. How important a threat is it now? Scientists tell us that Russia is experimenting with these reactors, as is the United States, France and other countries. However, fast-breeder reactors are not very successful at the moment.

Whether or not Australia likes it, there is every possibility that the rest of the world's supplies of uranium could be exhausted, partly because of the use of light-water reactors and partly because of the present failure rate of fast-breeder reactors, and therefore Australia will, before long, be a fairly vulnerable target for anyone who is desperately committed to a nuclear programme and sees Australia as a lightly guarded country. There is no doubt about that when we realise the we can be invaded by incapacitated refugees coming into Australia on wooden planks from countries to the north of us.

The second possibility is seized on by those who say that we have plenty of brown and black coal and that it will be 200 years before it runs out. The Miami and Persepolis conferences in the United States pointed out that, over the past few decades, we have been trying hard to get out of using those carbon-dioxide producing coal fossil fuels. In the world's major cities carbon-dioxide, along with petroleum, has contributed towards heavy smog, industrial smog and cancer. Tens of thousands of deaths are attributable to the use of coal as a fuel because of its carcinogenic content, the cancer-forming content of the material, which is given off when coal is burnt.

Those facts are on the Statute Book as against the possibility that we will have a nuclear holocaust other than a deliberately exploded atomic bomb like those used on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which we have all come to realise was a mistake. These are the everyday deaths that are unavoidable if we are committed to the use of brown or black coal. The coarser the fuel the more pollution that is emitted into the atmosphere at a time when this Government, among other world governments, is producing anti-pollution legislation that would certainly have to be changed radically if we change our attitude towards the use of these fossil fuels, once again as an everyday source of energy. It is a problem that has not been resolved.

A third problem that has been thrown up is the disposal of nuclear waste. That is a soluble problem. Sir Mark Oliphant warned that the major danger was that of nuclear war, a danger which, of course, already exists and which has done since the 1940's when the first nuclear bomb was exploded. At that time, on the A.M. broadcast on September 28, 1977, he also said:

The waste problem, in the sense that the radio-active waste from nuclear reactors can be safely stored, has been solved. I

have no doubt about that whatever.

In support of that is an article which I quoted to the Attorney-General and which I believe he would have since read because he referred to it personally afterwards. It is an article in the *Scientific American* of June, 1977, volume 236. The article, which is headed "The disposal of radio-active wastes from fission reactors", states:

The task of disposing of the radio-active wastes produced by nuclear power plants is often cited as one of the principal drawbacks to the continued expansion of this country's capacity to generate electricity by means of the nuclear-fission process. Actually the task is not nearly as difficult or as uncertain as many people seem to think it is.

Then follow many pages of complex and scientific explanation. It is a highly reputable magazine, and I am sure Sir Mark would have been aware of that article when he commented on the fact that it was physically possible to dispose safely of nuclear waste. Any interested member can obtain a copy of the article from the Parliamentary Library. It is cutting number 122/11 of last year.

Many other questions have also to be considered if the world is going to run out of energy within the next 20 to 30 years, and we must consider that at least some forms of energy will be completely depleted. We have already at this time, when we are saying we are adequately provided with energy, 1 000 000 000 people starving for food, and that means they have a power deficit; they do not have enough power to provide industry, commerce or food.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you seriously saying that nuclear power will help them directly?

Mr. ALLISON: The honourable member will have his chance to speak in a minute. The honourable member is trying to throw in red herrings, but the point is—

Mr. Millhouse: It is not a red herring at all. You know perfectly well that nuclear power will not directly help the under-developed countries. Why don't you acknowledge that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: Whatever the honourable member may say as an antagonist of nuclear development, we do have one of the major factors put to us that we should be economising the world over in the use of fuel. Now that we have an expanding population, no-one will deny that. Even given a declining birth rate, by the year 2000 we will have tens of thousands of people in every country, totalling millions or billions of people (depending on the various estimates) in the world in addition to present population. Even in our State which has a slowly increasing birth rate we still have an increase.

We do not have enough power to provide the world at present and we are being asked to economise in the use of fuel. Anyone who looks at the situation must appreciate that, if we have to economise, we will produce less. Only in an expanding economy can we provide acceptable living standards not only for the people who are currently on a fair to high standard of living but also for the 1 000 000 000 people who the United Nations statistical source states are currently grossly neglected. This is one group for whom the member for Mitcham has expressed sympathy but he has not said how he is will provide additional power for them.

Members interjecting:

Mr. ALLISON: If atomic energy will not provide the additional power for these newly developing countries, perhaps the fuel we will conserve in going to atomic energy may be diverted to their resources. The point is that if we cut out one very important potential source of fuel we will go backwards instead of even marking time. We will exhaust the world supply of oil and of coal. Even if we think we will survive for 200 years, that is no time at all in

the time scale during which the world has existed. People will be on earth for far longer than the next 200 to 300 years. If nuclear energy can be used for 10, 20 or 30 years to give us time to develop alternative sources of power, we could avoid a holocaust that could be far worse than a nuclear holocaust. Nation could be against nation simply because of fuel and food shortages and starvation.

I see that as a bigger potential threat already in sight than the potential for nuclear warfare. I think man's common sense will prevail when it comes to the use of nuclear weapons, whereas no common sense can prevail when we are faced with billions of people starving. It is a humane point of view that says we should at least be taking out some sort of insurance. If we permit mining and stockpiling and encourage companies to do this work, we have the present Federal Government which has developed safeguards, but if we stop companies from investigating—

Mr. Millhouse: Would you like to tell us something about the safeguards? You're being remarkably silent about them.

Mr. ALLISON: If I had a double tongue or two mouths, like the honourable member seems to think we all have (we do not share his distinction), I might be able to talk in two directions simultaneously.

Mr. Millhouse: You can't answer—

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

Mr. ALLISON: If the honourable member is not worried about the world's unemployed, perhaps that is one reason why he says Parliamentarians can work part-time for a full-time salary. There are many people who do not have even one job.

Mr. Millhouse: You had better be careful; your own Leader is doing that according to—

Mr. ALLISON: I do not know about that; the honourable member is the one who boasts about it when it comes to the question of unemployment. In South Australia we have a mineral development with a potential at Roxby Downs to give us a township of the size of Mount Isa, which has a population of 30 000. Imagine the potential development in South Australia which the trade unions could look forward to as a source of employment for at least relieving the present problem.

Mr. Max Brown: You can't say—

Mr. ALLISON: The population in the district of Whyalla might be interested in the honourable member's attitude, if he is against having employment for 30 000 people. I am sure that will go down well in his local newspaper! We must admit that, in this present highly sophisticated scientific era, the problems posed as the only reasons for opposing nuclear legislation can be overcome. The very fact that we are so short of fuel is a strong indication that they will be overcome, and the fact that we in Australia are so presumptuous as to assume that these dangers do not already exist or that we could influence them now—

Mr. Millhouse: If you can't beat them, join them.

Mr. ALLISON: The honourable member is being childish. The dangers are already there. The technology is already at work, and we have experts such as Sir Mark and others who have already pointed out how the problems can be solved.

We have had the threat of atomic war for 30 years. Many people say that that very threat has in fact been the major factor that has stopped us from having another world war, such wars tending to come along every 20 years or so. I think that it was predicted from 1945 that there would be another war in the next decade or so, so desperate did the situation seem to be between the

western countries and the Iron Curtain countries. The existence of atomic weaponry has been a form of insurance.

The amount of uranium reported to exist in Australia is minimal. It was claimed 18 months ago that 98 per cent of uranium was in the rest of the world. Since then we have had a complete reappraisal and now we are firmly of the opinion that about one-third of the world's quality uranium exists in Australia. The fact that we are here as a potential jewel to be plucked by someone really desperate for uranium cannot be ignored. World decisions have already been made regarding the use of nuclear power.

Mr. Max Brown: What about getting on to the safety precautions for uranium?

Mr. Millhouse: Max, don't encourage him. We may be here after dinner, as it is, the way he's going on, as his Deputy Leader went on.

Mr. ALLISON: As it seems that most members are either asleep or wanting to go home, to test the feeling of the House, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister is sufficiently interested to want to prolong the debate. I regard the legislation before us as nothing more than a cynical attempt on the Minister's part to make South Australians believe that he and the Government are interested only in enforcing the Labor Party's policies. The insurance clause that permits him to revise his decision every year or so is an indication that change is on the way. I see no reason why clauses 6 and 10 should receive the Opposition's support, because the various safeguards regarding nuclear waste disposal are either in existence or we have the Federal Government's policies on the ultimate disposal of uranium, insisting on safeguards existing in consumer countries. In the light of those two facts, I believe we should oppose the Bill for what it is and I do precisely that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker, I thought for a moment that you had not even noticed that the honourable member had stopped.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This afternoon members of the Liberal Party have done their best to generate a full-scale debate on the mining of uranium, no doubt thinking that it will give them some political advantage to do so, but I suggest that they have totally failed and that the atmosphere in the Chamber while first the member for Kavel and then the member for Mount Gambier were speaking was utterly dead. No-one has been the slightest bit interested in starting a full-scale debate. There has been no-one in the press galleries to listen to what the members fondly hoped were words of wisdom and jewels of rhetoric that would appear in the *Advertiser* and the *News*. I do not want to speak for long on this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Good!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel is remarkable. He went on and on this afternoon, and even his own members were restive behind him. The only effect his contribution had on me was to make me annoyed and to make me decide that I would speak in the debate after all. The whole of the arguments put by him and by the member for Mount Gambier can be summed up in one word, namely, greed. The whole policy of the Liberal and National Parties Government in Canberra and the Liberal Opposition here is based on greed—what we, as Australians, can get out of it, and how much we can get

out of mining and flogging our uranium to others. Members can rationalise it as best they can. The little member from Mount Gambier tried to do that by referring to unemployment and to the under-developed countries. It is sheer rationalisation. The whole appeal of the Federal Government's policy on this issue revolves around the greed of Australians—how much more we can get out of it for ourselves, and how silly we would be to pass up this opportunity to make more money.

I remind the Liberal Party that we are already one of the wealthiest countries in the world. We do not need this extra money. The member for Mount Gambier would not listen to me when I interjected on him and challenged him on this question, but he knows as well as I do that little is to be gained directly by under-developed countries through nuclear power. It has to be adapted on so vast a scale as to make it economically impossible for poor countries to harness it. They know that. What garbage we hear from the apologists for the Federal Government! All the people who peddle that garbage know it as well. It is remarkable that in a debate like this members of the Liberal Party who are opposing the Bill have not even got the Fox Report in the Chamber. We might have had one or two loose references to it, but not one of the Liberals is bothering either to quote it or to recall what is in it.

Mr. Gunn: Don't quote from it selectively, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Eyre does not want me to quote it selectively, I will quote the whole of the principal findings and recommendations. I was not going to do that but, if he is challenging me to do that and saying that I might be selective, I will read the whole of it. The principal findings and recommendations, on page 185—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Ignore them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can try to shut me up.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm not, but you're wasting your time answering Opposition interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The tragedy of the Minister's situation is that in his heart of hearts I am afraid that he agrees with the Liberal Party on this matter. It is only that he is bound by his Party's policy that has got him into the situation of introducing a Bill like this. If I am wrong in that (and all my observations of the Minister on this subject are to confirm what I have said), I challenge him to say so when he replies to the debate. The Liberal Party members want me to read all of the principal findings and recommendations of the Fox Report.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't let them cause you to waste the limited time you have in the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have 25 minutes; that will be long enough for me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you want to waste part of it, go ahead.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the opportunity to speak for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. I can see you are looking forward to my using my full time.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They're trying to provoke you into wasting your time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister has appealed to my better instincts, so perhaps I will not quote the whole of the findings and recommendations. I refer members to pages 185-6 of the first Fox Report and, if any of them believe that I have quoted out of context, they can go to the full list. The member for Kavel said that the disposal of waste was, so far as he knew, the major problem about the

mining, export and use of uranium. I remind him of the third of the findings, as follows:

The nuclear power industry is unintentionally contributing to an increased risk of nuclear war. This is the most serious hazard associated with the industry. Complete evaluation of the extent of the risk and assessment of what course should be followed to reduce it involve matters of national security and international relations which are beyond the ambit of the inquiry.

There is a little more, but I will not read that. I go now to the seventh recommendation, as follows:

Policy respecting Australian uranium exports, for the time being at least, should be based on a full recognition of the hazards, dangers and problems of and associated with the production of nuclear energy, and should therefore seek to limit or restrict expansion of that production.

I go now to the final recommendation, and this is where the Federal Government has been absolutely unconscionable. It reads:

Our final recommendation takes account of what we understand to be the policy of the Act under which the inquiry was instituted. It is simply that there should be ample time for public consideration of this report, and for debate upon it. We therefore recommend that no decision be taken in relation to the foregoing matters until a reasonable time has elapsed and there has been an opportunity for the usual democratic processes to function, including, in that respect, Parliamentary debate.

We all know that there has not been that opportunity, that public debate. What has happened in the Federal Parliament anyway has been an entire and utter farce. We have seen the Federal Government taking advantage of the weakness of the Labor Opposition simply to impose a decision on the people of Australia, and the Labor Party was quite impotent to do anything about it. We are playing with the future of mankind in what we are doing here. The policy of my Party on this matter is quite clear. It has been adopted, and it has not been varied or altered. The relevant part of our policy on uranium is as follows:

An indeterminate stay on uranium export, and that there be not only public debate but also constructive action by Australia to stimulate and itself initiate a massive international programme of research and development of safe and inexhaustible supplies of energy, whatever their nature.

I emphasise those words: an indeterminate stay on export. That is where we stand. We have been right through the period of—

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's come from the left wingers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel falls into the trap of believing that anyone who opposes him must be a knave or a fool and must have base motives. Apparently, he believes that the only people who are opposed to the mining and export of uranium are so-called left wingers. If he opened his eyes even to a slit he would know that people from all walks of life, of all kinds, and of all political persuasions (and probably some in the Liberal Party, although they are misguided to be there) are opposed to the mining and export of uranium.

That is the position, and it is a complete fallacy. We have had it peddled time and time again in this place, particularly this afternoon by the member for Kavel, who believes that the only people who are opposed to this are left wingers and that their efforts will weaken the Western world and strengthen the Eastern bloc. That is dangerous nonsense. That is the position we have in the Australian Democrats. Clauses 6 and 10 of the Bill (I have not looked at the others; and I do not know whether they are good, bad or indifferent, and I am loath to accept the assurance of the member for Mount Gambier that they are all right) I

support. A few months ago I would have been entirely against any work being done in connection with prospecting for uranium or the mining of other minerals found in association with uranium. Some time before Christmas I attended a seminar on the subject at the Adelaide University, where I heard a mining man, who impressed me, saying what I have since found out to be a fact: that minerals are found not in little pockets separately but all mixed up together, and that it is impossible to mine only copper at Roxby Downs without disturbing the uranium; therefore, unless we have some policy such as that behind this Bill, it will be impossible to mine the copper at Roxby Downs or to mine any mineral where uranium may be found.

That, I have concluded—and this is my personal view—would be unfortunate. I would much rather we did not touch any uranium, but, as apparently it is physically impossible to do that if we are to mine other minerals, this to me is the next best thing. Let me not be misunderstood. I think I was one of the first to lift the lid off what the Uranerz organisation was doing, with the Minister's connivance, in the Hills a few months ago, prospecting for uranium. I am totally against that because they are looking for the uranium. At Roxby Downs, as I understand it, there are vast copper deposits. I do not accept what the member for Kavel said about that. There is uranium there as well, is there not?

Mr. Gunn: That's right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unless we have some policy such as this Government has brought in, it will be impossible to mine the copper.

Mr. Becker: Wouldn't it be dangerous to stockpile the uranium?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am told it need not be dangerous to stockpile the uranium in its raw state. That was my understanding at the time of the Ranger Commission, when I had to go into it. It is borne out here in the earlier recommendations of the Fox Commission, as follows:

1. The hazards of mining and milling uranium—and we are not going as far as that—
if those activities are properly regulated and controlled, are not such as to justify a decision not to develop Australian uranium mines.

I accept that. That was the clear evidence of the Ranger Commission. If the hazards of mining and milling are controlled, it is obvious that the hazards of mining and stockpiling can be controlled. Given the stand which my Party takes and which I wholeheartedly support (that there should be an indeterminate stay on this), there seems to be no alternative to the policy embodied in those two clauses of the Bill.

I do not think that any honourable member is suggesting that there should not be full exploration and encouragement of the mining—and I am thinking of Roxby Downs, because I have no doubt that that is behind the Bill, even though it is not mentioned directly. It would be unfortunate if there were to be any impediment to the mining of the copper deposits up there.

The Liberals have been playing politics this afternoon. I think it has been completely unsuccessful. No-one showed the slightest interest except me, because I have had to sit here to get my chance to speak. I had to sit here during the long and tedious speech of the member for Kavel and also the speech of the member for Mount Gambier. I support the Bill. I believe that this is the best policy to adopt in all the circumstances, and it is in accord with my view that there should be an indeterminate stay on the export of uranium.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I oppose the Bill. The member for

Mitcham accused the Liberal Party of being selfish and self-centred—

Mr. Millhouse: "Greed" was the word.

Mr. GUNN: The motive was greed. I am surprised that the member for Mitcham would make comments of that nature. He is on record in this place as informing the public of South Australia that being a member of Parliament is only a part-time job.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: He goes out and has two or three other sources of income, which I would say would be far in excess of what the average citizen would receive. If that is not greed, I do not know what is.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre kept speaking, even though I was on my feet. He knows better. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I have interest in the other sources of income of the member for Mitcham, I do not see anything in the Bill about them. It is entirely out of order for the honourable member to refer to that fact.

Mr. Dean Brown: Which one are you referring to?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order. I think the honourable member for Eyre has had a fair say on the matter. In future, when the Speaker stands, I hope that he will sit down.

Mr. GUNN: I will not pursue that matter further, because I think I have made my point.

Mr. Millhouse: According to the Director of the Liberal Party—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has had his turn. I hope he will cease interjecting.

Mr. Millhouse: His own Leader is doing—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I shall ignore him. He normally goes on in a childish fashion, and he is continuing that way this afternoon. Roxby Downs is in my district, and I do not think the member for Mitcham is very familiar with the circumstances of the proposed operation there. I suggest he should contact the Western Mining Corporation to ascertain whether that corporation believes it is economic to mine copper at Roxby Downs, if it is not permitted to mine and export uranium. I think he will find that the corporation believes it is not economic to spend the millions of dollars necessary on the site if it is not permitted to sell uranium.

I am totally opposed to the overall policy of the A.L.P. I make no apology for saying that I support the present policy of the Commonwealth Government. The South Australian Government has been rather hypocritical in its attitude. We know that, leading up to and during the 1977 Federal election campaign, members opposite were saying one thing but allowing people to go out through the length and breadth of South Australia and prospect for uranium. I would like to know what sort of undertakings were given. I was informed in my own district what was going on. As a matter of fact, I had people come on to my own farm looking for uranium. I wonder what would happen if someone came down to this building, which has much granite on it, and took some readings to see what sort of uranium counts it would give, because I understand that wherever there is granite there is a certain amount of uranium.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If they took a reading on one of your speeches they would get a very positive reaction, because it is full of waste product.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I have called the Minister to order one other occasion, and I hope that he will stop interjecting.

Mr. **GUNN**: I am not particularly interested in what the arrogant Minister is saying.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! I want the honourable member to stick to the Bill.

Mr. **GUNN**: I want to refer now to a couple of clauses that affect my constituents engaged in the opal mining industry. Again, the Government and the Minister have shown a total lack of courtesy and consideration. Only yesterday the Secretary of the Coober Pedy Miners and Progress Association received a letter from the Minister relating to the contents of this Bill. How can those people make a judgment about how this legislation will affect them? I was speaking to him earlier this afternoon and he said that they were not particularly happy about the clauses in this Bill. Because they have not had the opportunity to consider the matter properly, I intend to oppose the Bill, and I sincerely hope that the passage of the measure will be significantly slowed so that the necessary action can be taken in another place. I have advised the association to contact the Hon. A. M. Whyte when they have made up their minds about this legislation.

On a previous occasion the Minister rushed legislation through this House without giving the members or the people it could affect any opportunity to properly consider it. I should have thought, having made that mistake once, it would not happen a second time. The Minister would be aware that there are regulations still under consideration by people in the mining industry, particularly at Coober Pedy, and they have not yet made a final decision. He has officers there at present having discussions and, before they have finished discussing that matter, he brings in another piece of legislation without going to them. I believe it is in very poor taste.

Let us look at clause 14, which amends section 59 of the principal Act and which provides:

- (1) A mining operator shall not use declared equipment in the course of mining operations except—
 - (a) upon land subject to a lease or licence granted under this Act;
 - (b) upon a registered claim situated within a precious stones field;

That means that, if a person wants to go out prospecting in an area which is designated for opal mining and he intends to use declared equipment, he has to register a claim. They are most concerned about this.

When I read this clause, my memory about some of the propaganda that the A.L.P. used during the election campaign was refreshed. It was untruthful, so I thought it would be an appropriate time to read some documents that were given to me. During that campaign a document authorised by Mr. J. Andrea, of Coober Pedy, appeared. The document is headed "Australian Labor Party, Coober Pedy sub-branch newsletter". Item 1 stated:

Trench diggers have become undeclared mining equipment.

Let us look at the document put out under the letterhead of "Department of Mines South Australia", which states:

Attention trench digger operators. The information in a newsletter published on behalf of the Australian Labor Party Coober Pedy sub-branch which states, "Trench diggers have become undeclared mining equipment", is a misstatement. Trench diggers are still declared equipment and each claim must be registered before mining by a trench digger is carried out. Working with a trench digger on a claim which is not registered may be considered as unauthorised mining and the operator could be prosecuted. The matter of trench diggers being not declared equipment is being discussed between the

C.P.M. & P.A. and the Mines Department and some action will be taken in the near future.

That was a damaging contradiction for the A.L.P. Since then there have been discussions relating to having trench diggers, and I understand those discussions have just reached finality. I am pleased about that. Most people who want to go out and do any prospecting like to take fairly heavy equipment to do it, because otherwise it is not practicable for them, because of the costs involved. The Secretary has informed me that his members are most concerned about clause 16, and I sincerely hope that the Minister, before proceeding, will take into consideration the matters that they will shortly be bringing to his attention.

Clause 12 amends section 46 of the principal Act. They are most concerned about that clause. I understand that the Minister and his officers have had discussions with them over a considerable time about the effects of this clause. The miners are far from satisfied at the manner in which this clause is drafted. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the matter and remove the word "forfeited", because they do not believe that it is appropriate. They were of the opinion that the Government had accepted the suggestions they had put forward. Those are just two matters. The House would be aware that this legislation was brought into the House only yesterday afternoon and it has not been possible to give it the detailed consideration necessary.

I sincerely hope that this is the last occasion on which the Government will be so rude, not only to those people who have been affected but also to the members of this House who have some interest in these matters. When the Bill goes into Committee I intend to raise a number of matters with the Minister, and I hope I have given him the opportunity to consider the two points I have previously mentioned. At this stage, I will refresh the Minister's memory and draw the House's attention to some of the statements made over the past few years about uranium mining. I will do that in a few moments. I appeal to the Minister, before he proceeds with this legislation, to give those people at Coober Pedy and Andamooka an opportunity of properly considering the Bill before the legislation is introduced. He knows it was impossible for me to get a copy of the Bill up to them, so they could consider it, as I received it only yesterday. They received a letter from him, not a draft copy of the Bill, so I appeal to him in the future not to rush legislation into the House until they have properly considered it and have had an opportunity to get in touch with their member of Parliament in this place or another place.

I intend to recommend to my colleague in another place that he consider endeavouring to hold up this legislation until those people have had a proper opportunity to consider it. I believe it is a gross discourtesy on the part of the Minister. There has been plenty of time to prepare the legislation, so why was it just dumped on those people? The Minister knows full well their views on this matter, because I introduced a deputation to him some months ago relating to other matters, and he was fully aware of some of the feelings of some of the miners. We should cast our minds back to 1974, when the Premier said:

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

Then Mr. Whitlam spoke to the Japanese Prime Minister in 1974, when Mr. Connor announced he was looking at the possibility of having a feasibility study at Port Pirie. It is obvious that the Labor Party, for political purposes, has set about a course of action in an endeavour to disrupt the programme that has been laid down by the Fraser

Government.

It is divided amongst itself. The A.W.U. is opposed to the policy of the Australian Labor Party, and on this occasion I support the stand it has taken. At least it has shown a sense of responsibility that members of the A.L.P. have not shown. When we have high unemployment, surely a so-called responsible Government would support a policy that would, at least, provide jobs and also the energy so needed by the rest of the world. The member for Mitcham is advocating a policy that, if we have a national resource the world wants, we should not sell it but should leave it in the ground and be short-sighted.

I suppose he would say to people in the Middle East that they should not export their oil because carbon-monoxide goes into the atmosphere because of the use of motor cars. That is the nonsense put out by the A.L.P. I hope that the present Federal Government will proceed as soon as possible in the interests of people in this country and of those under-developed countries that require energy.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I will not canvass all the ground covered this afternoon, but will make one or two points. This Bill has been introduced to give effect to what I believe to be a totally muddled and misguided policy of the A.L.P. The fact that it contains other provisions in relation to mining and not in relation to uranium is consequential. Certainly, I oppose the Bill because of what it states in relation to uranium as well as for the total lack of time that has been available for the proper consideration of its other provisions by people most concerned because they work in the industry. For those reasons, I oppose the Bill, but I also oppose it basically because of the importance that the Government attaches to it as a matter, I should think, far more of confidence than the ridiculous and nonsensical motion which was passed last week, and which has been totally reversed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is out of order concerning that matter. I hope that he sticks to the contents of this Bill.

Mr. Gunn: He is doing a good job.

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

Mr. TONKIN: The question of confidence is one that has been passed this time from the left wing of the Labor Party to the Premier and to the Minister of Mines and Energy and to his colleague who was formerly in his position, who are all people who it is well known strongly and basically support the utilisation of projects such as Roxby Downs, whether or not they involve uranium ore. I can understand the sensitivity of the Government on this entire matter. It had a thrashing during the Federal election campaign because of it. The credibility of the Australian Labor Party and of the Premier, as the chosen spokesman for the Labor Party on the uranium issue, took a battering and they suffered enormously.

We had the position of active prospecting in the North; the issue of exploration licences; the granting of licences to Uranerz in the Adelaide Hills; and the continuing discussions with representatives of Urenco on uranium enrichment during a visit when they inspected the site, all of these things continuing or having continued at the time when the Premier was on television advertising a leave-it-in-the-ground policy for the A.L.P. No wonder it suffered as it did, and the defeat it suffered was spectacular.

We have had quoted (and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has dealt with that matter satisfactorily) the motion passed in this House on March 30 last relating to uranium. I do not think the Government is in a position

any longer to refer to that motion in the terms that it has done, in the light of the other matter on which you, Mr. Speaker, properly called me to order a short time ago. That is a matter that the Government will not be allowed to forget, either. The Opposition has dissociated itself from the policy and stance of the South Australian Labor Government, and has done so emphatically. Since March 30, the second Ranger Report has been released and the 11-point controls policy of the Federal Government has been announced.

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

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank the Minister for his courtesy in waiting until I finished my sentence before he interrupted me. The 11-point controls policy and the second Ranger inquiry report represent the most stringent safeguards and controls to apply to any uranium now available to the reactor industry. The Minister well knows that. They have met all the requirements envisaged by the Opposition at the time of that debate in the House. Since then there has been much research, and an investigation conducted by the Liberal Party has made it more convinced that satisfactory safeguards are available.

The decision to export uranium rests with the Federal Government (there is no question about that), but at State level the decisions to be made are: what can we do to overcome the potentially dangerous situation now confronting the world with the escalating use of fossil fuels; and are we prepared to allow the massive environmental and climatic changes that are threatened? This is a real danger, which involves the continued use of fossil fuels at a level necessary to supply the energy needs of the world in the next 25 years.

Inevitably, according to environmental experts after examining this worrying matter, the increase in CO₂ and sulphur fumes that will occur will significantly raise the temperature of the atmosphere and will, of necessity, seriously affect the polar icecap. This is something we have heard about in science fiction novels in the past, but it seems from the report from the United States National Research Council that the possibility of melting the polar icecap is a real one and that it could occur if fossil fuel continues to be burned at the rate necessary to provide the world's energy needs by the year 2000. It will not happen immediately, but it is a permanent effect that no amount of talking at this stage will in any way stop happening once that level has been reached. I repeat: it is a real danger, and one that we must consider.

We have to examine the other problem: what is our moral responsibility to the world if, by not supplying uranium to the world, we bring about the construction of fast-breeder reactors? It will be argued that fast-breeder reactors already exist, but they provide a real and serious danger, a far greater danger to the world than a normal reactor. If in any way we can stop the development of fast-breeder reactors, we will be fulfilling a moral responsibility to the world. If it means that we should be exporting our uranium so that it is possible to avoid the development of fast-breeder reactors, we have a moral responsibility to take that action, and again the Minister knows that very well.

I was amazed to hear the member for Mitcham say today that the Liberal Party's policy on these matters was dictated only by greed. That is a small-minded thing to say, and all I can say is that I am surprised that a man who espouses such high moral principles has not been able to see the moral obligation that this State and country have to

the third world and its energy needs, and to the whole world's environment.

Mr. Keneally: What does Brigadier Willett say?

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

Mr. TONKIN: The member for Stuart is sadly in error in this matter and I suspect that, as a member closely involved with the Redcliff site, he must be upset to see how the Labor Party is burying its head in the sand.

I want to make it clear that a Liberal State Government would consider proposals to develop South Australia's uranium resources. We have made this clear before, but I want to repeat it now. We want the following provisions: that the designated guidelines for mining and processing uranium in South Australia are always met; that any proposal can satisfy all the requirements to protect the natural environment (resulting from an independent and public inquiry into the impact on the environment), if it can be demonstrated that real economic benefit will accrue to the people of this State; that the proposal actually creates jobs for South Australians and brings added revenue to the State Treasury; that there is a defined level of Australian equity in any company or consortium involved in such development; that a predetermined percentage of royalties is allocated for research and development of alternative energy sources; and that a State Liberal Government is satisfied with the safeguard arrangements for uranium exports. That policy would be adopted by a State Liberal Government. It is acknowledged that considerable time will elapse between preliminary approval for impact studies to commence and the actual development of a project. This period will allow the time that will be necessary to check and recheck all aspects of the safeguards and world energy trends. As well as those safeguards, we would recognise our moral obligation to provide uranium to the third world and to help provide the energy that is necessary. We would recognise our obligation to avoid the environmental catastrophe that will undoubtedly occur if we do not stop to find some other means of generating energy other than the burning of fossil fuel.

The member for Mitcham spoke about greed. I repeat that greed is not a feature—economic development is. I repeat that his lack of appreciation of the moral responsibilities of this State and this country reveal a shortsighted and small-minded approach. By dint of good fortune and hard work, South Australia has the opportunity of setting up three major developmental projects, projects which we desperately need in this State and which could make a tremendous difference to the overall prosperity and employment opportunities of this State.

I do not believe we are in any way guilty of what the member for Mitcham called greed. We are concerned solely with the development and prosperity of this State, with the wellbeing of the people of this State—and that which involves the development of this State. The projects to which I refer are the Lake Frome and Roxby Downs mining ventures and the Redcliff industrial complex.

Lake Frome uranium, as I understand uranium reserves, is in excess of 22 000 tonnes (48 000 000 pounds) of uranium. Consistent sales of uranium over the past 12 months exceeded \$US40 a pound, so the value of deposits at Lake Frome would be about one billion dollars, and probably more. The deposit could be developed quickly and would probably lead to the direct and indirect employment of between 500 and 1 000 people.

Of more significance in the short term is the fact that the establishment of these operations would involve contract work within the State in excess of \$100 000 000, and would

provide a tremendous incentive to existing industry. The recent discovery of copper and uranium mineralisation at depth over a wide area at Roxby Downs near Andamooka opens up a real possibility of a huge new mineral deposit. It is a discovery that has been called the Mount Isa of South Australia.

As the Deputy Leader has already pointed out, there is no possibility that the Roxby Downs deposits could be developed economically without uranium, or vice versa. Roxby Downs is probably the most exciting potential development in this State since the discovery of Cooper Basin gas. However, because of the short-sighted locking in of the Labor Government of this State to a foolish (to put it mildly) national policy adopted by the Australian Labor Party for political ends this State is suffering.

We are looking at the possibility of the most significant decentralising influence in this State since the steelworks were established at Whyalla. We are looking at a population of 30 000 people, to be supported as the Mount Isa mines supports the people there. Hundreds of millions of dollars annually are involved.

Then, we look at the Redcliff industrial complex. Originally, it was planned to have a major petro-chemical plant established there. The Federal Labor Party killed that project, and Mr. Connor did his bit to kill it, too. South Australia was too late. It may well be that we can still put forward representations on that project to the parent company in America, but Dow Chemical, it would seem, has a number of other alternative sites that it will undoubtedly find more attractive and profitable than the site at Redcliff. This is a matter of grave concern, because it would have brought a much-needed industry and much-needed prosperity to this State.

The next and new concept for Redcliff is one that the Minister denies having peddled around Europe. I am prepared to accept that. He simply took details of the project with him and discussed it with as many people as he could.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true. Why do you keep on peddling that story?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. TONKIN: A new site is now being proposed for uranium development and enrichment. Plans for the hexafluoride plant were prepared in some detail, and now the policy of the Labor Government in this State looks like killing that. This is not just because of the policy of the State Labor Government; it is also because of the policy of the A.L.P. generally. This policy was not supported by many of its leaders, and certainly not by the President of the A.L.P.

The scheme is going down the drain, and South Australia is to lose out yet again because of a decision of a political Party based on the most ridiculous grounds. The report by Brian Toohey in the *Australian Financial Review* of July 27 last year is particularly relevant to this proposed hexafluoride plant. In the report, he points out, accurately, that if the Federal Government is consistent and holds to its 11-point safeguard proposal it must seriously consider the establishment of a hexafluoride plant in Australia before very long. Through the vigour of the South Australian Mines Department and its Minister (and let us give credit where it is due: to members of the South Australian Mines Department and Energy Department and even to the Minister), Redcliff must have been by far the most favoured site for such a plant. However, now the likelihood, as my Deputy Leader has said, is that it will be established in Queensland, where they have a reasonable Government, certainly a reasonable union, and a reasonable trade union attitude. In that State, trade

unions are determined to seek the best for the people of their State.

No State is so endowed with mineral riches that it can afford to throw away opportunities such as the three projects to which I have referred. One has merely to look at the subject of mineral royalties, which was dealt with in such a crooked fashion by the State Government when talking about the State's taxation income during the last State election campaign, to see the massive difference that exists between the amount that the States of Queensland and Western Australia receive in mineral royalties compared with that received in South Australia.

We cannot afford to have that situation continue. Obviously, we need to consider alternative energy sources. Research must go on. Solar energy may well provide the long-term solution to our problem. No-one could hope for that more than do Opposition, and, I suspect, Government members.

The Minister recognises the need for this, yet the amount that has been allocated to solar energy research and alternative energy research by all State Governments and, I suspect, by the Federal Government is peanuts compared to the real need and urgency of developing that alternative energy source. The Minister of Mines and Energy was wise in promoting the Redcliff uranium project, but he has let the people of South Australia down badly because of his giving in to the pressures that have been put on him in relation to uranium development now.

I hope that nuclear energy will be only a transitional form of energy. It is ridiculous to say that we hope nuclear energy will never come and that alternative energy sources will be found before it is necessary to have nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is with us now; it has been in existence and providing energy for many years, and it will be necessary for some little time to provide the energy needs of the third world. There is no point in maintaining the Australian Labor Party's pretence in this matter. If it were honest, the fact that it is continuing to support exploration and to hold discussions on the whole matter of enrichment would bring forth approval, because that is what it is doing in this State. We know that it is doing it. Indeed, the Premier himself has said that we must keep in touch and up to date with what is happening. Why does he persist in trying to have it both ways, and why does the Minister aid and abet him in this matter?

The State Labor Government would attract far more support and respect if it were honest in its approach to this whole matter, but it is locked into this face-saving A.L.P. policy. Therefore, it is prepared to be dishonest and hypocritical in its approach. We have already heard the matters outlined thoroughly by other Opposition speakers. South Australia, unfortunately, will be left in the lurch and lagging behind, and it is the hypocrisy of the South Australian Government that is really on trial. What value is the Bill, really, when one considers the true attitudes of the Premier, the Minister, various other Government members, and the activities very properly conducted by the Mines Department?

Continued interest and research are necessary. I do not blame the Government for doing that and going ahead with it, but what I do blame it for is its hypocritical and dishonest attitude in going ahead and, at the same time, introducing a Bill of this nature. The Bill is a sop to the left wing, and the Opposition will have no part of such a hypocritical political exercise designed to try to hold Caucus and Cabinet together. I oppose the Bill.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): My purpose in speaking in the debate is to expose the hypocrisy and inconsistency of the Labor Party on the issue of uranium mining. Labor's ban

on the mining, treatment and export of uranium, as dictated by the dominant left wing of the A.L.P. at the national conference in Perth last year, was a total repudiation of the policy followed when the Labor Party was in Government federally. When the Labor Party was in Government federally, it was a policy of sell, sell, sell uranium; yet, as soon as the A.L.P. lost power federally, there was a sudden change of heart.

One cannot help but ask whether that change of heart was based on anything but a desire to try to make life difficult for an elected Government of a different political persuasion. Let us look at the facts of what happened when Labor was in power. After taking office on December 2, 1972, the Whitlam Government gave undertakings that export contracts obtained by Mary Kathleen Uranium Limited, Peko E.Z., and Queensland Mines for the delivery of 11 757 short tonnes of uranium ore would be honoured. It made arrangements for the recommissioning of Mary Kathleen, the development of the Peko E.Z. project at Ranger, and the subsequent development of other mines in the Alligator River region. The Whitlam Government obtained a 42 per cent shareholding in Mary Kathleen Limited.

It is worth looking at and reminding ourselves of the statements of Labor spokesmen over recent years. I refer, first, to the statement of the late Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr. Connor, in 1974, as follows:

Australia will ensure that our major trading partners—Japan, Italy, and West Germany—obtain an equitable share of the uranium we have for export.

Let us look at what the Deputy Prime Minister, Dr. Cairns, said in March, 1975, after a visit to Iran. He said:

Iran would be given access to supplies of uranium from Australia under favourable conditions.

Let us look at the following statement of the A.L.P. shadow Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr. Keating, in June, 1975:

Japan is interested in moving into nuclear power and enriched fuel. We are prepared to give the Japanese any amount of fuel that they need, enriched if we can do so.

Please note—

The only thing is that we would like to do the enriching. Instead of sending just yellowcake at bargain-basement prices we want to get the profit that comes from enrichment.

That is the spokesman for the Minister's Party in the Federal Parliament.

Dr. Eastick: That was precisely the Premier's statement originally.

Mrs. ADAMSON: That is right. On October 9, 1975, Mr. Keating said:

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

I hope members opposite are listening to these words, because they illustrate more clearly than anything else the total inconsistency and hypocrisy of the Labor Party on this issue of uranium mining.

Let us look at the comments of the economic spokesman for the Labor Party. On April 14, 1972, when he was shadow Treasurer, Mr. Chris Hurford said:

Uranium exports, in whatever form, could be highly profitable for this country. With the proper taxation policies there could be enormous economic benefits for everyone who lives here.

Let us see the comments of the deposed Prime Minister, the deposed Leader of the Federal Labor Party, in Federal Parliament in 1975, as follows:

In Brussels, London, The Hague, Paris, Rome and Bonn as well as in Moscow, I consistently asserted Australia's wish to develop her own enrichment capabilities so that as much

uranium as possible should be exported in an enriched form. I notice the Minister is reading his paper. Perhaps he does not wish to hear what we have to say from this side of the House.

Dr. Eastick: Perhaps he would like you to spell the name of the person who made that statement.

Mrs. ADAMSON: It was Mr. Whitlam. Again, I quote the then Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr. Connor, in a major policy statement in December, 1973, as follows:

In respect of our energy resources we will, within safe limits, at all times supply to them and our other major trading partners all that we can reasonably export.

At that time, Mr. Connor was referring to Japan. I notice a look of slight discomfiture on the faces of members opposite. Well they might be discomfited. Let me refer to the comments of their own Leader in an editorial in the *National Times* of July 11-16, 1977. The editorial refers to the about face of the Labor Party at its national conference and states:

Don Dunstan was instrumental in shaping the tough policy. It was only three years since Dunstan himself was planning a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia.

An editorial in the *Financial Review* gets to the nub of the matter and states:

Pure in heart, simple in mind—

I suppose that as a description of members opposite that is a charitable description but, nevertheless, one that could apply in these circumstances—

Uranium might be more a power game within the A.L.P. than a matter of ideological purity, but the stupidity of the decision in political terms is quite appalling.

An editorial in the *Melbourne Herald* after the Federal Liberal Government had made its decision to go ahead and mine uranium subject to stringent safeguards, states:

On balance there can be little doubt that Mr. Fraser has taken the right step, both for Australia and for those major nations basing their future economies on atomic power systems. A great many responsible Australians probably remain uncertain. Perhaps the fact that men as distinguished in science as Sir Macfarlane Burnett and Sir Mark Oliphant have come to accept the case for mining and export may decide them.

One of the things that helped decide them and one of the things that helped decide the Federal Liberal and National Country Party Government was a report that they adopted ensuring strict safeguards. The member for Mitcham, I think, referred to these safeguards; let me spell them out. The safeguards policy announced by the Prime Minister does, of course, go well beyond existing safeguard requirements. It requires conditions of control and use of Australian uranium over and above just the application of I.A.E.A. safeguards. They are as follows:

- (1) Careful selection of eligible customers for uranium.
- (2) Bilateral agreements with customer countries.
- (3) Fall-back safeguards.
- (4) Prior Australian Government consent in relation to re-export, enrichment, and reprocessing; and physical security.

In addition to those conditions laid down by the Federal Government, we have conditions that have already been outlined by the Leader, and yet we have the Minister in this State proposing a Bill which has as one of its provisions clause 6 (3), which states:

This section does not prevent the recovery of any radioactive mineral in the course of mining operations carried out for the recovery of other minerals provided that the radioactive mineral—

- (a) is stockpiled in accordance with conditions stipulated by the Minister;

If ever anybody was going to have 10 cents each way and be a dog in the manger at the same time, it is the Minister of Mines and Energy in South Australia. When talking about dogs in the manger one may well refer to the member for Mitcham with his expressed policy on mining, which he describes as being an "indeterminate stay". It is easy to be "indeterminate" about everything when one has no hope whatever of forming a Government. The member for Mitcham claims that there has been no public debate. On the contrary, there has been sustained public debate, and that public debate culminated in a Federal election held last year, an election at which the Labor Party strenuously tried to make uranium an issue. We know the result of that election—a resounding defeat for the Labor Party. I oppose the Bill, because it isolates South Australia from a national uranium policy, which is based on mining subject to safeguards. It is a responsible policy which is in the national interest and a policy which, if it were allowed to operate in co-operation with the Government of this State, would lead to progress and prosperity for this State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): In closing the debate, I think we should be clear about what the Bill does. I do not intend to reply to all the various misrepresentations that occurred during the debate: they have occurred previously. One can make any statement one likes in this House, but Opposition members take no notice of it. If they want to go on with those misrepresentations, that is up to them. However, I point out that the 1971 Mining Act repealed the previous Mining Act, and that previous Act contained special provisions relating to uranium and thorium which gave the Government special powers. This was enacted in 1945, when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier. For example, section 111a (1) of the old Act provides:

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any Act, land grant, certificate of title, lease, agreement, or other instrument of title, all uranium and thorium existing in its natural condition on or below the surface of any land in the State whether alienated from the Crown or not and, if alienated, whether alienated before or after the passing of this Act, is hereby declared to be property of the Crown.

Provisions were included for the Minister to take ownership of any uranium or thorium, to acquire it compulsorily, to control who had possession of it, and to determine any conditions that would apply to a licence as the Minister thought fit. The most stringent conditions applied. At the time of the 1971 Act, I do not think anyone expected the renewed interest in uranium and at that time it was considered that no special conditions were required. Whether or not one agrees with the Government's policy, it is essential to have special conditions with respect to radioactive substances, because the general form of the Mining Act is designed to give people a right to explore so long as they meet reasonable conditions that are laid down and, if they find something as a result of the exploration, to give them a right to obtain a mineral claim so long as they meet reasonable conditions laid down and, if they have a mineral claim and prove up the prospect and wish to get a mineral lease, they should have the right to get a lease so long as they meet the reasonable conditions laid down. Reasonable conditions are not something that can effectively be adjudicated by a court in this matter, and the reasonable conditions that may apply to certain minerals are not necessarily those that may apply to a radioactive substance if production were to take place.

Dr. Eastick: Why isn't the court competent?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If that is the attitude of the honourable member, let me read a judgment delivered in the Warden's Court in the recent case involving North

Flinders and Taylor and Schultz, in which the warden stated:

The previous Mining Act—
meaning the Act before 1971—

contained a separate part IXa dealing with the mining of uranium (and thorium) but the word "uranium" no longer appears anywhere in the current Act. The law relating to the mining of uranium in South Australia, and this includes the provision concerning the pegging of claims and the grant of leases and licences is therefore precisely the same as it is for other minerals. The only room for any variation is that which is contained within the various discretionary provisions of the Act.

In the past . . . I have stated that it is at times necessary to take into account special factors which arise within the mining of a particular mineral, but it does seem to me that, in the exercise of any discretion, the extent to which the mineral concerned can be taken into account is limited. The discretion cannot be used to produce a result which is contrary to the Act, and consequently the court cannot be concerned with the public issue of whether or not it is desirable to mine uranium.

That position taken by the warden led the warden to grant North Flinders its claim against Taylor and Schultz on the grounds that Taylor and Schultz had not met the labour conditions under that company's mineral claim. We have the position then, that, if any Government refuses to grant a mineral lease and the company is stuck with a mineral claim, it may lose that claim to anyone if it does not comply with the labour conditions laid down, even though it has no immediate prospect of producing and proceeding further, and that may arise not only because of the State Labor Government; it may arise because a Federal Liberal Government refuses to allow the company to export. These same problems, with which clauses 6 and 10 of the Bill are designed to deal, apply generally, whether the Government is allowing the development of uranium or not. No-one can export uranium at present in this country outside existing contracts. The only cab off the rank apart from that is the Ranger proposal. If one were sitting on a mineral claim in South Australia, one might wait a couple of years, even if one had a Liberal Government wanting to allow uranium, before the Federal Government gave the go-ahead, and, if one did not meet the labour conditions, one could lose that claim in the warden's court, as did Taylor and Schultz.

I ask members to think out the situation. True, the Bill gives the Minister or the Government of the day the right to determine whether uranium production shall go ahead, but that is proper in a matter that requires all sorts of special conditions anyway that may not be able to be imposed under the existing Mining Act. That is a perfectly proper thing to do. Anyway, the Government is the representative of the community, and I am sure that even the Opposition recognises that the whole question of uranium mining is highly controversial in our community, and that the warden's court or mining companies should not decide whether uranium is mined. That should be the decision of the constituted authorities that represent the people, namely, the State and Federal Governments, and if we as a Government determine that at this stage we are not prepared to allow uranium mining to go ahead, that is a decision that we should be entitled to take, stand up for, and be counted on.

Dr. Eastick: You are—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I ask the member for Light to think about this Bill, even if some of his colleagues will not. It will provide legislation which is necessary, whether uranium is to be mined or not. Even if uranium were to be mined, it is necessary for the Government to be able to

impose any conditions that are thought fit to be imposed. It is not the normal type of mineral activity. It is not the same type of situation as where someone is starting a quarry or extracting copper, or something else. We are dealing with substances that are highly dangerous, where special conditions and precautions are necessary, and any Government contemplating mining uranium or preventing the mining of uranium requires legislation of this sort.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're saying that it has to be stockpiled.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: All I am trying to tell the Deputy Leader is that he did not bother to read the Bill or understand it. He decided that he would try to indulge in some fairly base Party politics. That is what he did and that is why he is opposing the Bill. Turning to the question of retention licences—

Mr. Goldsworthy: I have to have a drink on that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It might clear the honourable member's head, but it would need a lot of mineral in that water before it did that. Retention licences, to which members seem to object, are necessary for a number of reasons. Any company which is sitting on a mineral claim and which has no immediate prospect of developing that claim is in a difficult circumstance regarding how much it will spend on meeting labour conditions. Therefore, one needs retention licences as a means of ensuring that that situation can be effectively covered. As I said before, even if one allowed uranium mining in this State, the Federal Government might not give a lease for the export of uranium, and one might not be able to proceed, in which case one is in trouble if all one has is a mineral claim: one needs a retention licence.

In the same way if one has an exploration licence, one cannot hold an exploration licence under the existing Act and spend nothing. Conditions and commitments have to be met under that licence. If one has found something but one has no immediate prospects, one might want to hold title to that area without further development. If the Government of the day is preventing such development, it may be reasonable for that company to be granted a retention licence.

It is ridiculous for Opposition members, even if they are concerned purely with supporting uranium mining, to oppose the Bill. Certainly, the Bill gives the Government effective power to prevent uranium mining, but it also give any Government, which wanted to allow uranium mining, effective control over the way in which it took place, in the interests of those who held any licences or leases. It would be in their interests in a way that would protect them from forfeiture in difficult circumstances that might arise before the warden's court under the existing Act.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You have to stockpile it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I indicate for the benefit of the Deputy Leader that the legislation is designed to cover a whole host of different situations. In producing any kind of mineral, there will almost certainly be trace quantities of radioactive substances, which may be stockpiled or, if they are in sufficiently low concentration, allowed to go to waste. I suggest to the Deputy Leader that, if he examined the tailings in the Kadina and Moonta area, he would get a significant radioactive reading. He could also go to Victor Harbor and get a similar reading.

Mr. Gunn: It's been—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Eyre should be careful if he goes to Victor Harbor, because he might arrive back in a worse condition than he is in already. The legislation is designed to permit a whole series of conditioned situations. It allows the Minister to issue a lease on any terms and conditions that are necessary to impose. A mining lease permits production.

It allows the Minister to refuse a lease. It allows the mining of other minerals that occur in association with radioactive substances, where radioactive substances, if necessary, have to be stockpiled.

It allows all of these gradations of the situation and it is effective legislation. It is ridiculous and improper for the Opposition to take the line it has taken this afternoon. I know that the Opposition is incapable of immediately reconsidering its position. I ask the Opposition over the weekend to get some advice, talk to people who know about the industry, ask mining companies about problems relating to the existing legislation, and ask them how much they want to spend on expensive litigation to sort out matters which could perhaps be sorted out clearly by the passage of this Bill. I hope the Opposition will then support the third reading of the Bill. I ask the House to support the second reading.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Keneally, Klunder, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (15)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wilson.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan and McRae. Noes—Messrs. Allison and Arnold.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COMMERCIAL AND PRIVATE AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 21, at 2 p.m.