

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 February 1979

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

Supreme Court .....	12
Tourism, Recreation and Sport .....	18
Transport .....	118
Treasury .....	—
Woods and Forests .....	1144
Total .....	50530

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to questions, except nos. 6, 7 and 9, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

## GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

646. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many non-public servant Government employees were working with each department at 30 June 1977 and 1978, respectively?

2. For each department, how many of these employees were casual employees and how many were part-time employees?

3. What was the growth rate in numbers of non-public servant Government employees for 1977-78?

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

1 & 2. Details of the number of full-time equivalent non-public service Government employees working in each department at 30 June 1978, as advised by each department, are set out in the attached table. Obtaining figures on the number of non-public service Government employees working in each department on 30 June 1977, and on the number of part-time and casual employees for 30 June 1978, would entail considerable work, the expense of which is not considered to be justified.

3. The estimated growth rate in numbers of non-public servant Government employees for 1977-78 is 1.81 per cent.

## NON-PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES AS AT 30 JUNE 1978 (FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT)

Department	
Agriculture and Fisheries .....	363
Art Gallery .....	29
Auditor-General's .....	—
Community Welfare .....	286
Corporate Affairs .....	—
Correctional Services .....	1
Economic Development .....	2
Education .....	18458
Electoral .....	—
Engineering and Water Supply .....	5277
Environment .....	119
Further Education .....	1755
Highways .....	2121
Hospitals .....	13094
Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs .....	28
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science .....	—
Labour and Industry .....	41
Lands .....	51
Law .....	33
Libraries .....	103
Marine and Harbors .....	768
Mines and Energy .....	180
Police .....	3689
Premier's .....	46
Public and Consumer Affairs .....	3
Public Buildings .....	2583
Public Service Board .....	—
Services and Supply .....	208

## STATUTORY AUTHORITIES

648. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Do all State statutory authorities regularly supply the Australian Bureau of Statistics with total numbers of employees and, if so, how often are these figures supplied?

2. If such figures are not supplied quarterly, where does the A.B.S. obtain its figures for total State Government employees?

3. If such figures are supplied quarterly, why is the Premier unable to supply such figures to the Parliament in answer to question No. 407?

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

1. No.

2. The manner in which the Australian Bureau of Statistics obtains such figures is the province of the Bureau and not the State Government.

3. See 1 above.

## SALES TAX

673. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Does any arrangement exist for the sale of goods to prison inmates free of sales tax and, if so, what are the complete details including date of implementation, amounts involved, administrative costs, if any, and extent of sales to other than inmates?

2. Does this service extend to any other departments under the Minister's control and, if so, what are the full details in each instance?

3. Is any action in train to extend the provision to any other department or group?

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

1. No. However, the possibility of introducing such an arrangement is being investigated.

2. No.

3. No.

## FERAL GOATS

689. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Will the Minister treat as a matter of urgency the recommendation regarding the feral goat problem, contained in the Nature Conservation Society's report released this week on the Northern Flinders Range, that "an immediate and concerted reduction in numbers is of the highest priority"?

2. Is it possible to intensify and accelerate the study presently being undertaken on this problem so that it can be concluded and acted upon as soon as possible and, if not, could additional measures for control be introduced immediately and, if not, why not?

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

1. The matter of feral goats in the Northern Flinders Range is under review in the Department for the Environment.

2. This is a matter for the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority.

**WILPENA ELECTRICITY**

731. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. What are the reasons for the delay in extending 240 volt power to Wilpena and surrounding districts?

2. Have any representations been made by environmentalists or the Environment Department which have in any way caused the delay in construction of these power lines?

3. Is the Government concerned that it is taking considerable time to complete these particular power lines?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The replies are as follows: 1, 2 and 3. There have been a number of enquiries in the last few years about extending 240 volt power to Wilpena and surrounding districts, particularly since the District Council of Hawker built a SWER line to Rawnsley Park, south of Wilpena about a year ago but as far as we know there are no plans to build any such extensions. A few months ago, as a result of enquiries received by the Government, the Trust examined and reported on methods of providing supply. Costs involving a capital outlay of the order of \$500 000 and an operating subsidy of about \$80 000 p.a. appeared to be prohibitive in relation to the small number of consumers involved. There were also obvious environmental factors involved because of the special nature of the area, much of which is a national park. Because of the latter the matter was referred to the Department for the Environment for its consideration. The matter is now being considered by a Working Party chaired by that Department.

(a) when;

(b) by whom; and

(c) at what estimated construction cost?

2. What happened to the feasibility study requested by the Government into a restaurant at Windy Point and:

(a) what was the cost of the study;

(b) who undertook it;

(c) who assisted from the Premier's Department; and

(d) was the study similar to studies in other areas?

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

1. No.

(a) see above.

(b) ditto.

(c) ditto.

2. The feasibility study into a restaurant at Windy Point was not acted upon by the Government. In view of the examination then and subsequently of loan funds demands, this project did not receive high enough priority for allotment of funds.

(a) \$3 000.

(b) Oliver C. Shaul & Associates, Australian Square, Sydney, N.S.W.

(c) Liaison and administrative matters were handled by the Premier's Department.

(d) The study considered the economic viability of the proposed restaurant, size of complex, types of service and staffing.

**NATIONAL PARKS****DENTAL HOSPITAL**

760. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What is now the waiting time for treatment at the dental department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

2. Is the Government satisfied that this time is reasonable and, if not, what action, if any, is proposed?

3. Is it proposed to increase the number of dentists and technicians in the department and, if so, when and by how many and, if not, why not?

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

1. Conservative fillings—18 months

Crown and bridge work—2 years

Dentures—3 years

Oral Surgery—No delay

Orthodontics—2 years

Periodontics—No delay

Paedodontics—No delay.

2. There is no delay in treatment for oral surgery, periodontics and paedodontics. In other areas the waiting times are longer than is desirable. New patients are informed of the waiting times and have the opportunity to seek alternative treatment. On the other hand, they can decide to be added to the waiting list. It should be recognised that the dental service provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital operates within the constraints of the hospital cost sharing arrangements between the Commonwealth and State Governments.

3. Due to financial and manpower restrictions the hospital is not able to increase staff during this financial year.

**WINDY POINT**

790. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Has the Government received any recent proposals for the establishment of a restaurant at Windy Point and, if so:

**ROADSIDE VEGETATION**

809. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will management plans for specific parks be drawn up by the National Parks and Wildlife Division, and approved for those parks, before any more trusts are proclaimed to manage such parks and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No.

810. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What protection is available for roadside vegetation which is often the last remaining example of indigenous vegetation in an area?

2. If no such protection exists, will the Minister consider introducing legislation and, if not, why not?

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

1. Collectively, Sections 779 and 880a of the Local Government Act, 1934-1972, Section 29a of the Highways Act, 1926-1973, and Regulation I of the Regulations for the preservation of trees on Main Roads under that Act afford a degree of protection from vegetation in virtually all road reserves within South Australia. Other legislation which assists in protection which assists in protecting such vegetation includes Section 101 of the Bushfires Act 1960-1972, Section 22 (1) of the Fences Act 1975-1977, and Section 47 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978.

2. Vide I.

**CLARE POLICE STATION**

811. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What will be the total cost of construction of the Clare Police Station, what are the component costs for the various facilities, and what are the facilities being provided?

2. When did the building commence and what is the building programme?

3. What is the expected staffing of the station on completion of the building works, and what is the staffing potential over the next five years?

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

1. Police Offices .....	230 325
Cells .....	134 215
Residence .....	51 529
Carport and Garage .....	23 459
Site Works .....	158 992
Total .....	598 520

2. Work on the site commenced on 20 February 1978, and completion is expected by 26 January 1979.

3. The existing staff establishment of 7 is expected to be adequate at the time of occupying the new premises; however, planning is proceeding on the basis that this level will increase by two within the next five years.

5. Has consideration been given to converting one of the three metropolitan race courses into a multi-purpose sporting complex and entertainment centre and, if so, which one and what was the estimated cost of such a project and, if consideration has not been given, why not?

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

1. 19 October. The meeting simply sought to emphasize the importance of the racing industry.

2. A Government grant of \$200 000 has been approved for the racing industry for 1978-79. Grants of \$200 000 each were also made available to the industry for 1976-77 and 1977-78.

3. No consideration was given for additional Government grants to the racing industry to increase prize money for annual feature events. No specific requests have been received from the industry.

4. No.

5. No. The three metropolitan courses are still required for horse racing.

### BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

833. **Mr. MILLHOUSE:** (on notice): Does the Government propose to introduce legislation to provide a deposit on all glass beverage containers and, if so, when and what sum is to be the minimum deposit?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** As has been stated previously, no major changes are proposed for the Beverage Container Act until it has been given a reasonable phasing-in period. It is considered that two summers will allow sufficient time for the full impact of the legislation to take effect and a proper assessment to be made.

834. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is the Government aware of the resolution passed on 27 October 1978 at the annual general meeting of the Local Government Association:

"That this meeting urgently requests the State Government through the Minister for the Environment and his department to introduce amending legislation to provide a deposit of at least 10c on all glass beverage containers",

and, if so, what is the response of the Government to the request in such resolution and what action, if any, is it proposed to take?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes. Refer to Question on Notice No. 833.

### RACING INDUSTRY

835. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. Have representatives from the South Australian Jockey Club called on the Premier to discuss problems associated with the racing industry and if so, what was the outcome of the discussions?

2. What financial assistance can the Government offer the racing industry to enable it to compete favourably with other States?

3. Was consideration given for an additional Government grant to horse racing, trotting and greyhound racing, to enable the respective codes to offer prize money for their annual feature event, such as the Adelaide Cup, and, if so, what amount is the Government prepared to offer and, if not, why not?

4. Was consideration given to closing one of the three metropolitan race courses and, if so, which one and what reasons were given for the closure?

### NOISE COMPLAINTS

838. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many noise complaints has the Government received to date since the legislation has been enacted?

2. How many prosecutions have been laid?

3. What has been the outcome of the prosecutions?

4. Has the department experienced difficulty in obtaining prosecutions and, if so, to what extent?

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

1. 1 884.

2. Two.

3. Convictions were recorded in each case. One person was fined \$40, and the other was placed on a \$60 good behaviour bond for 12 months.

4. No.

### DOMESTIC NOISE

839. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. When will legislation prescribing noise levels relating to domestic noise in residential areas be introduced to Parliament?

2. What is the reason for the delay?

3. What is the recommended acceptable noise level emitted from domestic residences in residential areas?

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

1. At this stage it is not proposed to introduce legislation regarding domestic noise in residential areas. The majority of domestic noise complaints, for example, air-conditioners, swimming pool pumps and filters, and power tools are subject to control under the provisions of the Machine Noise Control Regulations, 1978.

2. Vide No. 1.

3. 52dB (A) between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m., and 45dB (A) between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

### BELAIR RECREATION PARK

843. **Mr. EVANS** (on notice):

1. What are the terms and conditions of the contract for management of the Belair Recreation Park golf course, as outlined in question No. 270?

2. What quantity of Engineering and Water Supply

Department water was used at the Belair Recreation Park for each of the years 1973-74 to 1977-78, respectively?

3. How much water is used from underground water supplies for the Belair Recreation Park?

4. Is the equipment that cost \$50 000 for the care and maintenance of the golf course at the Belair Recreation Park included in the \$402 168 development cost?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The replies are as follows:  
1. The contract for management of the Belair Recreation Park Golf Course is between the Minister for the Environment and a Mr. M. Crafter. Mr. Crafter is responsible for the collection of all green fees, organising bookings, starting times, and the appointment and payment of staff employed to assist in carrying out his responsibilities. As other aspects of the contract are of a confidential nature between the parties, it is proposed not to release details.

- 2. 1973-74—22 001 kilolitres
- 1974-75—25 736 kilolitres
- 1975-76—64 427 kilolitres
- 1976-77—92 062 kilolitres
- 1977-78—139 110 kilolitres

3. Over a period of eight months during the past year approximately 91 600 kilolitres were used on the golf course. Details of consumption from another bore which supplies water to areas of Belair Recreation Park other than the golf course are not available as the bore is not metered.

4. \$30 000 of the \$50 000 golf course equipment expenditure was included in the \$401 168 development costs. The balance (\$20 000) was an estimate of items approved but not paid for at the date when question No. 270 was asked. For this reason, it was not included in the development costs of \$402 168 to that date.

#### PUBLIC SERVANTS

847. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Are any former public servants who have retired being retained by the Government as consultants and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) who are they; and
- (c) what financial arrangements are there between the Government and each of them?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Although several retired public servants are being retained by the Government, none could be classed as a consultant. In most cases they have been appointed to boards and committees. They receive sitting fees only. In some cases nominal annuities are paid to acknowledged experts commissioned to produce Government handbooks in their particular fields. Similarly, a few have been retained to perform specific tasks where lack of their particular expertise would otherwise inhibit maintenance of essential services.

On the information made available by departments and statutory authorities the board has ascertained that only one former public servant is being retained as a consultant. He is Mr. Ben Dickinson who resigned from the service some years before taking up consultancy work with the Pipelines Authority of South Australia.

#### KANGAROO MEAT

851. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Will the Minister give consideration to issuing meat tags, which have to be used for the sale of kangaroo meat, directly to the landowners so that they can issue them to shooters of their choice?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No.

#### PARROTS

855. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is it necessary for a person to have a permit to breed or keep golden shoulder parrots in South Australia and, if so:

- (a) how many such permits are held at the present time;
- (b) what criteria is used in determining whether a permit will be issued;
- (c) why is this species of parrot protected; and
- (d) why does not the Government encourage the breeding of this species?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Yes.

(a) An estimated six. A general permit to keep prohibited animals is issued and details of species are not accurately known.

(b) A permit is issued where it can be established that the keeping of such animals is in the interest of scientific research.

(c) It is considered to be an endangered species in Australia. It is included in Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, which Australia ratified in July 1976.

(d) The breeding of birds, which would normally have to be conducted in captivity, does not assist the conservation of the species because there are few examples of aviary bred stock being used to re-establish species in the wild.

#### BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

856. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What industrial disputes are there at the Bolivar treatment works and for how long have they been going on?

2. What action, if any, has been taken to try to settle them and with what results so far?

3. What has been the estimated cost so far to the Government of these disputes?

4. What effect, if any, have these disputes had on the operation of the treatment works?

5. Have the disputes caused any change and, if so, what changes in the composition of effluent pumped into the gulf, and what effect, if any, is it believed such change has had so far on marine life in the gulf?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The dispute which the honourable member refers to in his question has been resolved. The operation of the plant at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works is back to normal.

#### PRICES ACT

857. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What goods and what services are now declared goods and declared services pursuant to s.19 of the Prices Act?

2. For what goods and for what services are maximum prices now fixed pursuant to ss.21 and 24, respectively, of the Prices Act?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Declared goods and services under section 19 of the Prices Act, 1948-1978 are as follows:

Division 1—Liquors and Tobacco

1—Ale, beer, lager, stout and any mixture thereof and wines and spirits.

Division 2—Groceries and Foodstuffs

9—Bran and pollard and sharps, and stock foods containing bran, pollard or sharps.

- 10—Bread and bread rolls.  
 10A—Breakfast foods.  
 27—Flour, wheaten, wheat meal, and self raising.  
 34—Wheat.  
 37—Infants' and invalids' foods.  
 47—Milk.  
 50A—Prepared stock and poultry foods.  
 56—Soap, toilet or laundry.  
 63—Wheat meal (for stock foods).
- Division 5—Clothing  
 99—Clothing, garments, and apparel of all descriptions other than—
- Handkerchiefs;
  - Bathing costumes, trunks and caps;
  - Furs and articles of apparel made from furred skins;
  - Garters, arm bands, braces, suspenders, and belts;
  - Hair nets;
  - Millinery;
  - Clothing, garments and apparel made, or principally made from alpaca, mohair, astrakhan, sealette, fabric imitating fur, imitation camel hair cloth, velvet, velveteen, plush, lame, tinsel, fabric including lame or tinsel, pure silk, chenille, linen, lace effect fabric, handpainted fabric, applique designed fabric, and nylon;
  - Women's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions;
  - Men's clothing, garments and apparel of all kinds and descriptions, other than working attire;
  - Maids' gowns, dresses and frocks where designed for use as evening, dance or wedding wear, being ankle length or longer;
  - Safari jackets, other than for college wear, jodhpurs and leather jackets;
  - Surgical garments;
  - Foundation garments, other than maids' or girls' brassieres;
  - Scarves;
  - Ties, other than school and college ties;
  - Men's, youths' and boys' felt hats;
  - Maids' and girls' socks, stockings and sockettes made from nylon, pure silk or wool.
- 100—Diapers.  
 101a—Footwear.  
 \*101b—Parts for the manufacture of footwear—soles, heels, boot and shoe uppers and all component parts, materials and aids to manufacture, partial manufacture or repair for use in the manufacture, partial manufacture or repair of footwear of all descriptions.  
 105—Nursery squares.  
 108—Infants' and babies shawls.
- Division 13—Hides, Leather and Rubber  
 \*222—Leather.  
 \*223—Leather, imitation leather and fibre kitbags, attache cases, satchels and the like.  
 \*224—Rubber pads, soles and heels.  
 \*225—Slipper forms, and piecegoods for use in the manufacture of boots, shoes or slippers.  
 \*226—Tyres and tubes.  
 \*227A—Articles manufactured wholly or partly from rubber other than rubber gloves, and rubber floor coverings.
- Division 14—Paper and Stationery  
 \*228—School requisites, namely—
- Coloured chalks
  - Coloured pencils
  - Compasses and dividers

- Drawing paper and pins
  - Erasers
  - Maps
  - Notebooks
  - Pasting books
  - Pens, nibs, pencils, including drawing sets
  - Protractors (celluloid)
  - Rulers
  - Set squares
  - "T" squares
  - Drawing and sketching materials
- 248—School exercise books and the like.  
 \*252—Text books, primary and secondary schools.
- Division 15—Drugs and Chemicals  
 257—Acid, sulphuric.  
 271—Manure and fertilisers, organic and inorganic, including—
- blood and bone fertilisers
  - sulphate of ammonia
  - superphosphate
- Division 16—Oils, Paints, Varnishes, Adhesives and Plasters  
 285—Kerosene.  
 \*289—Oils—mechanical and lubricating.  
 \*293—Petroleum and shale products, other than aviation gasoline.
- Division 17—Packages and Containers  
 \*304A—All types and grades of bags, sacks (other than new bags and sacks) but including bags and sacks filled for the first time.
- Division 18—Miscellaneous  
 329—Gelignite.  
 335—Sand and gravel.  
 339—Stone.
- Division 19—Services, etc.  
 \*354—Boot and shoe repairs.  
 \*355—Bricklaying and laying of cement and concrete masonry units and blocks.  
 \*357—Building repairs, alterations and renovations.  
 \*358—Carpentering.  
 359—Cartage, haulage and delivery rates excluding crane hire and fork lift truck charges.  
 359A—Towing of motor vehicles.  
 359B—Recovery of motor vehicles.  
 359C—Storage of motor vehicles.  
 \*361—Commissions on declared goods and services.  
 \*364—Electrical work and repairs.  
 \*364A—Footwear manufacture—sole sewing, stuff cutting, upper sewing, shanking and all other services supplied in the manufacture or partial manufacture or repairs of footwear of all descriptions.  
 367—Funeral, cemetery and crematorium services.  
 \*368—Men's and boys' haircutting.  
 372—Meat pies and pasties.  
 \*373—Painting, paper hanging and glazing.  
 \*374—Plastering.  
 \*375—Plumbing and repairs, including installations of hot water services.  
 376—Public utilities—gas.  
 \*383—Tiling and floor laying.  
 \*384—Termite (white ant) treatment services.  
 \* — — Services supplied or rendered by or on behalf of any legally qualified medical practitioner in the practice of his profession.
- Division 20—Non-Intoxicating drinks and ice cream  
 \*387—Ice cream including ice cream whether coated or otherwise, served in containers or packages of all kinds and descriptions.  
 \*Items remaining under control but prices not fixed.
- Minimum Prices

s.22a—At which grapes may be sold or supplied to a wine maker or distiller of brandy.

2. Maximum rates or mark-up margins are fixed under sections 21 and 24 of the Act on the following items:

Foodstuffs: Beer, wine and spirits, Bread, Flour, Breakfast foods (wholesale only), Infants' and Invalids' foods, Soap, Country milk, Meat pies and pasties.

Clothing: Infants', boys', girls', youths' and maids' clothing and garments including school and college wear, Men's working attire.

Footwear: Children's, youths' and maids' school footwear, Working boots.

Petroleum Products: Including petrol lubricating oils, distillate, furnace oil, heating oil (all wholesale only), kerosene (wholesale and retail).

School Requisites: Exercises books

Miscellaneous: Superphosphate, Sulphuric acid, Gas, Cartage, Gelnite (retail at Coober Pedy only), Feed wheat, bran and pollard, Some stock and poultry foods, Quarry products, towing, recovery and storage of motor vehicles.

Minimum prices are fixed for wine grapes.

### NATIONAL PARKS

862. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the delay in the completion of final management plans for Innes National Park and Flinders Range National Park?

2. Was the recently disbanded National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council required to approve management plans for parks (pursuant to section 38 (7) and (8) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act) before they could be gazetted and if so—

(a) will there be indefinite delay in the gazetting of these recently prepared management plans; and

(b) what will be the extent of this delay?

3. Will the proposed "smaller committee" to "advise on conservation and scientific matters" to be established by the Minister, be authorised to approve management plans for parks and reserves?

4. When will this committee be established?

5. What progress will be made in formalising—

(a) already prepared; and

(b) currently being prepared, management plans in the interim?

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

1. The newly appointed Reserves Advisory Committee will examine the Innes National Park plan, and its release can be expected in the near future. The Flinders Range Stage I plan is being incorporated in a complete Flinders Range Plan.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The committee has been established.

5. Formalisation depends on first receiving advice from the Advisory Committee.

### WITTON BLUFF

867. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Coast Protection Board liaise with the Agriculture and Fisheries Department when investigating the effect on the aquatic reserve at Port Noarlunga of the proposed boat harbor at Witton Bluff and, if not, why not and, if so, in what way?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The Coast Protection Division of the Department for the Environment has

liaised with the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries on this issue. Presently, the division is preparing for discussion a draft sketch of the proposed harbour.

### BOAT LICENCES

868. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Marine and Harbors Department consider the publication of an information leaflet which could be handed out, or posted to, all boat-owners and helmspersons when obtaining their licences to handle boats, to acquaint them with the presence and location of all aquatic reserves and the penalties which would be incurred by maltreatment of these reserves and the marine life present within them and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The Fisheries Division of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries is currently distributing the *South Australian Aquatic Reserves* pamphlet, which includes information on all aquatic reserves in South Australia, to the Department of Marine and Harbors and all its country outposts. Boating and fishing writers of the *News* and the *Advertiser* will be informed of this distribution and the publication's availability to the public.

### AQUATIC RESERVES

869. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Does the Agriculture and Fisheries Department consult with the Environment Department when it is assessing coastal or near coastal areas as being suitable for aquatic reserves and, if not, why not and, if so, does the Coast Protection Board assist with this assessment and in what way?

2. What other divisions of the Environment Department are involved in the assessment of aquatic reserves?

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

1. Yes. The Coast Protection Board through the Coast Protection Division of the Department for the Environment assists with technical and, if required, financial assistance in the assessment of coastal and near coastal areas for aquatic reserves.

2. The Projects and Assessments Division.

### ALDINGA DRAINAGE SCHEME

871. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the local council in the Aldinga area been given permission to construct a drainage scheme which will discharge wastewater into St. Vincent Gulf?

2. Is it known whether the influx of significant quantities of muddy and polluted drainage water and stormwaters will affect the marine life and environment of the Aldinga reef area, which is an aquatic reserve?

3. Is the construction of this drainage scheme going ahead at present?

4. Is it yet completed?

5. What effect is this water likely to have on the aquatic reserve?

6. Could this drainage water be used to re-charge aquifers below the Adelaide Plains and Hills area and, if so, will the feasibility of doing this be investigated by the Environment Department?

7. Could this drainage water be re-directed to irrigate plantations of trees, specially planted for commercial and environmental purposes?

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

1. The District Council of Willunga is the stormwater drainage authority for the area and does not require permission to proceed with such works. It should be noted that the scheme is to discharge stormwater, not waste water.

2. It is unlikely that there will be any significant effect on the marine life and environment at the Aldinga reef area.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. Expert opinion of a marine biologist is that there would be no significant damage to the reef platform from the effects of the expected quantity of stormwater discharge. If any biological changes did occur, it would only be after unusually heavy discharge and would likely be localised and not of long duration.

6. No studies have been undertaken to establish the feasibility of using drainage water from this area to recharge aquifers below the Adelaide Plains and Hills area and none are proposed. Preliminary studies of the potential use of drainage water for aquifer recharge in other areas of the Adelaide Plains have indicated that such a proposal would be very uneconomic.

7. Yes. However, such a proposal would be highly uneconomic.

#### DINGLEY DELL

872. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. How many persons from the Environment Department attended the opening of Dingley Dell on 27 October?

2. Who were these persons and for what reason did they attend?

3. What was the cost to the Government of—

(a) the salary of the departmental staff, including travelling time; and

(b) the luncheon provided at the Victoria Hotel?

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

1. 18.

2. Mr. R. Dempsey, Mr. B. Doherty, Mr. P. Cornish, Mr. N. Newland, Mr. D. Ashfield, Ms. S. Reed, Mr. J. White, Mr. B. Allen, Mr. J. Wesley-Smith, Mr. I. May, Mr. S. Bowley, Mr. B. Pycroft, Mr. M. Hinsliffe, Mr. G. Kahl, Ms. M. Crowley, Mr. G. Maciejewski, Mr. A. Werchiwiski, Mr. R. Wapels.

These persons attended as they are either resident in the South Eastern area of the National Parks and Wildlife Division of this department, or were involved in the preparation of plans for the opening of Dingley Dell.

3. (a) The administrative work involved in obtaining this information could not be justified.

(b) \$534.

#### WEST LAKES RAILWAY

874. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What investigations have been undertaken for the establishment of a railway line to West Lakes and in particular, Football Park?

2. Is such a proposal feasible and, if not, why not?

3. What land has been acquired for such a line and—

(a) where;

(b) how many properties have been acquired and at what price, and

(c) what was the total paid?

4. What railway stations are proposed and what are their locations?

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

1. A preliminary investigation was carried out in 1974 with a view to extending the Hendon railway to West Lakes and Football Park.

2. Physically and geographically—yes, but financially, no, unless the Federal Government gives financial aid for the project.

3. (a) From Hendon station to the east boundary of the car park at Football Park.

(b) Seven properties for \$19 290.

(c) \$19 290.

4. Possible locations for railway stations are immediately west of Frederick's Road and at West Lakes with Hendon station remaining at its existing site.

#### PARKING

878. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Why has part of the parking space on North Terrace immediately to the west of Parliament House been barricaded off?

2. With what authority and on whose instructions was this area barricaded?

3. For how long will it be barricaded?

4. Why have such barricades been painted?

5. Is the footpath immediately north of the barricaded area to be blocked and, if so, when, why and for how long?

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

1. To provide for the loading and unloading of vehicles during the work of restoring the Old Legislative Council building.

2. The Minister of Works.

3. November 1979.

4. To improve visibility.

5. No.

#### CONTAINERS

890. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What number of containers left South Australia by—

(a) container ship;

(b) rail for other ports; and

(c) motor vehicle for other ports,

during the year to 30 June 1978, and what was their geographic destination?

2. What has been the trend during the current financial year and, if there are any major changes evident, what are they?

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

1. (a) 5895. South-East Asia, Philippines, Indonesia, Europe, Middle East, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, North America, New Zealand, South-West Pacific, U.S.S.R., South Africa and other States of Australia, excluding Queensland and the Northern Territory.

(b) I suggest that the honourable member refer this part of his question to the Australian National Railways Commission.

(c) No records are available.

2. With respect to 1.(a), figures for the corresponding period in 1977 reveal over a 100 per cent increase in the use of the container terminal at Outer Harbor.

#### OATS

894. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Is it intended that oat marketing will be controlled by the Barley Board for the 1978-79 season and what are the details of the arrangements to give effect to such decision?

2. What use, if any, will be made of existing organisations with export contacts and what are the details?

3. What, if any, advertising or promotional campaign will be utilised to provide adequate public knowledge of the changed procedures?

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

1. Yes, details of the first advance for the 1978-79 season were announced by the Barley Board recently. All arrangements for marketing are strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Barley Marketing Act which was amended in 1977 to encompass oats.

2. The Australian Barley Board will have due regard to home consumption requirements before seeking any export markets for oats. The board is the sole authority for export sales of raw oats. Growers may sell oats direct to merchants but the latter may only export these in treated form.

3. Various press releases have been issued by the Australian Barley Board in the past three to four months. The board has also held talks with millers and provenders whilst S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. have announced details of silos accepting oats.

#### MILLSWOOD STATION

896. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. To what use is the former ticket office at the Millswood Railway Station to be put?

2. Why is it being renovated?

3. What work is being done on it?

4. What is the estimated cost and how is this made up?

5. When will it be finished?

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

1. There are no firm plans as to the future of the former ticket office.

2. It is not being renovated.

3., 4. and 5. See 2.

#### CLARE POLICE

899. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Is the new Clare Police Station complex being built by the Public Buildings Department and, if so, what portion by that department and what by outside contractors?

2. Was a quantity surveyor's report obtained before commencement and in particular what quantity of bricks was deemed necessary for the work?

3. What quantity of bricks was delivered to the site and were they utilised in the building?

4. If a surplus of bricks was delivered what are the details and for what purpose was any surplus used?

5. If any surplus to need bricks were removed from the site what are the circumstances of their removal including the financial return for the bricks and to which account has any financial return been allocated?

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

1. Yes.

27 per cent departmental labour.

73 per cent outside contractors.

2. No. 40 000 bricks.

3. 44 139. Not all bricks were utilised.

4. In accordance with normal trade practice a surplus of bricks were ordered to cover breakage, brick cutting requirements and defective material.

5. Surplus bricks not required were returned to the Public Buildings Department supply area and will be

included in a forthcoming salvage sale.

Any financial return will be credited to the project account at the completion of the sale.

#### WATER RESOURCES

901. **Mr. RUSSACK** (on notice): Did the Government participate in the National Water Resources Programme, by applying for financial assistance for particular projects and, if so—

(a) what were the individual projects in order of priority;

(b) what amount was sought for each project; and

(c) has an answer been received and, if so, what individual amount has been approved for each project and if not, when is an answer expected?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:**

1. Yes.

(a) Metropolitan Water Treatment . . . \$11 400 000

Saline Drainage Rehabilitation . . . \$810 000

Rehabilitation of Irrigation Headworks  
\$4 900 000

(b) See (a).

(c) \$0.613 million has been approved for Saline Drainage Rehabilitation.

There is no indication as to when an answer will be forthcoming with respect to Metropolitan Water Treatment and Rehabilitation of Irrigation Headworks.

#### RURAL LAND

908. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Has a scheme similar to the former marginal lands scheme been considered, where small uneconomical holdings will merge into viable communities with restrictions on the titles to prevent undesirable subdivision in rural areas for hobby farms or rural retreats?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The marginal lands scheme was established to encourage a more suitable type of farming operation in the marginal lands of the State. Through funds obtained from the Commonwealth flour tax, the State bought up land from private farmers and aggregated them into larger holdings. These were then returned to production through leases with quota restrictions on crops and other conditions relating to stock. I understand the scheme ceased operating in 1961. Rural properties are also amalgamated under the farm build-up provisions of the Commonwealth Rural Reconstruction Programme.

Through the existing policy now administered by the Director of Planning over subdivision of rural land, the intent of the question is carried out. For example, a subdivider is asked to demonstrate that the land being divided will comprise an economic farm unit after division, and through this means, undesirable subdivision into smaller holdings for rural retreats is generally prevented. The policy also encourages the amalgamation of titles to form larger holdings wherever possible, particularly when an applicant seeks to cut off a small allotment to separate an existing house from the property.

The recent amendment to the Planning and Development Act (No. 119 of 1978), which was assented to on 7 December 1978, provides for all land division to be subject to control procedures (below 50 hectares by the Director of Planning and above 50 hectares by the relevant local governing authority). The controls exercised under this amendment should greatly assist in preventing undesirable subdivision in rural areas.



**OFFICER BASIN**

909. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Has the Mines Department or any private company carried out surveys for hard carbons or other minerals in the Officer Basin area of South Australia, and, if so, which company, what was the result and was any fresh water found in the area?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Exploration for hydrocarbons in the Officer Basin was commenced by private companies in 1954 and by the Department of Mines in 1966. The private companies drilled four exploration wells and carried out aeromagnetic, gravity and seismic surveys, the latter totalling 1 830 line km. There has been no active company involvement since the relinquishment of P.E.L. 12 in 1976. The Department of Mines and Energy recently drilled two stratigraphic wells in the Officer Basin area, having carried out 630 line km. of seismic and gravity work in the last 12 years. Officers of the department have also carried out geological mapping within the Officer Basin. No hydrocarbons have been discovered as a result of this exploration activity, although results of the recent drilling by the Department of Mines and Energy are extremely encouraging.

Since 1977 there has been an increase in activity around the Mintabie opal diggings and, as a result, the department is planning a major mapping programme during the 1979 field season. The mineral potential of the rest of the Officer Basin area remains untested.

Supplies of fresh water are available from bores near the exploration wells Emu No. 1 and Birksgate No. 1. Salinities of 7 500 mg/l were recorded at Emu No. 1, and 600 to 700 mg/l were at Birksgate. Two wells at Birksgate No. 1 flowed 1 600 and 4 000 barrels of water per day from depths between 415 and 1 099 ft.

**THIRD WORLD BOOKSHOP**

911. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. How many times have the Vice Squad removed illegally displayed publications from Third World Bookshop?

2. How many prosecutions have been launched?

3. What were the results?

4. What were the publications involved?

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

1. Five.

2. There have been five people prosecuted for various breaches of both the Police Offences Act and the Classification of Publications Act.

One has involved charges under Section 18 of the Classification of Publications Act. This has been laid down for hearing on 6 February 1979.

Another has been charged under Section 33 of the Police Offences Act and this has been set for hearing on 8 May 1979.

A third involved breaches of both section 33 of the Police Offences Act and section 18 of the Classification of Publications Act. The defendant in this case entered a plea of guilty on 25 January 1979, and was fined \$250 on each count.

The fourth prosecution involved once again breaches under both Section 33 of the Police Offences Act and Section 18 under the Classification of Publications Act. The defendant pleaded guilty to the charges on 25 January 1979 and was fined \$250 on each count.

Finally, the fifth prosecution involved charges under section 33 of the Police Offences Act and section 18 of the Classification of Publications Act. Here again, the defendant pleaded guilty to the charges on 25 January

1979, and was fined \$250 on each count.

3. See 2.

4. As the list of publications seized is extensive it would best be made available to the honourable member direct, if he wishes.

**YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE**

912. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Has formation of the South Australian Youth Training Centre Planning Committee been completed and, if so:

(a) when was it formed and how often does it meet:

(b) who are the personnel of the committee and what are their qualifications, respectively;

(c) from what sections of the McNally Training Centre do they come;

(d) have they power to co-opt and, if so, under what conditions and for what reason;

(e) is it expected that the committee will be enlarged in the future and, if so, why; and

(f) on what basis were the members selected for their appointment?

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

(a) Formed 16 October, 1978. Meets weekly.

(b) Ms. V. Hall—3½ years experience in residential care and in-service training.

Mr. D. Griffiths—7 years experience in residential care and in-service training.

Mr. P. Taylor—Six months experience in residential care. Studying for Bachelor of Social Work.

Mr. R. Wood—1½ years experience in residential care and enrolled for Associate Diploma in Social Work.

Ms. R. Kennedy—2½ years experience in residential care, B.A. (Hons.) and Master of Psychology.

Mr. D. Thompson—1½ years experience in residential care and studying for Associate Diploma in Social Work.

Mr. R. Leahy—2½ years experience in residential care, B.A. Degree and studying for Bachelor of Social Administration.

(c) Ms. Hall—Sturt Unit.

Mr. Griffiths—Assessment I.

Mr. Taylor—Grenfell Unit.

Mr. Wood—Sturt Unit.

Ms. Kennedy—Deputy Supervisor (Treatment).

Mr. Thompson—Deputy Supervisor (Assessment).

Mr. Leahy—Supervisor.

(d) Yes, if necessary to gain additional information. No conditions set.

(e) No.

(f) The Supervisor and two Deputy Supervisors were selected by virtue of their positions. The other members were selected by the McNally Consultative Committee after nominations had been invited from all staff.

**NIES REPORT**

913. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Minister provide a detailed report on how each recommendation of the Nies Report has been implemented by the Government and why any of the recommendations have not been implemented?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The reply is as follows:

1. A professional standing committee for youth assessment and treatment has not been appointed. Further consideration of this matter has been deferred pending

decisions by Parliament on the Bill for a Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act.

2. The Government's policy continues to emphasise rehabilitation of young offenders with a view to the individual becoming a more productive member of society and the community. The new intensive neighbourhood care scheme is an example of this policy being implemented.

3. The Government accepts this recommendation and is increasingly involving the community in the rehabilitative process. One example is the increasing use of volunteers by the department.

4. The Government supports non-statutory agencies in providing alternative forms of rehabilitation which are complementary to statutory programmes. For instance, grants totalling more than \$180 000 have been approved for payment to non-Government youth homes and hostels in 1979.

5. Any action on this recommendation must be considered in relation to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Bill, which is still before Parliament.

6. This recommendation is being implemented and the Aboriginal communities are becoming more involved in rehabilitative and preventive programmes relating to their own youths. Aboriginal committees have been established in some locations and a Central Aboriginal Welfare Advisory Committee is in process of being established. This committee will have a number of district subcommittees.

7. This recommendation will be considered in relation to the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act if that legislation is passed by Parliament.

8. Youth assessment is being upgraded with the appointment of additional assessment officers.

9. The process of removing residential assessment units from existing Centres has been commenced by administrative action.

10. This process is continuing. In 1977-78 45 per cent of assessments were in the community compared with 40 per cent in 1976-77. Introduction of the I.N.C. scheme should continue this process.

11. This recommendation is regarded as impractical.

12. The policy is to have at least one suitable Aboriginal person included on each assessment panel for an Aboriginal youth. However, there are still a few occasions when no suitable Aboriginal person is available.

13. Youth project teams are being established in regions. These teams will cater for girls as well as boys. Very few girls need these.

14. It is extremely difficult to purchase and establish cottage facilities for youths. The Intensive Neighbourhood Care Scheme is preferred.

15. Brookway Park has been closed. Vaughan House is now operating as the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre. Next year McNally Training Centre will be used only for youth training centre functions.

16. Consultation between senior personnel of the Department for Community Welfare and the Education Department regarding appropriate educational programmes is on a continuing basis.

17. Treatment programmes for Aboriginal youths are being devised.

18. Wherever possible, Aboriginal workers will be included in teams of workers working with Aboriginal youth.

19. Research and evaluation of assessment and treatment procedures is being considered but funds are limited.

20. Manning scales and the other matters mentioned in this recommendation have received a great deal of

attention by investigating committees, discussions with staff, etc., and this will be continued.

21. Residential care workers pursuing external studies qualifications are subject to the same conditions and concessions regarding time off for studies as are other Public Service staff.

22. On the job training programmes for residential care staff are being further developed and a Staff Development Officer has been appointed for that purpose.

23. The roles of residential care workers are the subject of constant examination. They will be influenced to some extent by the children's protection and young offenders legislation which is still before Parliament.

24. This is a matter of constant attention because of changing situations. Certain provisions included in the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Bill have relevance to this problem.

25. The department has an Information Officer. A recent television programme was an effort to continue to inform the public.

26. The development of services for young offenders has been considered comprehensively in a departmental report and in conjunction with the report of the Royal Commission into the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act.

#### EGG BOARD

914. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the South Australian Egg Board to establish its own pulping equipment and, if so, where, what will be the cost and why has the board taken this particular action?

2. Has the board of management of the Egg Board been in dispute with Red Comb and, if so, what was the nature of such dispute?

3. Has the board not been satisfied with the existing egg pulping arrangements in South Australia?

4. Where has the board had egg pulping carried out over the past five years?

5. What will be the cost of any new arrangements?

6. Who are the members of the South Australian Egg Board?

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

1. Yes, at its Keswick headquarters. The Board intends taking this action to offset substantial losses (approx. \$12 000 per annum) in operating costs by its agent. In any event it will be necessary to purchase new and more versatile machinery irrespective of where pulping is carried out. The acquisition of such equipment and its centralisation at Keswick will lead to marked improvements in the range of processed egg products for both local and overseas markets.

For comments on costs see 5 below.

2. The only area of dispute is the proposal to consolidate pulping functions at the Egg Board's Keswick premises.

3. No.

4. (a) Red Comb Co-operative Society.

(b) F. M. Pritchard.

(c) Farmer Brown.

(d) Cackleberry.

5. The annual savings to be gained by undertaking the work at Keswick is estimated conservatively at \$13 000.

6. Members of the South Australian Egg Board—

Chairman, R. B. Fuge.

Deputy Chairman, G. H. P. Jeffery.

Government Appointee, N. C. Mair.

Producer Member Area 1, J. G. Simpson.

Producer Member Area 2, R. N. Harris.  
 Producer Member Area 3, J. S. Freebairn.

### SALINITY

915. Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What studies have been done to assess whether the clearing of deep-rooted indigenous vegetation and *pinus radiata* plantations in the eastern highlands near Albury-Wodonga will cause a gradual increase in the salinity of the groundwaters in this area and therefore, by implication, in the Murray River?

2. If no studies have been done, why not?

3. Will the Government recommend that such studies be done in order to keep to a minimum the salinity levels of Murray River waters by the time they reach South Australia?

4. Will the Government undertake such studies?

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

1. None.

2. Any cleared indigenous timber or *pinus radiata* will be replaced by plantings of *pinus radiata*. The pine area has no maritime input of salt and there is no evidence that the operation will be detrimental to water quality.

3. No.

4. No.

### PAPER MILL

916. Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Will the Minister ascertain the amount of chlorine which will be used in the treatment of organic substance such as extremely fine wood fibres in the wastewaters of the thermo-mechanical paper mill proposed for Albury-Wodonga and, if not, why not?

2. How will the Government deal with the increase in the concentration of chloro-organic substances in Murray River water as a result of paper mill processes and increased sewage treatment for the larger human population expected in this area?

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

1. There are no proposals to add chlorine to the effluent from the plant treating waste from the proposed paper mill at Albury.

2. Effluents from the sewage treatment plants serving the cities of Albury and Wodonga are not chlorinated. Furthermore, as domestic sewage from the proposed paper mill will be treated in a separate plant and is unlikely to be chlorinated, no increase in the level of chloro-organic substances in the river from these sources is expected.

### MOTOR VEHICLES

917. Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Does the Minister consider that the octane rating of petrol should be controlled by:

(a) the addition of lead alkyls;

(b) changing refinery methods to produce petrol with a high enough octane rating but requiring no lead;

(c) by requiring vehicles to be specially designed and manufactured to meet exhaust emission standards, instead of merely attaching the emission control mechanism after building the vehicle; or

(d) other means?

2. Will the Minister provide positive incentives to encourage the manufacture and sale of light, in preference to heavy, vehicles and, if not, why not?

3. Does the Minister intend to recommend the purchase of lighter vehicles for use by Government departments, to encourage energy conservation and lower pollutive emissions and, if not, why not?

4. Will the Minister consider the use of diesel and liquid petroleum gas fuelled vehicles, where practical, by Government departments in the future?

5. What studies have been undertaken to investigate the use of a lead filter incorporated into the exhaust system of motor vehicles as a device for reducing lead emissions to the atmosphere?

6. What is the Government's policy with respect to lead filters to reduce the amount of lead discharged to the atmosphere in vehicle emissions?

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

1. In 1973 the National Health and Medical Research Council issued a recommendation that as a matter of prudence "... pending results of further studies on the biological effects of lead, that measures be adopted to ensure that emissions of lead from motor vehicles are not increased".

New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania have introduced legislation limiting the lead content of motor spirit. South Australia has not yet had to legislate for a reduction in the amount of lead added to petrol as:

(a) traffic density is significantly lower than Sydney and Melbourne;

(b) approximately half our motor spirit requirements are imported from Victoria and thus meet Victorian lead level requirements; and

(c) significant capital and operating expenditure would be necessary at Port Stanvac as the refinery has no catalytic cracker and alkylation unit and no spare reforming capacity, these units being needed to make low lead petrol.

Lead catchment devices are an alternative means of limiting lead emissions by removing lead particles in a specially designed exhaust muffler. However, at this stage they have not been demonstrated to be economically and technically feasible nor have they been adopted elsewhere in the world.

2. and 3. The use where practicable of four-cylinder cars in the South Australian Government and statutory authority fleet would save 0.3 per cent of total State consumption of motor spirit. Maximum pollutive emissions are legislated in terms of grams per vehicle kilometre and as such there are only small savings resulting from a shift to smaller cars. However, this Government supports the use of lighter vehicles where practicable.

4. Yes.

5. The efficiency and cost of lead catchment devices are being studied by several national bodies, including the National Energy Advisory Council, the Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions of the Australian Transport Advisory Committee, the Vehicle Emissions and Noise Standards Advisory Committee of the Australian Environment Council, as well as many industry and university groups.

6. Lead catchment devices are still in the process of development and tests have been of limited duration and were inconclusive. Thus, at this stage, the Government does not have conclusive evidence to enable lead filters to be considered as an option to reduce the amount of lead discharged to the atmosphere in vehicle emissions.

### OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

918. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What measures does the Coast Protection Board take to protect sandhills and beaches and other land within its jurisdiction from the activities of off-road vehicles and trail bikes?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The Coast Protection Board has provided advice and financial assistance towards fencing and sign-posting to local government authorities, to assist them with the control of off-road vehicles and trail bikes on public land on their coasts. Private landholders have also been given advice.

When designing new public access roads to the coast, the Coast Protection Board insists on fencing or other measures to prevent the roads being used as a means of access into dunes and other vulnerable areas.

Beaches are a separate issue. Many beaches are designated as Government roads, and others are used to such an extent that they can be considered as roads for the purposes of the Road Traffic Act. Registered off-road vehicles are subjected to the same controls as any other registered vehicles. Again, the use of vehicles on beaches is primarily a local government responsibility.

### COASTAL PLANNING

919. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Does the Coast Protection Board use the services of students of the geography departments of both universities, the Institute of Technology, and colleges of advanced education to assist in the compilation of data required for coastal planning and, if not, why not and, if so:

- (a) when has this been done;
- (b) what sections of the coast were studied; and
- (c) for what purpose?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No. The opportunity has not arisen to use the services of geography students to assist the Coast Protection Board.

### "HONEYPOT" TECHNIQUES

920. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware that the Local Government Association has recently released a report as a result of the work carried out on matters relating to environmental policies and, if so, how does the Government consider the suggested use in the report of "Honeypot" techniques to divert large numbers of the public from sensitive, to less sensitive areas?

2. What is the Government's policy regarding such techniques?

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

1. Yes. The "Honeypot" technique has been well established for many years by park managers around the world. The technique formed the basis of the establishment of regional parks and open space areas by the Government in the late 1960's. Park managers have used the technique extensively for internal management.

2. The Government intends to continue the use of this technique. Refer to 1. above.

### COOBER PEDY HOSPITAL

921. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Why has there been a delay in allocation of funds for the construction of a new hospital at Coober Pedy?

2. Can the Minister give an assurance that funds will be

forthcoming so that work can commence and planning can take place on this urgently required building?

3. Is the Minister aware of the demands made upon the existing facilities at Coober Pedy and is he also aware of the increased use that is taking place at the hospital?

4. Will the Minister take urgent action to have funds provided this financial year so work can commence as soon as possible?

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

1. The Commonwealth Government has withdrawn its financial support from the hospitals development programme which, together with reductions in Commonwealth funding in other areas, has resulted in a reduced capital programme for health projects for the next five years. As a consequence, the South Australian Health Commission is reviewing priorities to re-establish the programme in line with the reduced funds available and many projects have been deferred.

2. Timing will depend upon the availability of funds. However, it is recognised that Coober Pedy has a high priority.

3. Yes.

4. It will not be possible to provide funds for this project in 1978-79 as the funds that were available have been totally committed.

### COOBER PEDY AIRSTRIP

922. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. What is the delay in providing funds from the Outback Areas Community Development Trust for the sealing of the Coober Pedy airstrip?

2. If agreement is not reached with the Commonwealth under the local ownership arrangement, will the Outback Areas Community Development Trust proceed with the sealing of the airstrip?

3. Will the local community be required to provide any finance from their own resources towards this very important project?

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

1. The trust is awaiting acceptance by the Commonwealth Department of Transport of a responsibility under the aerodrome local ownership plan.

2. This is hypothetical.

3. This is normal practice.

### COOBER PEDY WATER

924. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is the Engineering and Water Supply Department taking any action to improve the water supply at Coober Pedy?

2. Is the Minister aware that there is a lack of capacity in current reverse osmosis plants?

3. Will action be taken to increase the capacity of the existing plants?

4. When is it anticipated that the recently tested gauze will be harnessed to assist the town's supply?

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

1. Yes.

2. I am aware of the situation at Coober Pedy.

3. Any action taken will be subject to the results of investigation presently being undertaken.

4. The harnessing or otherwise of the recently tested bore will be subject to the results of investigation presently being undertaken.

## ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION

926. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Is the Environment Department studying ways of protecting the area adjacent to the new Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway corridor as the construction of the railway line progresses and with the possible sealing of the Stuart Highway and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Minister consider that preventive measures taken now may be cheaper and more effective in the long term than remedial measures which may be required later and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

## BREMER RIVER

929. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): When can the member for Murray expect to receive an answer to a question asked during the Appropriation Bill debate relating to:

(a) how much money the Government has already spent on the cleaning up process of the Bremer River; and

(b) how much money the Government has allocated to continue this work over the next 12 months?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The member for Murray's question has been answered by letter.

## HAWKE'S NEST RESERVE

930. **Mr. CHAPMAN** (on notice):

1. Is the ranger currently stationed at Hawke's Nest Reserve, Kangaroo Island, to be transferred in the near future and, if so, to where and will the position be filled and, if so, when and by whom?

2. Is the Minister aware that the Hawke's Nest residence has been rather expensively upgraded recently and that locally it is desired that this house be permanently occupied by a resident ranger?

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

1. Yes, to Streaky Bay. The position will be filled in due course, through the usual procedures. However, this position is regarded as a lower priority than other vacancies in the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment, and in view of the staff ceilings it is unlikely to be filled in this financial year.

2. Yes.

## ST. VINCENT GULF

931. **Mr. CHAPMAN** (on notice): Does the Government intend to carry out an environmental impact study in the St. Vincent Gulf waters prior to commencing a petrochemical installation in the upper reaches of the gulf and, if so, will the Government agree to have on its inquiry committee a member nominated by the South Australian Division of the Australian Fishing Industry Council?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** No. A committee has not been established to inquire solely into the environmental aspects of the proposal for the Spencer Gulf waters. The public will, however, have adequate opportunities to scrutinise and comment upon the impact of plant through normal environmental impact assessment procedures.

## RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES ACT

935. **Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):

1. Is the appointment of two specially qualified and experienced investigation officers, envisaged by the advertisement in the Public Service Board Notice on 21 June 1978 considered adequate for the proper administration of the Residential Tenancies Act?

2. Why is there to be no appointment to the vacant position of Investigation Officer, Grade I, as indicated in the Public Service Board Notice on 8 November 1978?

3. When will an appointment be made to the vacant position of Investigation Officer, Grade III?

4. What investigation staff will be available for residential tenancies work when the Act is brought into operation on 1 December 1978, and will it be adequate for the task?

5. When will the full complement of specialist investigation officers be available for this work?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Two specially qualified and experienced investigation officers would not be adequate for the proper administration of the Residential Tenancies Act.

2. No appointment has been made to this vacancy (two positions) because the department in re-examining its priorities in the light of staff ceilings has decided to redeploy existing staff to carry out the work; officers capable of performing the work related to the Residential Tenancies Act will have these duties reallocated to them accordingly on a temporary basis until the demand for the service can be more accurately quantified.

3. An appointment to this position was made by Executive Council on 9 November 1978.

4. One Investigation Officer, Grade III, and three Investigation Officers, Grade I, will be employed on matters arising out of the Residential Tenancies Act on 1 December 1978. In addition, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has approached all investigation officers in the branch and as a result a pool of approximately 20 investigation officers willing to perform residential tenancies duties if the need arises, has been established. The department has estimated the full complement of specialist investigation officers required to be five, but this will be reassessed when the demand for the service can be more accurately quantified.

5. Three of the estimated number of specialist staff required have already been appointed. Another will be operative from 27 November 1978. The department will monitor the public's requirements and existing staff will be redeployed if required.

## ADELAIDE WATER

936. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. How many people—

(a) in the State Water Laboratories; and

(b) in South Australia, other than in the State Water Laboratories,

are working on methods of limiting the formation of chloro-organics in Adelaide's drinking water supply?

2. How long has this work been continuing?

3. How far advanced is the work being done at Hope Valley on limiting the production of chloro-organics?

4. Have the State Water Laboratories investigated the safety aspects of using a lower concentration of chlorine to disinfect Adelaide's drinking water supplies and, if so, what results did they obtain?

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

1. (a) Two.

(b) None, as far as is known.

2. Since September 1978. However, a monitoring programme has been in operation since 1975.

3. Certain trends have been established and are being examined on a laboratory scale treatment unit.

4. Yes. The concentration of chlorine used is the minimum dose required for effective disinfection.

### ALDINGA DRAINAGE SCHEME

937. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What information can the Minister give regarding the effect on the marine environment in the Aldinga Reef Aquatic Reserve, of the installation of a wastewater drainage system which will discharge polluted drainage water into St. Vincent Gulf in close proximity to the Aldinga Reef?

2. Did the South Australian Marine Research Advisory Committee discuss the matter and, if not, why not and, if so, what were its conclusions?

3. When was permission given to build this drainage system?

4. What length of time elapsed between the initial submission of the Willunga council to the Coast Protection Board for permission to build the drainage system and the date on which permission was given to go ahead?

5. Does the Minister consider that sufficient time was allowed for interested and knowledgeable groups to submit their comments?

6. Were any such comments given full consideration before permission was given to build the drainage system?

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

1. It is unlikely that any significant environmental damage to the reef platform will occur from the estimated volumes of discharge, but this will be monitored for early warning of any potential damage.

2. No. The matter was not referred to the committee. However, members of the committee, who are representative of the Department for the Environment, the Coast Protection Board, the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and the University of Adelaide, have discussed this drainage scheme and their opinion, based on expert advice, is that the drain will not have any significant effect on the reef.

3. See answer to Question on Notice 871.

4. There was no requirement for the Willunga Council to seek the permission of the Coast Protection Board to build the drain. The council's consulting engineers did, however, discuss with officers of the Coast Protection Division aspects concerning this drain.

5 and 6, vide 3 and 4, hence not relevant.

### COMMUNITY WELFARE PROGRAMMES

938. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. What are the individually designed programmes, outlined on page 93 of the Annual Report of the Director-General of Community Welfare, 1977-78, which aim at reducing further offending after release?

2. What are examples of those programmes?

3. Who decides which programme will be given to each offender?

4. Has a committee or committees been set up to make those decisions and, if so, of how many people and what are their names?

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

1. An individual programme based largely on the Assessment Panel Report is drawn up for each youth committed to the Centre which is designed to develop acceptable social attitudes and which usually includes education, work and behaviour and attitudinal goals. This is all relevant to his future social functioning in the community.

2. Example of a programme for one youth:—

(1) Behavioural/Attitudinal Goals:

(a) The unit to have high expectations of mature behaviour, and to confront him on inappropriate displays of anger or aggression;

(b) It to be made clear that anger itself is understandable, but he must learn to express this appropriately;

(c) In view of his tendency to immediately support the "underdog" youth to be encouraged to discuss his feelings with staff and decide whether/where such support was appropriate.

(2) Involvement of Parents: Parents involved in the Programme Panel, and to be involved in learning how to deal with him and understand him; to visit weekly and discuss progress with staff.

(3) Educational/Vocational Goals: As he was interested in eventually doing mechanical work, and wished to enrol in an Adult Education Course during 1979, youth to be involved full-time in the school programme; this to include cooking, music and physical education, but to focus on the reading, writing and expression skills required to undertake the proposed course of vocational mechanics.

(4) Psychiatric/Psychological Assessment: The psychiatric evaluation saw him as naturally aggressive with little outlet for this within the centre. The centre to focus on him learning socially acceptable means for expressing his aggression and to channel it through appropriate outlets.

(5) Community Welfare Worker Involvement: The community welfare worker to liaise between parents and the centre, and to focus particularly on the father's relationships with his son.

(6) Out of Centre Involvement: The youth to be enrolled in a gym instructor's course at the Y.M.C.A., to enable some of the goals as set out in (4) to be pursued.

3. The Programme Panel comprising the community welfare worker for the youth, unit staff, the Deputy Supervisor, Treatment (Ms. R. Kennedy), the parents if possible and where appropriate a psychologist or other consultant.

4. See 3. above.

### ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS

939. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Why is there a discrepancy between the answers to question Nos. 445 and 775 regarding the numbers of staff employed in the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Unit?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Question 445 refers to two permanent staff on field duties only, whereas question 775 refers to five permanent staff in the unit (two of these are field staff).

### FERAL GOATS

940. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): When is it expected a reply to question No. 689 on feral goats in the northern areas of the State will be received?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Refer answer to Question on Notice 689.

## GULF POLLUTION

924. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What measures is it proposed to take to assess, and to rectify if possible, the problem of pollution in the gulf waters near Port Gawler and the Bolivar sewage treatment works?

2. Has the Minister had requests from fishermen and others to investigate the escalating problem apparently caused by treated effluent from the Bolivar treatment works being discharged into the shallow, coastal gulf waters and, if so, how many requests have been made?

3. Are the seagrass banks, which are present in the shallow coastal environment, nursery areas for many fish, tube-worms and other marine life of the gulf?

4. Does the treated effluent have a detrimental effect on the breeding areas of some marine life?

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

1. Regular assessments of the area are carried out and at this stage in view of the small known effects, no remedial measures are proposed.

2. Yes, several.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

## ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS

943. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What is the explanation for the delay in amending, or redrafting, the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965, in order to set up more realistic safeguards

for the preservation and protection of Aboriginal sites in South Australia?

2. Does the Minister intend that an Aboriginal representative be included among the members of the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Advisory Board?

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

1. The Department for the Environment is currently undertaking a thorough review of the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965; the operations of the Relics Unit, and the role and constitution of the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Advisory Board.

2. Vide 1.

## ELECTORS

945. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. On how many occasions since July 1978 has the number of electors per House of Assembly electorate been determined and what were the numbers for each electorate on each occasion?

2. When was an electorate by electorate roll last printed and when is it expected that the next series of rolls will be printed?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The replies are as follows:

1. The number of electors in each House of Assembly District has been determined on four occasions since July 1978, viz. at the end of August, September, October and November.

2. Rolls were last printed in November 1977. No date has been established when new rolls will be printed.

## ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS 1978

	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.
Adelaide .....	16 713	16 696	16 850	16 943
Albert Park .....	17 770	17 774	17 764	17 745
Alexandra .....	18 037	18 023	17 997	18 000
Ascot Park .....	16 674	16 609	16 813	16 814
Baudin .....	20 017	20 156	20 477	20 509
Bragg .....	16 914	16 931	17 175	17 444
Brighton .....	18 456	18 501	18 756	19 044
Chaffey .....	17 861	17 879	17 863	17 891
Coles .....	17 891	18 023	18 178	18 353
Davenport .....	17 761	17 748	17 723	17 664
Elizabeth .....	17 788	17 816	18 122	18 370
Eyre .....	15 700	15 541	15 495	15 437
Fisher .....	19 396	19 436	19 454	19 448
Flinders .....	15 950	15 878	15 907	15 941
Florey .....	17 791	17 758	17 742	17 736
Gilles .....	17 436	17 417	17 364	17 306
Glenelg .....	17 460	17 445	17 419	17 411
Goyder .....	16 932	16 944	16 925	16 883
Hanson .....	17 456	17 454	17 477	17 561
Hartley .....	18 496	18 428	18 364	18 331
Henley Beach .....	18 312	18 343	18 316	18 287
Kavel .....	17 651	17 645	17 652	17 655
Light .....	16 175	16 201	16 194	16 203
Mallee .....	15 686	15 666	15 516	15 508
Mawson .....	20 467	20 560	20 553	20 670
Mitcham .....	17 087	17 090	17 035	16 997
Mitchell .....	17 215	17 168	17 113	17 026
Morphett .....	17 183	17 134	17 085	16 988
Mount Gambier .....	17 602	17 598	17 631	17 686
Murray .....	17 566	17 600	17 611	17 660
Napier .....	16 782	16 802	16 840	16 909
Newland .....	19 944	19 978	19 989	19 995

## ELECTORAL ENROLMENTS 1978—continued

	AUG.	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.
Norwood .....	17 042	16 994	16 986	17 121
Peake .....	16 682	16 711	16 712	17 016
Playford .....	18 028	18 020	18 018	17 957
Price .....	16 342	16 303	16 268	16 258
Rocky River .....	17 073	17 099	17 103	17 105
Ross Smith .....	16 342	16 306	16 261	16 501
Salisbury .....	20 122	20 158	20 225	20 508
Semaphore .....	17 890	17 874	17 876	17 875
Spence .....	15 961	15 983	16 131	16 197
Stuart .....	16 980	16 942	16 986	17 022
Todd .....	18 234	18 261	18 428	18 652
Torrens .....	16 863	16 884	17 287	17 408
Unley .....	16 334	16 274	16 210	16 391
Victoria .....	15 640	15 624	15 558	15 605
Whyalla .....	17 136	17 080	17 189	17 333
<b>TOTAL</b> .....	<b>820 838</b>	<b>820 755</b>	<b>822 638</b>	<b>825 364</b>

**TRI-HALO-METHANES**

946. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What are the "techniques" used by the State Water Laboratories for extracting tri-halo-methanes from Adelaide's drinking water supplies?

2. Are these techniques only used to estimate the amount of tri-halo-methanes present, or do they actually remove these chloro-organic substances from the water supply?

3. Have ways and means of limiting the formation of chloro-organics been discovered during the monitoring programme which has been undertaken by the State Water Laboratories during the year that this programme has been operating and, if so, what are these ways and means and are they effective?

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

1. Nitrogen Scrubbing Technique. Liquid Extraction Technique.

2. The techniques are suitable for analytical purposes only.

3. No. However, work is presently being undertaken by the State Water Laboratories to assess the effectiveness and practicability of techniques investigated overseas and their applicability to Adelaide's water supply. The investigations are only at an early stage.

948. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. If the present level of tri-halo-methanes in Adelaide's drinking water supply pose "no threat whatsoever" to the health of people, what plans does the Minister have for limiting, or eliminating, the presence of these toxic pollutants which are appearing in domestic water supplies at an escalating rate due to the increasing use of chlorine as a sanitary agent in industry and in the domestic sphere?

2. Does the Minister consider this to be a matter of urgency?

3. Are there any possible substitute methods for disinfecting drinking water other than chlorination and, if so, are such methods too costly or what other reasons are there for their non-use?

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

1. A detailed investigation has been undertaken to determine:

(i) the levels of tri-halo-methanes in South Australian water supplies.

(ii) methods of limiting or reducing the concentration of these compounds.

Proposals for further action will be dependent on the result of these investigations. There is no evidence to indicate that tri-halo-methanes are appearing in domestic water supplies at an escalating rate.

2. No.

3. Yes. However, none are acceptable as a disinfectant by comparison with chlorine and all are significantly more costly.

**FILTRATION**

947. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Are substances called synthetic poly-electrolytes used at the new filtration plant established to purify some of Adelaide's water supply?

2. Are these substances suspected of being potent initiators of the formation of chloroform (that is, trichloromethane)?

3. Does this mean that the use of such synthetic chemicals in the clarification process will do more harm than good?

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

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

**HORSES**

949. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Government received representations from any equestrians who desire more freedom in the riding of horses in the Shepherds Hill reserve and, if so, is the Government prepared to allow people this freedom and, if not, why not?

2. If no representations have been received, will the Government consider removing restrictions on the areas within this reserve where people are allowed to ride horses?

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

1. One person has made representations. Current restrictions on horse riding in the park are designed to minimise soil erosion and disturbance of other park users and for these reasons it is not intended to permit more freedom in the riding of horses.

2. Vide 1.



**FORESTS**

950. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What protection from depletion do natural forests have other than those forests dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

2. Does the Minister consider that some protection should be given to certain remaining tracts of natural forested land, particularly in areas of land with drainage problems?

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

1. Areas of natural forest are set aside as Natural Forest Reserves under the care and control of the Woods and Forests Department pursuant to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act.

2. Yes, where resources permit.

**BRIDAL CREEPER**

951. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What plans are there for controlling the plant Bridal Creeper (*Asparagus asparagoides*), which has the ability to colonise areas of bushland or park land, and is very hard to control once established in an area?

2. Is this plant listed as a pest plant and, if not, why not?

3. Has this plant been studied by officers of the Environment Department and, if not, why not?

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

1. Bridal Creeper is a most difficult plant to control and all trial work previously done has failed to produce a satisfactory answer. The plant can be killed by applying long-term soil sterilisation herbicides, but this technique results in death of the associated trees or shrubs and therefore is neither economically nor environmentally acceptable. Future trial work, therefore, may need to relate to basic work on the biology of Bridal Creeper being carried out by Mr. David Symon, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, and similar work in Victoria. Mr. Symon has completed his initial field studies and these results are being written up.

2. Bridal Creeper is causing much concern through its ability to smother roadside vegetation in many parts of the State, but more particularly on Eyre and Yorke Peninsulas. Therefore, the plant is under consideration for proclamation as a community pest plant. A decision to seek its proclamation, however, will probably need to await the development of a satisfactory control measure.

3. Yes.

**CRAIGBURN**

952. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What effect would the sale of parts of Craighburn (owned by Minda Inc.), and the consequent use of the area south of the Sturt River for housing development, have on the Sturt River, the Sturt Gorge Recreation Park, and the natural environment in that area?

2. Will the Minister give backing to this proposal similar to that given by the Minister for Planning?

3. Will the Minister strongly pursue the aim of incorporating the heavily wooded area south-west of this possible development in the Sturt Gorge Recreation Park?

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

1. None.

2. The Government has already stated that it would support the development of part of the Craighburn property which is presently zoned for residential development,

provided that part of this residentially zoned land becomes a conservation park. In addition, the Government would require a guarantee that all land north of the Sturt River be retained as open space.

3. Vide 2.

**LEIGH CREEK**

953. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Has the Electricity Trust decided on the type of houses that are to be built at the new Leigh Creek township?

2. Has any decision been made on whether the new township of Leigh Creek will be run on the same basis as the existing town?

3. What will happen to private business operators in the old town and will they be given similar premises in the new town?

4. Will private business operators who own land and premises in the old town of Leigh Creek be compensated?

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

1. The Electricity Trust will be calling tenders for the design and construction of houses in the new Leigh Creek township. The specification will require houses to be of a type suitable for the environment and needs of residents.

2. The new township will operate on similar lines to the existing town but with further provision for private development.

3. Private business operators in the old town will be given an opportunity to transfer to the new township but the exact terms applicable have not yet been finalised.

4. No private business operator owns land in the old town of Leigh Creek but two have premises on land leased from the Electricity Trust. The basis and terms for any compensation must be considered in conjunction with transfer arrangements and have not yet been decided.

**EYRE PENINSULA**

954. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. What projects is the Marine and Harbors Department involved in on Eyre Peninsula to improve the facilities available to fishermen, particularly the unloading facilities for tuna at Streaky Bay?

2. Is the department to spend any funds in other ports on Eyre Peninsula to improve unloading and berthing facilities for fishing boats?

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

1. Streaky Bay: Investigations are in progress on the feasibility of gradually upgrading existing facilities.

Elliston: Construction of a new launching ramp at Anxious Bay for use by abalone fishermen and trailer boat owners.

Venus Bay: Investigations are currently being made into providing improved facilities in conjunction with necessary repairs to the jetty.

Franklin Harbor: Widening of a section of the jetty and the dredging of the channel.

Thevenard: Construction of a new slipway.

Port Lincoln: A new two-tonne wharf crane has been commissioned for use by fishermen and additional power points for their use are to be installed in the near future. New cradles are being provided at the slipway. The matter of providing sheltered mooring facilities for fishing vessels and other small craft is currently being investigated.

2. Not in the foreseeable future.

### URANIUM

955. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is the Government concerned at the recent agreement between the Western Mining Company and the Western Australian Government to allow the company to mine uranium in Western Australia and also establish a processing plant in the Kalgoorlie area?

2. Will the Government change its current policy on this matter to prevent jeopardising of similar developments in South Australia?

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

1. and 2. The South Australian Government's policy on uranium mining is unchanged. The States which have contrary policies, will permit, no doubt, uranium mining and processing to proceed. Such developments are beyond the control of the South Australian Government.

### IRON BARON ROAD

956. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Highways Department to upgrade or seal the Iron Baron Road?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** See the reply to Question on Notice No. 394 given on 14 August 1978.

### COOBER PEDY LAND

957. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Will the Lands Department release land outside the designated town area of Coober Pedy to people wishing to build dug-outs and, if not, why not?

2. Is the Minister aware that there is now a shortage of suitable land for the construction of dug-outs?

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

1. No. It is intended to contain all occupation within the town which is exempt from mining. Any extension of the settlement would require a reduction of the area available for mining purposes.

The Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs has only recently commenced a study to identify the needs of the settlement and the reasonable limits and nature of future occupation.

2. Yes. This matter will be dealt with in the study referred to in 1. above.

### COOBER PEDY ROADS

958. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Will the Highways Department take immediate action to upgrade the road to the 17 mile opal field at Coober Pedy?

2. Will the Highways Department give consideration to improving the general alignment of this road?

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

1. No. The Highways Department due to lack of funds and the relatively low priority of the work, is unable to do more than periodic maintenance grading.

2. See 1.

959. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is the Highways Department concerned at the deterioration of the bitumen streets at Coober Pedy and, if so, what action is intended to be taken to improve them?

2. Will the Minister give consideration to completely resealing the streets which are now breaking up rapidly?

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

1. Yes. It is intended to carry out maintenance during the 1978-79 summer.

2. Consideration is being given to various alternatives including complete resealing for more lasting improvements. Any work other than maintenance is subject to funds being available after the 1978-79 financial year.

### COOBER PEDY WATER

960. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Has the Mines Department conducted surveys or drilling operations within 150 kilometres of Coober Pedy and, if so, has it found adequate supplies of fresh water, which would be suitable to pump into Coober Pedy and, if not, will the Mines Department immediately commence a programme of drilling to see if there are any suitable quantities of fresh water in the locality?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Department of Mines and Energy has recently carried out a successful underground water investigation 22 km north-east of Coober Pedy. In August 1977, acting on the results of exploratory drilling by the mineral company Australian Selection Trust, the department drilled a production well which gave a large yield of relatively low salinity water. This water cannot be described as fresh because it contains up to 5 000 mg/l of total dissolved solids, the World Health Organisation maximum recommended for domestic use being 1 500 mg/l. Nevertheless, it represents a useful supply of lower salinity water than that presently used in the desalination plant. The reticulation of this water to Coober Pedy is at present under consideration by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is possible that similar areas of low salinity underground water could be located within a radius of 150 km of Coober Pedy, but it is most unlikely that significant supplies of fresh water will occur west of the Marree-Oodnadatta Road.

### LEGISLATION

961. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Government intend to carry out a review of the various Acts of Parliament which it has initiated, particularly those Acts which have increased the burden of workers' compensation and various other charges and administrative Acts which are causing employers not to take on further staff?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The member was answered by letter on 8 December 1978.

### NORTHERN ROADS

962. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. What is the Highways Department's sealing programme for rural arterial roads on Eyre Peninsula for the next three financial years?

2. What is the programme for the northern parts of South Australia for the next three financial years?

3. In view of the importance of Leigh Creek will the department be endeavouring to make extra funds available for the Hawker to Leigh Creek Road?

4. Upon the completion of the Hawker to Leigh Creek Road, is it intended to extend the bitumen as far as Lyndhurst?

5. Is the unsealed section of the Hawker to Orroroo Road in the Highways Department's plans for future sealing and, if so, when?

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

1. (a) Bratten Way from Tumby Bay to Cummins to be completed in 1979.

(b) Iron Baron Road from the Lincoln Highway to Iron Baron to be completed in 1981.

- (c) Cleve-Kimba Road from Cleve to 8 km north to be completed in 1980.
2. (a) Hawker-Leigh Creek Road to be sealed at the rate of 15-19 km per annum.
- (b) Stuart Highway. Complete Bookaloo-Mount Gunson section and Pimba to 50 km north-west.
3. Yes.
4. No.
5. (a) Yes.
- (b) 1980-81.

### PUBLIC SERVICE

963. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Is it necessary for a member of the State Public Service to resign his position if he nominates for a seat in State Parliament?

2. Are there any exceptions and, if so, what are they?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The replies are as follows: In the opinion of the Crown Solicitor it is not necessary for a member of the State Public Service to resign in order to nominate for a seat in State Parliament. However, he agrees with the practice adopted by the Public Service Board of advising potential candidates of the provisions in the Public Service Act which enable them to resign and to be reappointed if not elected.

This advice has been given to protect candidates during electioneering from committing a breach of the Public Service Act by disclosing information, gained in the course of their duties, without Ministerial approval.

To eliminate any confusion over this issue, consideration is being given to amending the Public Service Act to require officers to resign to contest elections.

In reply to the specific questions raised the replies are:

1. No.
2. No.

### GERIATRIC CARE

964. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What now is the shortage of geriatric beds in South Australia?

2. What action is the Government taking to overcome this shortage now and in the future?

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

1. The term "geriatric beds" embraces three quite different types of facilities.

- (1) Acute hospital beds, exclusively or predominantly devoted to elderly patients under the care of general practitioners, physicians or specialists in another branch of medicine. It is not easy, or indeed particularly useful, to consider such facilities separately from overall provision for acute hospital services to the population at large.

Overall South Australia enjoys relatively generous numbers of hospital beds by Australian or International standards, a large number of which in practice are devoted to the care of elderly patients.

- (2) Designated assessment or rehabilitation beds under the clinical control of a specialist in geriatric or rehabilitation medicine. The specialist disciplines of geriatric and rehabilitation medicine have not developed the same way in Australia as in some other Western countries, but we are developing comparable

services.

This is recognised to be an area of high priority and services are being developed as rapidly as possible, within the constraints imposed by the availability of specialist medical staff in the field and funds.

- (3) Beds for extended and permanent care of the elderly, located in nursing homes and hospitals. The Adelaide metropolitan area is generally well provided with nursing home accommodation by Australian standards, and almost lavishly so by overseas standards. There are few nursing homes in country areas of South Australia. However, in country areas extended and permanent care of elderly people is provided by local hospitals.

Overall provision of hospital beds in country areas of South Australia is considerably higher than the Australian average.

- (4) Developments in the related area of psychogeriatrics are also important. A new unit for the care of psycho-geriatric patients was recently commissioned at Glenside Hospital, and a similar unit is at an advanced stage of planning for Hillcrest Hospital.

2. See above.

### WEST BEACH CLUB

965. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. When did the Executive Engineer of the Coast Protection Board inspect West Beach Surf Life Saving Club premises and what were his findings and recommendations?

2. What was the reason for the inspection?

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

1. There has been no official inspection by any officer of the Coast Protection Division of the Department for the Environment. The outside of the building was briefly inspected in January 1978 when a departmental officer was in the area on other business. It was noticed that the reinforcement of the concrete balcony was corroding resulting in some settlement of the verandah and cracking of the solid brick balustrade. No recommendations were made.

2. An official of the club had contacted the Department for the Environment by telephone to discuss the condition of the building. A formal approach was to have been made by the club to arrange an inspection, but no such approach has been received.

### INSURANCE

966. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): What were the findings of the report to the Government by the Committee of Inquiry into Compulsory Third Party (Property) Damage Insurance undertaken by the Highways Department in November 1972?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** See my reply to Question on Notice No. 740 which was given in the House on 24 October 1978.

### ILLEGAL SHOOTING

967. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Will the Minister take action to stop the illegal shooting and vandalism in the northern pastoral areas as

reported in his press release in October 1977 and, if not, why not?

2. Is the Minister aware that the National Parks and Wildlife Service issues hunting licences to people and makes a charge for same without providing information on areas where permission to shoot will be granted?

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

1. Yes. Department for the Environment officers stationed at Leigh Creek, Streaky Bay and Port Augusta patrol the northern pastoral areas as part of their duties. Where a specific problem is pin-pointed, back-up staff from Adelaide provide support.

2. Persons issued with permits to hunt are advised that they may hunt on vacant land, or private property subject to having obtained written permission from the owner.

### PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

968. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. How many people are currently employed in the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department?

2. Is it Government policy not to dismiss any of this work force and, if so, on what basis are the numbers of this work force ever reduced?

3. What is the estimated annual turnover of employees within this division?

4. Is it Government policy that the department is given all available work on a non-competitive basis to ensure sufficient work to maintain the existing work force?

5. What has been the growth rate in the number of employees in the Construction Division since June 1973 and what have been the reasons for this rapid growth rate?

6. Have the fees paid to private consultants declined since June 1975 and, if so, what have been the reasons for this reduced use of outside consultants?

7. Has the number of professional people employed in the division increased since June 1974 and, if so, what has been the increase in numbers?

8. Does the Government call outside tenders for all work carried out by the Demac section and, if not, why not?

9. How much work was commenced by the Construction Division during both 1977-78 and 1978-79 for which outside tenders were not called, what is the total value of this work, and why were tenders not called?

10. If outside tenders are not called for many construction jobs, how does the Government ensure that the Public Buildings Department's construction costs are competitive with private contractors?

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

1. 707.

2. No.

3. Approximately 6 per cent.

4. No.

5. Number of Employees in the Construction Division

January 1974 ..... 595

June 1977 ..... 764

December 1978 ..... 707

The initial increase in staff levels is attributable to the decision to acquire a Government construction capability and subsequently to implement the Demac programme.

6. No. Fees paid to consultants during 1977-78 were greater than those paid in 1975-76.

7. No.

8. No. However, private contractors and suppliers do have a substantial involvement in the work undertaken by the Demac section through the submission of competitive quotations.

9. Approximately 25 per cent of the Public Buildings Department total Loan Works programme was undertaken by the construction division during 1977-78. It is anticipated that a similar amount will be undertaken during 1978-79. The value of projects let or commenced on site by the construction division during 1977-78 was \$19 223 000. It is estimated that the figure for 1978-79 will be approximately \$21 500 000.

The Government considers that the need exists to maintain an adequate flexible construction capability. It is, therefore, necessary to ensure that sufficient work is available to maintain at least a reasonable level of employment within the construction division and work is allocated to the division as necessary on that basis.

10. Having regard to the need for the division, the Government is satisfied that costs are maintained at an appropriate level. In this regard it should be pointed out that as nearly 70 per cent of the expenditure of the construction division is incurred through the private sector as a result of competitive quotations and tenders this proportion of the cost must be in line with that which would be incurred by a building contractor in the private sector. Strict cost control measures are employed by the department to ensure that costs remain within estimates.

### ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S STAFF

969. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Was a person promised employment on the Ministerial staff of the Attorney-General and then told that the employment was no longer available?

2. What was the name of the person concerned and what position was the person promised?

3. Did Cabinet discuss the appointment?

4. What monetary settlement was made to the person concerned and why was this settlement made?

5. Why was the appointment of this person to the staff of the Attorney-General vetoed?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Arrangements were being made for the employment of a Mr. P. Crayford on the Ministerial staff of the Attorney-General. The employment was not proceeded with and the matter is now subject to negotiations between the Crown Solicitor and Mr. Crayford's solicitor.

### ASBESTOS

970. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has been taken as a result of the report of the South Australian Health Commission on asbestos hazards in the State Library?

2. What further action is proposed?

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

1. The Director-General, Public Buildings Department, has been asked to arrange for the removal of the asbestos in accordance with the Health Commission's recommendation.

2. See 1.

### PROGRESSIVE MUSIC ASSOCIATION

971. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Has the Government given money to the Progressive Music Association and, if so, how much, when, why and under what conditions and, if not, does the Government propose to give money to the association and, if so, how much, why and under what conditions?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Government decided to assist the Progressive Music Broadcasting Association provided the association was successful in obtaining a broadcasting licence. A category "S" licence was granted on 6 October 1978. As a result, the Government is providing the sum of \$62 250 to the association during 1978-79. The Minister of Community Development presented a cheque for \$10 000 to the association at the official launching of the association's "call sign" on 25 November 1978.

The balance of the grant will be paid during the remainder of the financial year. The grant is to be used to purchase equipment to enable the association to establish its broadcasting facility.

#### DEPARTMENT'S POSITIONS

972. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How many senior positions comparable to those set out in reply to question No. 801, were there formerly in the Hospitals Department and the Public Health Department?

2. What were those positions and what was the salary of each?

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

1. 23.

2. Position	Salary
	\$
Snr. Admin. Officer .....	17 447-18 068
Deputy Director-General of Public Health .....	31 668
Principal Medical Officer (Environmental Health) .....	33 174
Deputy Director, Mental Health Services .....	35 272
Director, State Health Resources Unit .....	31 662
Medical Co-ordinator (Hospitals Department) .....	35 272
Director of Administration (Dept. of Public Health) .....	20 365-20 984
Principal Medical Officer (Epidemiology) .....	33 174
Secretary .....	14 780-15 400
Snr. Admin. Officer (Policy Monitoring) .....	18 502-19 806
Director of Finance .....	24 591
Director of Administration .....	26 766
Director of Management Services .....	24 591
Snr. Admin. Officer (Management Services) .....	18 502-19 806
Admin. Officer, Equipment .....	15 771-17 136
Chief Personnel and Training Officer .....	18 502-19 806
Snr. Finance Officer .....	18 502-19 806
Controller, A.D.P. .....	18 068-19 123
Accountant .....	17 447-18 068
Special Medical Projects .....	31 601
Manager, A.D.P. Development .....	20 365-20 984
Principal Architect .....	23 641
Snr. Medical Officer .....	23 735-26 881

#### VOLVO BUSES

973. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What other makes of buses were considered before the decision was made to buy Volvo buses for use on Adelaide Hills bus routes?

2. What factors were taken into account in deciding to

buy Volvos for this purpose?

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

1. Mercedes Benz. M.A.N., Hino, Ikarus, Leyland, Scania.

2. Cost: interchangeability of parts with existing Volvo buses; spare parts pricing policy; bus body warranty; manufacture of bus bodies in South Australia; firm schedule for bus deliveries; braking system; South Australian company is agent; South Australian company has existing bus servicing and maintenance facilities.

#### SEMAPHORE RAILWAY

974. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Since the Semaphore railway was closed, how has the patronage on the replacement bus service compared with that of the former train service?

2. Is the new bus service worth while?

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

1. The patronage is similar.

2. Yes.

#### GLENELG TRAM LINE

975. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Are new or secondhand rails, and which, used when re-laying the Glenelg tram line?

2. If new rails, are not used, why not?

3. What plans, if any, are there for new rolling stock for the Glenelg tram line?

4. How long has the present rolling stock been in service?

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

1. Both new and, when available, secondhand rails from the railway system are used.

2. Apart from the obvious cost saving, secondhand rails are used on the tramway because axle loads are considerably lower than on the railway system.

3. There are currently no firm plans to acquire new rolling stock.

4. 49 years.

976. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Is the overway bridge at Goodwood over which the Glenelg tram line is laid, being reconstructed and, if so:

(a) how much has so far been spent and what is the total estimated cost;

(b) is it proposed that there should be a tram stop on the bridge and, if not, why not; and

(c) what will be the gradient of the bridge after reconstruction?

2. What arrangements, if any, are being made to facilitate, in this vicinity, transfer of passengers from tram to rail and vice versa?

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

1. Yes.

(a) \$30 000 of an estimated total cost of \$446 000 had been spent on the bridge to the end of November 1978.

(b) No, because of the high cost of such a structure, and because current passenger demand in the area is adequately met from existing facilities.

(c) 1 in 20.

2. It is considered that existing arrangements in the vicinity of the bridge for transfer of passengers between public transport modes are adequate, and no changes are contemplated in the foreseeable future.

### STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

977. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Are the electric lights as a rule left on in the State Administration Centre at night and, if so, why, for how long and at what estimated cost?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** No.

### ADELAIDE AIRPORT

978. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What are the terms of reference of the inter-government committee of Commonwealth and State officers referred to in answer to question No. 804?

2. Who are the members of that committee?

3. When was it set up?

4. To whom is it to report?

5. Has it yet reported and:

(a) what recommendations, if any, does it contain; and

(b) will the report be made public and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

6. If the committee has not yet reported, when is it expected to report, will the report be made public and when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There is no inter-government committee of Commonwealth and State officers.

### Mr. H. DEN OUDEN

979. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Under what circumstances are public servants permitted to do work for financial reward, in addition to their work in the Public Service?

2. Is Mr. H. Den Ouden an officer of the Urban and Housing Affairs Department and, if not, of what department is he an officer?

3. Did Mr. Den Ouden design a house in the Old Spot Village at Salisbury Heights for Hickinbotham Homes Proprietary Limited and, if so, was this with the knowledge and consent of the Head of his department and, if so, why was that consent given?

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

1. The criteria for officers engaging in "outside" work are determined by the Public Service and are as follows:—

(a) the outside work is undertaken within the officer's own time—or where the work is necessarily undertaken in normal working hours, the time involved is made up;

(b) the outside work does not adversely affect the performance of the officer's official duties;

(c) the outside work does not constitute a conflict of interest with the officer's official duties;

(d) the outside work does not involve an officer engaging in the private practice of his or her usual occupation or profession, other than in a lecturing role and then, only providing that the officer possesses special skills and/or knowledge which are necessarily required to be employed outside of the Service, in the public interest;

(e) the outside work does not prejudice the livelihood of unemployed or underemployed persons who may be able to derive income from that employment.

Conditions (a), (b) and (c) only are applied to part-time officers seeking permission to engage in outside

employment.

2. Mr. H. Den Ouden is appointed to the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs under contract for a period of three years commencing from 23 June 1977.

3. The S.A. Film Corporation and the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs completed negotiations early in 1978 to undertake an educational film on housing design which would demonstrate various possibilities related to contemporary design. To facilitate this project, it was decided to actually build a house and incorporate the assistance of two actors to portray a young couple in the role of home buyers. With the knowledge and consent of the Head of the department, an agreement was reached with Hickinbotham Homes Proprietary Limited that they (Hickinbotham) would use Mr. Den Ouden's design and build a house on their own land with their own materials. The house is designed to incorporate an economical system to allow flexibility of room layout, whereby the owner can create his/her own personal living environment as and when finances permit. The initial design includes only the necessary inside walls such as bathroom/toilet, laundry and kitchen, allowing for conversion at a later stage.

### MARALINGA

980. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Has the Government yet received a reply from the Commonwealth to the urging, referred to in the answer to question No. 827, to take the most stringent precautions with plutonium buried at Maralinga and, if so, when was it received and what was that answer?

2. What further action, if any, is it proposed to take with regard to this matter?

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

1. The Commonwealth Government announced on 11 January 1979 that approximately half a kilogram of plutonium buried at Maralinga in a potentially recoverable form would be returned to Britain.

2. South Australia looks forward to the early making of arrangements for the return to Britain of this material. The Commonwealth Government has been requested to consult the State on specific arrangements for removing the material.

### FROZEN FOOD FACTORY

981. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Does Meals on Wheels Incorporated still buy food from the Government Frozen Food Factory and, if not:

(a) when did it cease to do so; and

(b) is the reason for its ceasing to do so known and, if so, what is that reason?

2. For how long had Meals on Wheels Incorporated bought food from the Frozen Food Factory?

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

1. Meals on Wheels Incorporated have never purchased food from the Government Frozen Food Factory.

2. See above.

### MIGRATION

982. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Is it known whether there is a net annual emigration from or immigration to the State and, if so, which has it been in each of the last three financial years and what are the figures of migration for those years?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The following migration movements have been estimated by the Australian Bureau of Statistics to have occurred in South Australia over the past three financial years:

In the year to June 1976, there was a total net movement out of South Australia of 122 persons. This was a year when Australia as a whole experienced a very low level of overseas migration (21 231) and all States except Western Australia and the two Territories experienced net losses from migration. The total movement has been estimated by the A.B.S. to consist of a net gain of 642 from interstate transfers and a net loss overseas of 764.

The A.B.S. cautions that its estimates on interstate movement are subject to uncertainties because the data base used (namely movements based on child endowments and electoral roll transfers) is not complete nor are the changes recorded, particularly on electoral rolls, necessarily made at the same time as the movement takes place. Their figures do, however, represent the best available measure of interstate movements.

In the year ended June 1977, South Australia recorded a total net gain from migration of 5 773 (which consisted of a 3 914 net gain from interstate transfers and a 1 859 net gain from overseas). In the year ended June 1978, there was a total net gain of 1 578 made up of a net loss of 585 to interstate and a gain of 2 163 persons from overseas.

#### LAND COMMISSION

983. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Does the Land Commission have salesmen selling its land and, if so, how many and upon what terms as to remuneration are they employed?

2. Is the Land Commission trying to sell land in the O'Halloran Hill and Flagstaff Hill areas, and, if so, how much land has been sold in each of the past 12 months and at what price a block?

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

1. The S.A. Land Commission has five persons in its Marketing Branch. Two are sales representatives employed on a 12 month contract basis with remuneration at \$12 856 per annum. One is employed under the Land Commission Act at an annual salary of \$10 653. Two are employed under the Public Service Act at annual salaries of \$11 249 and \$15 089. The Commission also has arrangements with the following private real estate agencies for the marketing of land: Barrett and Barrett at Karrar (Hallett Cove); Home Market Pty. Ltd., at Craigmores; and Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited at Homefield (Happy Valley).

2. The Land Commission has not had land available at either O'Halloran Hill or Flagstaff Hill during the last 12 months. The nearest commission estate is approximately 3 kilometres distant at Aberfoyle Park.

#### PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 298 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility to adequately control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Dean Brown, Eastick, Allison, Chapman, Wilson, Tonkin, and Venning.

Petitions received.

#### PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

Petitions signed by 3 280 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed

amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences were presented by Messrs. Eastick, Tonkin, and Becker.

Petitions received.

#### PETITION: INCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS

A petition signed by 208 members of Lobethal Lutheran Church praying that the House would refer the proposed Incorporated Associations Act, 1978, to a Select Committee was presented by Mr. Goldsworthy.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: DOGS

A petition signed by 625 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Dogs Act to prevent the restraining of dogs on premises by the use of chain, rope, or any other material, was presented by Mr. Becker.

Petition received.

#### PETITIONS: CANNABIS

Petitions signed by 108 electors of South Australia praying that the House would on no account weaken the law which prohibited the use of cannabis were presented by Messrs. Hoppood, Payne, and Becker.

Petitions received.

#### PETITIONS: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

Petitions signed by 410 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible were presented Messrs. Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Wilson and Tonkin.

Petitions received.

#### PETITIONS: VOLUNTARY WORKERS

Petitions signed by 464 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community were presented by Messrs. Chapman, Allison, Wilson, and Tonkin.

Petition received.

#### PETITION: PETROL STATIONS

A petition signed by 712 residents of South Australia praying that the House would enact legislation to enable proprietors of petrol stations to be free to choose the hours they would trade was presented by Mrs. Adamson.

Petition received.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Berri-Cobdogla Comprehensive Drainage Scheme (Stage I),

Botanic Garden Herbarium Extension,  
 Dry Creek Valley Trunk Sewer Duplication (Stage I),  
 Whyalla Hospital Redevelopment—Phase II  
 (Revised Proposal), Interim Report.  
 Ordered that reports be printed.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Adelaide College of the Arts and Education,  
 Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act Amendment,  
 Art Gallery Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act Amendment,  
 Boating Act Amendment,  
 Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act Amendment,  
 Classification of Publications Act Amendment,  
 Criminal Law (Prohibition of Child Pornography),  
 Debts Repayment,  
 Dog Fence Act Amendment,  
 Film Classification Act Amendment,  
 Glanville to Semaphore Railway (Discontinuance),  
 Harbors Act Amendment,  
 Hartley College of Advanced Education,  
 Health Act Amendment,  
 Lifts and Cranes Act Amendment,  
 Local and District Criminal Courts Act Amendment,  
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act Amendment,  
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,  
 National Parks and Wildlife Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Petroleum Act Amendment,  
 Pipelines Authority Act Amendment,  
 Planning and Development Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Police Offences Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Police Offences Act Amendment (No. 3),  
 Police Pensions Act Amendment,  
 Police Regulation Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Prices Act Amendment (No. 3),  
 Real Property Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 Shearers Accommodation Act Amendment,  
 Sheriff's,  
 Spicer Cottages Trust,  
 Stamp Duties Act Amendment (No. 2),  
 State Lotteries Act Amendment,  
 Statutes Amendment (Agriculture),  
 Statutes Amendment (Remuneration of  
 Parliamentary Committees) (No. 2),  
 Supreme Court Act Amendment,  
 Workmen's Compensation (Special Provisions) Act  
 Amendment.

### NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: URANIUM

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice forthwith:

That this House deplores the enormous loss to South Australia of potential investment, industrial development, and employment resulting from the State Government's continued ban on uranium, declares that no benefit has come to South Australia as a result of that ban, condemns the Government for bowing to the left-wing extremists in the Labor movement regardless of the

best interests of the State and its people and, having no confidence in its management of the State's affairs, calls upon it forthwith to resign.

and that such suspension remain in force no later than 6 p.m.  
 Motion carried.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I move:

That this House deplores the enormous loss to South Australia of potential investment, industrial development, and employment resulting from the State Government's continued ban on uranium, declares that no benefit has come to South Australia as a result of that ban, condemns the Government for bowing to the left-wing extremists in the Labor movement regardless of the best interest of the State and its people and, having no confidence in its management of the State's affairs, calls upon it forthwith to resign.

There has been a great deal of speculation in recent weeks that the South Australian Government may be about to reverse its policy on uranium. The speculation has been further stimulated (and confused) by the various conflicting statements made by the Premier before, during, and after his recent visit overseas, and by the obvious differences and divisions within the Labor Party.

For some considerable time it has been transparently obvious that responsible members of the Labor Party have been asking themselves those key questions which are now concerning more and more people in the community, namely, "What benefits have been achieved for the State by the ban on uranium in South Australia?" and "What influence has the ban had on the overall world uranium situation?" On the positive side, the answer to the first question must be "Absolutely none." On the negative side, the harm to the State's economy in lost investment, development and employment opportunities is almost beyond belief or comprehension.

Regardless of what may happen in the future, it has become increasingly clear that the State Labor Government is throwing away thousands of jobs and losing many millions of dollars in potential investment and income to this State simply for the sake of a political gesture which has achieved absolutely nothing. Defenders of the Government's policy will undoubtedly once again point out that the Liberal Opposition voted for the motion which was introduced into this House in March 1977 and which the Government has used ever since that time as the basis for its total ban on uranium. That is not in question, and everyone will agree that a general attitude of uncertainty prevailed throughout the community at that time.

But the Liberal Party made its position and attitude quite clear (and it was an attitude in support of the development of uranium, with appropriate safeguards) some six months later, and has continued to advocate that policy in the strongest terms ever since. What the Liberal Party came to realise after careful consideration of the entire situation was that the U-ban in South Australia could achieve nothing positive, either in terms of benefit to the State or in influencing the total world uranium situation.

On the contrary, it became quite clear, as it should have been clear to the Government (and I believe it is to a number of members of the Government) that the adverse effects on the South Australian economy and our employment situation could only be catastrophic. And so it has proved, and the Government must be roundly condemned for persisting with a policy which has brought nothing but harm to the people of South Australia. Factional Party politics based on unrealistic, unreasonable, and emotional attitudes have been allowed to prevail, regardless of the effect on the welfare of the



people, but this has been of little concern to the proponents of the ban, compared with their obsessive desire to promote the supremacy of extremist influence within the Labor Party and the Attorney-General as leader of that group.

Current interest in the community has focussed on the enormous potential of Roxby Downs, as more and more details of its extensive mineral deposits have been announced. Certainly, it has been made abundantly clear by the experts that the mining of those copper deposits will not be economically possible without utilisation of the associated uranium, too. The U-ban therefore would effectively prevent the development of Roxby Downs. The place of Roxby Downs in the future of South Australia is something about which I will speak in more detail later, but there is undoubtedly every reason for the U-ban to be lifted as soon as possible, and every reason for every citizen of this State to wish that to happen. Certainly I can give the assurance that the development of Roxby Downs will have every encouragement and help from a Liberal Government.

While this matter is vitally important for the future, there is the equally important effect on the immediate future of the events of the past two years. Even if the U-ban were lifted soon, because the lead time for commercial production at Roxby Downs is about eight to 10 years, other projects and prospects must already be in train, or should be, to support our economy and to provide jobs during the interim period. While the truth may not be palatable to the Government, it is that the U-ban could already have cost the South Australian community millions of dollars and thousands of jobs in lost projects, and the Government cannot in any way escape the total responsibility for the effect of the uranium ban and the loss that it has caused.

State Labor Government policies have consistently inhibited industrial activity in South Australia compared with other States, but no one policy has had a more disastrous effect on the potential future of South Australians than has the uranium ban of the past two years. The two areas which have been so significantly and adversely affected by the U-ban are uranium mining and uranium enrichment.

Uranium mining is not new to South Australia. It was started here in South Australia almost 25 years ago, and the industry provided employment for up to 700 people at Radium Hill and 150 people at Port Pirie. During the seven years of its operation Radium Hill produced ore to a total value of £17 800 000 (\$124 000 000 in today's values) and provided £13 800 000 (£96 000 000) in overseas exchange. Radium Hill closed in December 1961 for three reasons, which were outlined in the Annual Report of the Director of Mines and Government Geologist for 1961-62. He listed them as, first, lack of markets (the world market for uranium had collapsed, owing largely to discoveries in other countries of extensive deposits unthought of at the time the agreement was entered into); secondly, diminished ore reserves at Radium Hill; and, thirdly, relatively high cost of production.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** What was the—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TONKIN:** I think I know what the Premier is driving at; I will deal with the problem, if he will contain himself. Since then extensive deposits of high-grade uranium have been discovered in South Australia, particularly at Lake Frome, and in many other sites. They are at Roxby Downs in association with copper and other minerals. There are now more than adequate reserves of sufficient quality to ensure that a uranium industry is viable economically. Extensive investigation into mining

by the *in situ*, or leaching method, has already taken place near Lake Frome.

The estimated lead time for that project is about 18 months and, if we had continued to move forward in 1977 without the U-ban, there would have been an escalated programme of exploration and we could even now be considering firm plans to mine at Lake Frome, and to process ore at Port Pirie.

As well as the employment created in the establishment of the project, many full-time jobs would now be in prospect, and a considerable income, at least comparable with that from Radium Hill, would be on the way for the people of South Australia. But the U-ban has made this impossible.

Other countries with uranium to sell are reported as being puzzled but delighted at South Australia's attitude. The two-year ban in South Australia has been to their advantage, and they may soon be enjoying the benefits of job creation, and the financial return which could otherwise have been ours in South Australia if the State Government had done its duty by this State and pressed on as planned. In March 1977 South Australia was not only ready to begin uranium mining, but had submitted to the Federal Government detailed and advanced proposals for a uranium enrichment plant, which showed clearly that we were far in advance of the other States in planning and technology.

Indeed, as he is wont to do at times in relation to various matters, the Premier said we were leading the world and certainly Australia in this project. We certainly were. Our submission for the uranium enrichment plant was acknowledged by all the experts to be virtually unassailable, and South Australia was looking forward to the creation, directly and indirectly, of thousands of jobs and an investment of many millions of dollars in the development of a uranium industry in the relatively near future.

Using the Government's own figures, the build-up of new employment possibilities could conservatively amount to 20 000, with the general impact on industry, transportation and community services amounting to employment benefits for many thousands more having an income or independent living based on a fully developed uranium production industry.

It was at that time that the third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee was submitted to the Government. The Government suppressed that report—it would not release it. As I recall, the Premier sent it back to be rewritten because it did not accord with the adopted policy of the South Australian Labor Party and the Federal Labor Party. The figures I have given for employment potential and income potential were from that third interim report of the Government's own Uranium Enrichment Committee. If the Premier says again, as he has said before in this House, that those figures were over-optimistic, that they were inflated, and that he does not really believe that they could be met now, I submit that even 50 per cent of the estimates given in that report would make welcome news for South Australia now in terms of jobs and income.

Now, after almost two years of the Labor Government's ban on uranium, South Australia has thrown away its advantage, its high reputation, and the confidence of the uranium industry throughout the world. Other State Governments, including the Labor Government of New South Wales, have put forward detailed proposals for a uranium enrichment plant, the plant that the South Australian Government's ban prevents us having.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Wran is in the lead, isn't he?

**Mr. TONKIN:** Wran is definitely in the lead. Those

Governments have put forward detailed proposals which show that they have used South Australia's two-year ban to their own advantage. One of them now looks likely to gain the plant, and the enormous lift in jobs and prosperity which will follow will be at South Australia's expense.

The Labor Party had done immeasurable damage to our prospects for the future. By its U-ban, imposed for very dubious political reasons, it has effectively given away job and investment opportunities which could otherwise have been attracted to our State. We have gone backwards, and clearly we have little hope of recovering that lost ground, particularly while the present Labor Government remains in office in this State.

The South Australian Government must now answer those two basic questions so that the people can form their own judgment: "What benefits have been achieved for the state by the South Australian Government's ban on uranium", and "What influence has this U-ban had on the overall world uranium situation?" As far as the first question is concerned, the truth of the matter is that no positive benefits have been achieved by the Labor Government's ban on uranium in this State since March 1977.

Unfortunately, the adverse effects of the U-ban on South Australia's present and future development prospects in terms of lost opportunities and reduced prosperity are becoming painfully clear to everyone; they are concerning everyone deeply. The U-ban is costing jobs, which are desperately needed; it is denying security, which is everyone's right; and, it is destroying the future for many South Australians. The employment situation in South Australia is critical and is recognised by everyone in the community as such. It is worse than the Australian average. Industrial development is showing a steady decline, and industry and investment, initiative and individuals are all leaving the State. The Government can deny this as much as it wishes, but it is the true state of affairs.

There is a time when the truth can no longer be avoided, or covered up. This is the situation in which South Australia now finds itself, under its present Government. All the denials, and all the Government publicity campaigns in the world will not change that reality. We have reached the time for the moment of truth for South Australia.

The answer to the second question, "What influence has the South Australian ban had on the world uranium situation," is no more satisfactory or reassuring. One so-called justification for continuing the U-ban promotes the theory that, because other countries are now producing so much uranium, South Australia would not now find it economical to exploit its resources. I believe that the Premier yesterday advanced much the same theory in relation to enrichment capabilities.

That argument serves only to underline the futility and impracticality of the ban in South Australia, because it accepts that one of the reasons why some other countries have developed and exploited their uranium resources (and why some other countries are exploiting uranium enrichment) is that South Australia has not been doing so. The plain and brutal truth of the matter is that the South Australian Government's ban has made no difference at all to the total world uranium situation. It has achieved nothing except lost jobs and lost income for South Australians both now and in the future.

Most important of all (since this has been cited as the fundamental objection to uranium both by the extremist faction in the Labor Party and by the Premier), we must face the reality that a Government ban on uranium in South Australia has not affected and will not in any way

affect or influence the development and imposition of safeguards in other countries. How on earth can it? In seeing the uranium industry at work overseas the Premier has just seen at first hand irrefutable evidence of that fact.

Nor will South Australia's ban affect the production or disposal of wastes elsewhere in the world. The U-ban has served only to isolate us, and to prevent us from exerting the influence on safety and disposal requirements which we could otherwise have brought to bear if we were an important supplier of uranium to the world market.

Reports on safety from overseas indicate that there have indeed been dramatic advances in technology, and this has been confirmed by the Premier during his visit. His own departmental officers are convinced and have advised him that it is now safe to mine, process and supply uranium. The problems of safety are being satisfactorily overcome, and that is obvious from the Premier's changed stance since his visit overseas.

**Mr. Chapman:** It's pretty obvious that his—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order. This is an important matter.

**Mr. TONKIN:** The fact that those problems are being satisfactorily overcome and the fact that the Federal Government has now allowed contracts to be signed with strict safeguard provisions in them constitute one more measure of the fact that progress is steadily being made towards a most satisfactory situation. The fact that this is occurring is in no way because of the ban on uranium in South Australia. It is happening in spite of that ban.

What benefits have come to South Australia from the U-ban? Absolutely none! What influence has it had on the world situation? Again, absolutely none! We can only conclude that the Government is therefore throwing away thousands of job opportunities and many millions of dollars in investment and income, simply for the sake of a political gesture which has achieved absolutely nothing, either here or on the world scene.

If, as now seems apparent, that theatrical gesture was designed to promote a particular stance of one faction of the Labor Party, then the Government must be roundly condemned for bowing to that extremist political pressure at the expense of the welfare of the people of South Australia.

But while the Labor Government already has a great deal to answer for to the people of South Australia, its no-uranium policy seriously threatens yet another potential major development for this State. Interest in Roxby Downs has been growing steadily, ever since the reports of the initial exploration were published, and numerous articles have recently appeared in the press. It represents, for South Australia, a beacon on the hill, a light in the future, our only hope.

Investigations are by no means complete, but, as we have been told, the findings indicate mineral deposits which would support a potential mining operation equal to, or bigger than, that at Mount Isa, in Queensland. Estimates of employment opportunities eventually supported by the project run into thousands. Mount Isa supports a population on site of 30 000 people. Mount Isa mines provide direct work for 7 000, and it is estimated that over 80 000 Queensland residents derive their livelihood from the operation. In 1977-78 royalties totalled \$15 600 000.

Clearly, Roxby Downs has a potential which, when developed, promises to do for South Australia what Mount Isa has done for Queensland, and what Hamersley has done for Western Australia. It has been described in the most recent issue of the *Miner*, published yesterday, as "South Australia's \$54 billion bonanza". The two direct products of this project are jobs for people and prosperity

for the State. The mineral royalties alone would open up new options for a Government, without any question of increasing taxation on individuals. The entire business community would expand and lift, given the stimulus which the Government would be able to provide.

The potential benefits to South Australia are not only enormous, but they are within our grasp. They are there for the taking. Plans are advancing for the commercial development of Roxby Downs within the next 10 or so years, with a massive investment of funds. But a no-uranium policy means no copper mining at Roxby Downs. No Roxby Downs means no jobs, no prosperity, and no future for many people in this State. A decision must be made soon, bearing in mind the long lead time. The mining company wants to know what the Government proposes to do, and whether or not it can be relied upon, even if it does change its mind. It must decide how it will spend its money for exploration. If it has, say, \$30 000 000 available to outline and prove the potential extent of the deposit, will it spend \$15 000 000 a year for two years, or will it spend \$3 000 000 a year for 10 years? These matters are vital to the future of South Australia.

The people of this State want to know what the future holds for them. They know what the situation is on industrial development, and jobs, and income, and that South Australia is not so well off for those things that it can afford to allow in-fighting and ideological posturing of Government Party factions to destroy its chances of Roxby Downs. It is clear to every level-headed and thinking citizen that we cannot possibly allow this to happen. But the Government is already throwing away the chances of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars, because its ban has prevented the development of a uranium industry. How can anyone now rely upon, or have any confidence in, the South Australian Government?

Even now a change of mind would still leave a great deal of uncertainty as far as mining companies are concerned. They have the responsibility for investing many millions of dollars in developing both mines and processing plants. How can they have the necessary confidence in their long-term security when there are members of the State Labor Cabinet and Caucus who have openly and publicly declared their extreme opposition to uranium, and their total support for a continuing ban? Is this the political stability which is so essential for the mining company's operations in this State? Of course it is not. The U-ban has already cost South Australia dearly, and, even if the ban were now reversed, the effect of it would still threaten to hurt us even more in the future, so long as the present Government remains in office.

But the Premier, having now returned from his overseas visit convinced that he is the only person in the world capable of making a decision on uranium, says that there is to be no change in the U-ban policy in South Australia—that is, unless he can at some time in the future pull his extremist members into line. The real tragedy resulting from the divisions and the in-fighting within the Labor Party on this issue is manifesting itself to the people in practical terms of lost job opportunities and failing prosperity.

It is unthinkable that South Australia's very existence should be left at the mercy of squabbling factions within the Labor Party. No wonder urgent meetings of the Labor Party executive are being held and discussions are being carried through. Sensible and responsible members of the Labor Party are just as concerned as are the Opposition and many other people in the community; 70 per cent of all trade union members are at a stage where they would want the U-ban lifted, but that is not good enough for the Government of this State. The Premier has been placed in

a most difficult position by the extremists within his own Party, where the Government can now offer the people only that situation and the entire community will suffer because of the victory of the faction led by the Attorney-General. While he and the Premier fight over who is going to lead the Labor Party, South Australia is suffering.

What we are dealing with is an internal Party factional squabble. It is not responsible government, and the Premier knows it full well. If he is unable to govern this State for the common good of all its people by standing up to the left wing, South Australia can do without him and his Government, and the people of South Australia are coming to realise that only too well. The Premier's decision which was announced yesterday has effectively condemned South Australia to a future of industrial stagnation and economic disaster. South Australians will not forget the harm that the Labor Government has done to this State. I find it most significant that the front bench opposite is virtually empty.

**Mr. Becker:** Half the members aren't here.

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

**Mr. TONKIN:** Between the Premier and those members of the Ministry who sit on the half bench (the Minister of Community Development, the Chief Secretary, and the Attorney-General) there is absolutely no-one sitting. I wonder why?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not see in the honourable Leader's motion anything concerning those who are sitting on the seats.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I think that the Ministers have made my point for me by their absence. I was about to urge those responsible members in the Government who have indicated openly their support for the mining and development of uranium during the past two weeks (and I refer particularly to the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Education) to put aside Party factional loyalties and put first the good of the people of South Australia. They should back up the responsible attitude they demonstrated while the Premier was away (I suspect that it was because they thought that he was going to come back with a changed mind) and support my motion. I believe that it is the duty of every responsible member to put aside Party politics and do what is best for South Australia.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer):** The Leader of the Opposition has just sat down on a clarion cry to the people of South Australia to put aside Party politics. After the idiot diatribe that we have just heard, those words ring very hollow. Indeed, on what I have to say this afternoon to this House, the Government is united. I realise that, given the unfortunate and public divisions in the Liberal Party, the Leader of the Opposition constantly tries to foist that sort of thing on this side of the House, but unfortunately he does not, I am sure, even believe his own words on that score. But, just so that he can be reassured as to the position on this side of the House, I will be supported this afternoon by the Minister of Mines and Energy, who will support everything I have to say.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! During the course of the Leader of the Opposition's speech there was quiet. I hope the disturbance does not continue. If it does, I will take action.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I think we should go back a little to see what is the history of the policy upon this particular matter, because that casts a little light on the present position of the Leader of the Opposition. A

motion was moved in this House in 1977, for which he and every member of the Opposition then present voted, that we should not, as a matter of principle, mine or develop uranium in South Australia until it was safe to provide uranium to a customer country.

Now it is true that since that time the Leader of the Opposition, in the early part of this session, moved a motion to say that he thought it was safe, and the grounds that he then gave for saying that it was safe were that there had been, since the time of that motion for which he had voted, the Fox Report, and the Fox Report showed that it was safe. When I come to the question of plutonium supplies, the accountability arrangements of the International Atomic Energy Agency, I will quote to the Leader of the Opposition what Mr. Justice Fox, who is at present the ambassador at large for Australia in this area, has to say, because he makes perfectly clear that it is not safe.

But let me deal with a few of the things that the Leader of the Opposition said at the outset. He asked "What benefits have come to South Australia from its present policy that we will not deliver uranium to a customer country until it is safe to do so?" The benefit is that South Australia will not take part in the process of the destruction of mankind.

The Leader of the Opposition supports those people in the community who say that, for commercial reasons, for the gaining of pelf, we are prepared to dig up and sell uranium in circumstances where the danger to mankind is enormous, and where we can not only condemn mankind to global pollution that will bring cancer or leukaemia to vast numbers of people throughout the world but also provide part of the process which may lead to the complete and ultimate destruction of mankind through the indiscriminate use of plutonium without proper controls. That is the benefit to South Australia, and no member of this Government apologises for the fact that we do not believe that we should be part of that process and that we cannot be in the uranium industry until we can say that it is safe.

The honourable member has said that, by saying that we want particular provisions as to safety established as a first principle, South Australia is having absolutely no influence upon the world—that there is no influence to be had from saying that we will not supply uranium, because, if we do not supply it, other people do, and therefore we should not use the position that we have a substantial proportion of the world's uranium supply in order to enforce conditions of safety and reason. I am very surprised that this is advanced by a Leader of the Liberal Party, because his Federal Leader has had the following to say on the topic, and this is an official statement of policy by the Federal Government:

This [the provision of the export of uranium] implies a requirement for selectivity in the choice of customer countries and the closest attention to ensuring adequate safeguards. It is not the Government's view [that is, the Liberal Federal Government's view] that safeguards should be regarded as something to be balanced against commercial considerations. We view adequate safeguards as a fundamental prerequisite of any uranium export which we would also expect responsible customer countries for Australian uranium readily to accept.

I agree with that entirely. In fact, on that policy Australia so far has concluded bilateral agreements with only two countries, Finland and the Philippines.

As I will show in a moment, in fact those safeguards are still inadequate and they are shown to be inadequate by our own Ambassador in the area. But the Federal Government at the moment has been negotiating with Euratom (the European Community's Atomic Energy

Agency) which has refused to date to accept the safeguards agreement which Australia has published as a model. In fact, some of its member countries say quite frankly that they will not accept some of the things that are in it, and the Federal Liberal Government is denying uranium to those countries because it cannot get agreement on the safeguards agreement. How does that differ in principle from the position which South Australia is taking? According to the Leader of the Opposition, that is all wrong, that Mr. Fraser and the others should give away the safeguards agreement and simply tell Euratom that we will dig up our uranium and give it to them, no matter what the consequences.

The honourable member has said that thousands and thousands of jobs would be available and an enormous income would flow to South Australia. In fact, these days mining operations are capital intensive and very much less labour intensive than they were once thought to be. What is more, the revised uranium enrichment study, which will be published shortly, shows that we have had to downgrade the forecasts on employment quite radically. While we were in Europe, Urenco-Centec, who were our consultants and associates in the development of that uranium enrichment study, said that both the market forecasts and the employment forecasts in the revised study are still too high and that, in fact, employment to be gained from this is less than that in relation to the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical plant. So, the kind of bullish statements that the Leader of the Opposition has been making about employment arising from this are not well based.

But there is a further matter. We are now faced with the fact that uranium enrichment capacity in the world from 1985 will be enormous. The Euro Diffusion (Eurodif) plants established at Tricastin, in France, have enormous capacity, well beyond the projected world demand for uranium enrichment. One of the multiple bay plants is in operation, and three more are to come into operation, each larger than the next: it is the biggest construction plant in Europe. The whole site is the biggest construction site of any kind in Europe. The excess capacity for uranium enrichment in 1985 will be enormous. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that our ban caused that. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition does not know terribly much about the technology involved. The lead time for the decisions on the erection of the Tricastin plant was such that that decision was taken long before May 1977 and had absolutely nothing to do with the situation in South Australia.

Let me turn to what we went to look at in Europe and what we discovered. There were two bases for our concern which led to the 1977 resolution in this House and the policy which has been properly adopted by the Australian Labor Party. The first of these is that both the Fox Report and the Flowers Commission pointed to the unsatisfactory nature of the then technology for the final and safe disposal of high-active wastes. The high-active wastes from the nuclear process have enormous radio-activity and enormous potential for harm. If they leak into the biosphere, they can be widely dispersed and the result can be disaster. The Fox Report said:

The author of the OECD report calculates that nuclear power production at the assumed rate of one kilowatt per head of population could cause about one fatal and one curable cancer case per million people each year. After some generations, 1 to 1.5 genetic defects per million people could be expected each year. Some witnesses, pointing to the genetic effects, questioned the right of people alive today to satisfy their demand for power by using technology harmful

to members of future generations, however small the numbers affected.

When talking about radio-active waste, the Flowers Commission said:

The highly active waste which arises from fuel reprocessing contains the fission products and actinides created by nuclear fission. The waste must be isolated until the various radioisotopes have decayed to insignificant levels. For the fission products this requires a period of perhaps a thousand years, but some of the actinides have half-lives of thousands or tens of thousands of years or longer. There are theoretical possibilities for transforming these elements into less long-lived forms but the process would pose considerable technical difficulties and operational hazards and appears unlikely to offer a solution in the foreseeable future. We must assume that these wastes will remain dangerous, and will need to be isolated from the biosphere, for hundreds of thousands of years. In considering arrangements for dealing safely with such wastes man is faced with time scales that transcend his experience.

The Flowers Commission found quite clearly that there was no processes then available for the safe disposal of high level active wastes, that the danger to mankind of those wastes was incalculable, and that the time during which that danger was there was beyond man's experience.

One of the reasons why we said that it was not safe at that time to sell uranium to customer countries was that no technology had been developed to deal with that problem. Secondly, there were no adequate accountability arrangements of enriched uranium which could go to weapons grade, nor adequate accountability arrangements in relation to plutonium, which could therefore be used for weapons proliferation. Once weapons proliferation occurred in the world in irresponsible hands the result could be the complete destruction of the whole of mankind.

That was what we were faced with, and it was on the two issues of whether there had now been developed a satisfactory high level waste disposal technology and whether accountability arrangements were sufficient to cope with the problems of nuclear proliferation that I went to Europe. I took with me Mr. Dickinson, the former Director of Mines, our consultant in the uranium enrichment studies (an acknowledged proponent of uranium development and mining), and Mr. Wilmshurst of Amdel, its top consultant to the mining industry, including the uranium industry, on developments in this country, so that I had with me the technical people who could look at the technical problems that were involved in these two issues.

In addition, I had with me Mr. Guerin, the Head of my Policy Secretariat, who had been responsible for the papers which led to our decision in 1977 that it was not then safe to provide uranium to a customer country, and my Press Secretary, Mr. Rann who, incidentally, has been a leading anti-nuclear campaigner for years, a leader of the Green Peace Movement in New Zealand when he was there, and one of the organisers of New Zealand's intervention in the French atomic test area in the Pacific. Consequently, he is constantly in touch with people in the anti-nuclear movement. Thus we had a whole range of opinion to see to it that there was no area of opinion with which we were unable to make contact or to deal.

During the period of a fortnight we went through the process of examining the technical and policy areas in Great Britain, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, and, to a slightly lesser extent, in West Germany. It was a gruelling trip. At the end of that time we came to conclusions as to the facts. Those conclusions were unanimous.

The Leader gets up here and talks about left-wing pressure in the Labor Party. I have never been able to discover terribly much left-wing pressure on Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst, but they are agreed as to what the facts are, and they are quite clear. The position is that in England, after the Flowers Commission, a great deal of work was done on high-level waste disposal. A lot of activity occurred in the examination of the storage, pooling and vitrification of high-level wastes. That is the reprocessing process by which uranium and plutonium has been taken out of spent fuel and the actinides and fissile products are then dealt with by storage and cooling over a period during which time they lose a significant part of their high-level radioactivity.

They lose temperature and it is then possible to incorporate them directly in boron silicate glass. That must be stored for a further period during which it loses part of its radioactivity and temperature and is cooled to a stage where it can be disposed of, finally, in some repository where it is removed from the biosphere safely for all time. That process was examined during the Windscale inquiry.

This is not just a matter of my opinion. In the Windscale inquiry, which was made by Mr. Justice Parker, the adversary process was used. People on both sides of the question, all the anti-nuclear people and the like, were heard and tested on oath. Mr. Justice Parker's conclusions were very clear on this topic. He said:

The disadvantages of disposal of spent fuel or indefinite storage of the fuel is that there is a wastage of energy but, in addition, it could escape from the disposal site back to the environment.

He believed, therefore, that given the nature of British fuel, which differs from some of the other forms of fuel in nuclear reactors, it was necessary for safety to reprocess.

He found that the vitrification process that I have described, of incorporation in boron silicate glass, is a feasible process, and with that we agree. However, he went on to say:

On the question of the disposal of the solidified waste—that is, the vitrified waste when it has once been put in that form and while it is still dangerous (according to the Director of Harwell, its high level radioactivity of a dangerous nature lasts at least 600 years)—

Professor Tolstoy drew attention to a large number of points which showed that a final solution to the problems of disposal has not yet been found. This I accept.

That was a judicial finding in the inquiry.

**Mr. Millhouse:** What is the date of it?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The date of the inquiry was 1977, and it was presented to the Secretary of State on 26 January 1978. We examined the question of whether that position had significantly altered since the finding. The answer is "No"; as far as Great Britain is concerned, it has not. There has not been a site found for ultimate disposal of waste. There is one site under investigation at Dunreah in Scotland. One bore is in the course of being sunk and they are currently down 300 metres. They have only just got planning approval and have started, but the necessary tests on whether it is possible to get a final repository at that site have not been completed.

The Minister for Energy in Great Britain, Mr. Wedgwood-Benn, said to me quite specifically, "We have not established a safe means of final disposal of high-level wastes which is satisfactory or which we could put to the public as satisfactory." That is the situation in Great Britain today. On Mr. Wilmshurst's report to me, Britain is significantly behind Sweden in technology in this area.

It will be about two years before that situation can successfully be reappraised. In Sweden, a different situation obtains. The Centre Party, which forms part of a

coalition Government, was elected specifically on a programme of not fuelling one additional reactor, in the last election held in Sweden.

**Mr. Millhouse:** They were Conservative funds.

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

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member is out of order, but he is quite right; they were Conservative funds. Indeed, the policy of Mr. Fälldin, the Leader of that Party, who became the then Prime Minister, was that no additional nuclear reactors should be fuelled. A law was passed in Sweden which was called the Stipulations Law and which required that, before any additional nuclear reactor was fuelled, it had to be shown to the nuclear inspectorate, which is an independent Government organisation critical of the nuclear process and with no interest in finding that it would work (it is there to monitor safety and is an independent organisation similar to the Ombudsman), and to the Swedish Parliament that the contracts and the method had been established for the absolutely safe disposal of high active wastes from that fuelled reactor. At the moment there are six nuclear reactors in operation in Sweden, and four more have been built but have not been fuelled. The original programme of the previous Social Democratic Party Government was to build a total of 13.

Very extensive and thorough studies were conducted. Once these studies were published they were subjected to what is called a remiss process, which allows a criticism of the reports, plus a series of independent reports by experts in various areas, including geologists and others. All of the experts were asked to have an input, and it was then reassessed. As a result of this, it has been determined by the Swedish Parliament that the next two reactors may be fuelled, that they consider that the process is safe with one qualification, which remains, and that is, that a sufficient consistent area of deep granitic rock, which has been a stable formation for millions of years and which is not subject to any likelihood of geological disturbance, can be proved up the moment tests have been taken on that rock to show what movement there is from a particular site in it. It must be proved that that condition in that particular bore is consistent throughout a sufficient area of rock to form a proper depository.

That investigation is under way, and Mr. Wilmshurst has inspected it. It has not been finally proved yet, but each of the bores taken so far has proved consistent with the original. This may well mean that during this year Sweden will prove up a safe, high-active waste disposal programme. The problem about that is that this method can apply only in areas which have similar formations of deep granitic rock and that applies in only a few countries throughout the world. Numbers of customer countries for uranium do not have such conditions.

We have not discovered anyone prepared to accept the final disposal of other people's atomic wastes. Sweden has been able to make contracts with the reproducers in Britain, British Nuclear Fuel Limited, and the Cogema Company in France, which is the reprocessor in that country for the reprocessing of spent fuel from its nuclear reactors. A condition of each of those contracts was that the waste would be returned to them. There is a similar provision in the contract that Japan has made with Cogema. Spent fuel from Japanese reactors has been delivered to France for reprocessing, and a condition was that, once the vitrified waste had been held for a period, it would be returned to Japan. Japan has proved no repository whatever for the final safe disposal of that waste. The frightening thing is that a number of countries faced with the final disposal of waste are now looking at

the disposal of that waste on the sea bed. No-one in this country can really be satisfied with that for a final disposal of waste.

When the Leader of the Opposition talks in the generalities in which he has dealt today, and when he talks about our getting jobs and it being safe to go ahead, I wish he would get down to cases and talk about the facts. What is going to happen in the future in these issues? I find that that is the one thing that the Opposition will never talk about.

We examined the situation in France and found that it had a large amount of waste which it was currently processing at its vitrification plant in Marcoule. At that plant the waste from gas graphite reactors is currently being vitrified on a commercial basis. I went through the atomic plants, fast breeder reactors, and the gaseous diffusion enrichment plant at Tricastin; in fact, I have been in so many atomic plants that it is a wonder I do not glow in the dark.

France has made it perfectly clear that it has no intention, at this stage or in the foreseeable future, of investigating or developing a technique for the final disposal of high level wastes. It intends to leave these wastes in air-cooled holes in the floor of its plants. I stood on these floors during my visit there and was told, "Oh well, they will be there for the next 40 or so years and then we will decide what we will do with them." It has been found quite specifically in the Flowers Commission and the Windscale inquiry that that is a programme of disaster, that it is unsafe and should not be done.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** It's what the Opposition would do, though.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In the Netherlands, they are very embarrassed about the position of high-level wastes, because they are going to have to have their waste reprocessed and they have nowhere to put it, because they have no granitic rock. Their programme was to bury the waste in deep subterranean salt domes. But their planning laws and the violent opposition to the processes which are being gone through in the Netherlands have prevented them from even drilling holes on the site to establish the consistency of the salt domes. Unless they are consistent and if, in fact, it is not straight salt all the way through, the whole process is useless and unsafe.

In West Germany, such a site is proposed at Gorleben, close to the G.D.R. border, where they are going to establish a reprocessing plant. At this stage of proceedings they have not proved up the technique, they have not proved it in anything like the way the Swedes have gone through the process of doing, and my advisers have to tell me—and they have told me—that they cannot consider that this has been properly proven.

That is the situation we are faced with in high-active waste disposal areas, and the significant thing is that, although the Prime Minister has demanded that specific provisions be undertaken by customer countries before we provide uranium to them, there is nothing in the agreements made with Finland or the Philippines or in the model agreement published by the Federal Government that has anything at all about waste disposal; there is no requirement in respect of waste disposal in any way.

Let me turn to the question of accountability and nuclear proliferation. The reprocessing process which is economically required by the nuclear industry in Great Britain and on the Continent, and which is required also for safety in some areas, will produce additional plutonium. The additional plutonium is what has given pause to the United States in its proceeding to reprocessing. It is worried about plutonium development.

The United States has an enormous amount of high-level waste, and President Carter has held up reprocessing to reduce the waste to the fissile products and actinides, because it is worried about proliferation of plutonium. What is the position in the United States about waste? This is a finding and conclusion of the House of Representatives committee only last year:

Radioactive waste is a significant and growing problem. At least 3 000 metric tonnes of spent nuclear fuel are now being stored at commercial reactor sites—

that is dealing only with civilian waste; the vast amount of waste is from the defence programme, which is many times this—

and with an additional 17 000 metric tonnes expected to accumulate in the next decade. Yet there is still no demonstrated technology for permanently and safely disposing of this waste.

That is a finding of the United States Congress. Somehow or other I do not think they are terribly influenced by rabid left-wing tendencies. This does not seem to me to be a basis of finding in fact from left-wing ideology.

The plutonium development is of vital importance to us because, if reprocessing is going on, then, in order to contain the plutonium, to contain the possibility of our increasing the amount of uranium of weapons-grade quality which can be reached, we have to have proper accountability at each sensitive site where high-grade uranium enrichment can occur, and we have to have an international control of plutonium. Neither of those things exists.

The honourable member has said in this House that, after listening to the report of the Ranger inquiry, everything is all right; we can go ahead and sell uranium, and it is safe. The motion of the Opposition before this House earlier in this session is that it was safe, based on Mr. Fox. Let me read to the House a publication of the International Consultative Group on Nuclear Energy, published by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, entitled *International Custody of Plutonium Stocks: A First Step Toward an International Regime for Sensitive Nuclear Energy Activities*. One of its authors is Russell W. Fox. The report states:

We conclude:

The nuclear weapon proliferation problem relates to the security of every nation.

The critical proliferation risk is the diversion, actual or feared, of weapons-usable materials.

Assurances of supply of nuclear materials, services, equipment, and technology for civil nuclear purposes are dependent on the establishment of non-proliferation measures which are recognised as adequate.

A number of nations do not regard existing treaties and international arrangements, embodied in the IAEA/NPT system and certain regional arrangements, as adequate to deal with the proliferation risks arising from the widespread use of civil nuclear power.

Additional restraints in bilateral agreements are at best only a partial solution—

That is the bilateral agreement process Australia has been talking about. The report continues:

Some suppliers insist on conditions which are more onerous than are required by others. The absence of uniformity not only tends to distort international trade patterns in nuclear materials, services and equipment, but also may subject nuclear enterprises in recipient countries to conflicting conditions when several sources of supply are involved. Restrictions are most likely to be accepted where they are least needed.

Considerations of finance and technology make interna-

tional co-operation desirable in many, if not most, cases of nuclear development.

The report further states:

There is substantial concern that existing international treaties and institutions may not provide an adequate basis for dealing with the nuclear weapon proliferation problem. The IAEA Statute, the EURATOM Treaty, the NPT, and the Tlatelolco Treaty are all important and valuable in their respective spheres. But adherence to them is not regarded, by a significant number of nations, as providing adequate international control of proliferation risks . . .

There is no universal or even general agreement as to desirable restrictions, in addition to current IAEA safeguards, or, indeed, as to whether such restrictions should be required at all. The most that the nuclear suppliers as a group have been able to achieve is agreement to exercise "restraint" in the export of sensitive nuclear materials or equipment. In any event, some of the additional restrictions are in the form of further promises, such as not to replicate sensitive facilities using transferred technology, when promises and assurances, even by treaty, have sometimes proven to be inadequate in the past.

And inadequate indeed they have proved. Although it has been stated quite clearly by the International Atomic Energy Agency and by the major supplier countries that, if we are to contain plutonium, the number of reprocessing plants must be absolutely limited, what has happened? West Germany has given permission to a commercial organisation to export a reprocessing plant to Brazil, which is not a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

**The Hon. J. D. Corcoran:** It hasn't signed it.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** It has not signed it. They will have a reprocessing plant through which they can reprocess and provide themselves with plutonium. The best we have is an assurance that at some time in the future they will make an agreement about its control.

Regarding the Brazilian Government, having a look at the recent history of South America and at what has happened in that country, the amount of assurance that can be given to the world about the safety of having plutonium in the hands of people of that kind I think is nil. Yet the honourable member says that it is safe, and that it is safe, what is more, to export uranium to countries that are now permitted to provide enriched uranium to Brazil, which is not a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

We found, amongst all the countries that we visited, a belief, an expressed view, that it was desirable to have an international control system on plutonium. We also found that there was no design of such a system on the ground at all; they have not even begun to talk about it. The international fuel cycle evaluation talks are going on, but in the participant countries that would be involved in necessarily working out how the actual accountability would work, the particular physical way in which plutonium would be stored, accounted for, inspected, and issued, none of that has been designed, nor is there any guarantee that it will be designed. We can get no answers on this topic (and that is clear) until after the international fuel cycle evaluation talks have been completed, and that will not be for another year. That, then, can only be a beginning. If those talks mean that we are going to get a better international accountability, that will be a start, because we need a better international accountability now.

What are the present accountability arrangements? We have not got control of plutonium. We have, within the European community, the inspections made by Euratom, the inspectorate of the European Economic Community. All they do is require reports from each plant, from the

ore process on. Those reports must be made to them (they are normally made monthly) as to the stocks, and movement and treatment of stocks, and they have periodic inspections, which in some parts, surprisingly enough, are only once every year, but at other times more frequently they have unannounced investigations from time to time to audit various areas of the accounts. However, they only look to see whether there has been any diversion from a stated purpose. The Euratom arrangements do not question the purpose: they only look to see whether the stated purposes are what has been done.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, on the other hand, follows what may have happened to any diversion. They look at whether the purpose was a proper one, but the International Atomic Energy Agency, according to our own delegates (Mr. Justice Fox and Dr. Smith), is under-staffed and under-financed. Our own people believe that there is no sufficient full-scope accountability until there is a 24-hour resident inspectorate at every sensitive plant, and that exists at not one plant anywhere.

In all of those circumstances, how can it be said that at this stage of proceedings we have evolved to a safe situation? We were advised strongly by people in administration and at the technical level in a number of countries we visited that the wise course for South Australia was to be cautious and, what is more, that it ought to set out to spell out in detail the safety requirements that we would demand before any commitment was made. What is more, they say that that must happen, and those demands must be met before a commitment is made, because the alternative is already obvious: an alternative which is now facing Australia, because of the concessions made in the past few days by the Deputy Prime Minister.

The situation that arose in relation to the Brazilian contract was that a contract was made for commercial purposes to sell technology to Brazil, because the commercial people in the Euratom countries wanted to beat France to the sale; it was as simple as that. Having made their commercial contracts, they wanted to water down the arrangements that would be agreed to by the Governments of the supplier countries. This caused the greatest of upset and disturbance: in fact, it caused a change in the governmental structure in The Netherlands, because the Social Democratic Foreign Minister rightly demanded that far more be done in providing adequate safeguards in relation to Brazil than was proposed. Unfortunately, he was defeated over it. What happened was that the Upper House of The Netherlands Parliament delayed it for a long time, but it eventually gave way because of the commercial pressure involved. The West German Government allowed a company to go against the whole policy of the supplier group in order to supply that reprocessing plant to Brazil.

We cannot afford, in South Australia, to say, "We'll make our commercial contracts first and then insist on the safeguards afterwards." I believe that South Australia ought to continue with its studies in this area. The honourable member says that Mr. Wran is a long way ahead, but I can assure him whom Mr. Wran talked to in Europe. I know whom he saw and what the submissions were, and I know how far their feasibility studies had gone. South Australia is way out in front at the moment.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** It's not much of—

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** We are a long way ahead in the technology and in the specific programmes that can be designed (there is no question about that), but we are not going to allow any commitments on those programmes until design conditions of safety have been met. Commitments can come only after a satisfaction of the

Parliament and the people of South Australia on the safety matters. We have to follow the Swedish course in this matter, and that is the right course to follow. I believe that we can go on and make studies and evaluations, set up our programme, and ensure that we know what is there and what the future implies, but no commercial commitment can be made until the conditions can be satisfied, and those conditions must be public, satisfied, known and certain. If that is done, South Australia can then hold up its head and say that we have seen that we have played our part as regards the world and the whole of this nuclear fuel cycle (admittedly it is there: we are not going to be able to get rid of the nuclear fuel cycle in Europe), but we will not be a part of any process that means the destruction of mankind or disease and horror for generations of South Australians to come.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** One hardly knows where to start in dealing with the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope honourable members will contain themselves.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** In his rambling discourse, the Premier accused the Leader of the Opposition of delivering an idiot diatribe. The Premier, as a lawyer, likes to think that he and his legal friends are the fount of all knowledge and wisdom in this Chamber. However, there are other people in the Chamber who probably have qualifications superior to those of the Premier regarding atomic energy, and who also have a fund of common sense, which is the fundamental requirement for making sound, sensible decisions about this matter.

What is at issue is not the ability of the Premier as a skilled actor and lawyer to stand up in this place and make the thinnest case look convincing. He has been doing that sort of thing for a good deal of his professional life in court. If he thinks he has a monopoly on facts, he is talking nonsense. On this side of the House there are people with scientific qualifications superior to those of the Premier.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Who are they?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Premier makes no bones about the fact that he has a law degree. It so happens that I have a degree in science with majors in physics and chemistry.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Henley Beach to order.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The member for Davenport has a masters degree in science. The member for Light has a degree with a scientific bent, as has the member for Mallee. Members on this side also have a fund of common sense, with is the fundamental requirement for making sensible decisions about uranium. Therefore, don't let the Premier pontificate and lord it over this place in his superior fashion, as though he is the fount of all morality, wisdom and knowledge regarding uranium.

**Mr. Allison:** He programmes them.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** He mesmerises them but he does not mesmerise us. The Premier, by carefully selected quotes this afternoon, has given an impression that is quite misleading. One hardly knows where to start in commenting on that rambling discourse. The Premier quoted early in his remarks Mr. Justice Fox, and then towards the end of his speech he quoted a pamphlet to which Mr. Justice Fox was a signatory, stating what purported to be Mr. Justice Fox's position relating to nuclear energy. A few days ago the following newspaper report appeared:

"We have to be realistic about nuclear energy," says Mr. Justice Russell Fox, Australia's ambassador-at-large for



nuclear non-proliferation and safeguards was talking in London after 18 months of globe-trotting.

Yesterday his term of appointment was extended for another six-month period. In a report by Malcolm Turnbull published here in the *Bulletin*, the judge says that because of the lack of suitable substitutes, the world is relying more on nuclear power as an energy source.

As a result, there is now a substantial nuclear industry which produces substantial amounts of power for some countries. "It is no more sensible to tell these people to abandon nuclear power than it is for me to tell you to live without electric lights," says Mr. Justice Fox.

**Mr. Klunder:** Did he say it was safe?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We will examine the question of safety later. The Premier gets up with this high moral stance, but it is a fact of life that two-thirds of the world's population is starving. It is also a fact of life that the provision of energy will go a long way towards alleviating that terrible position.

**Mr. Klunder:** That's not where the nuclear power plants are.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** India has developed a nuclear power plant, and that is one country which desperately needs development. There are immense problems on a global scale connected with the supply of energy from coal. If we are to apply this moral argument of the Premier's, we would have to return to the horse and buggy days. There would be no other solution. To balance the Premier's selected quotes, I will present some selected quotes. Mr. Justice Parker, in the Windscale report, states:

It is necessary to keep the nuclear industry alive and able to expand should expansion be required. Such expansion might be required, either to meet additional energy demands, or to preserve a "mix" and to avoid over-dependence on a particular energy source, or to reduce the number of fossil fuelled stations as a result of confirmation from further research of the views expressed in the Ford Foundation Report (and elsewhere) that such stations are more harmful than nuclear stations.

The build-up of carbon dioxide on a global scale through the combustion of fossil fuels is increasing the overall temperature of the earth, and this can have dire consequences for mankind that could well and truly swamp any problems that might be created because of the need to store material for nuclear reactors for a long term.

If we are to apply the Premier's argument, one of the first things we would have to do is ban motor cars, because more people are killed in South Australia through the use of motor cars than have ever been killed in warfare. It has not been demonstrated to the public that it is 100 per cent safe to ride in motor cars. Future civilisations will look back at us and believe that this aspect of our life is one of the lunatic aspects of the twentieth century. If we follow this argument through to its conclusion, we would have to come up with that result.

Bob Hawke, a prominent member of the Labor Party, until recently Federal President, argued in precisely these terms. I have brought Mr. Hawke's argument to the attention of the House previously. He is one Labor Party member who believes in uranium mining and export. He has said that, if this sort of argument is followed to its logical conclusion, we would have to stop mining iron ore and manufacturing steel. As Mr. Hawke said to students at Monash university:

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

and then what happens only as a result of keeping ours in the ground, is that the cost of energy is increased in those rich countries, which are now using this as a source of power and to the extent that their energy is costing more by not only making an impact upon them but immediately it also makes an impact upon the underdeveloped world in terms of increasing the cost structure of the rest of the world.

That is Hawke speaking, yet the Premier says that the whole Labor Party is unanimous and has seen the light on this matter. What utter nonsense! We know perfectly well there is a division of opinion in the Labor Party, as there is a division of opinion within the community.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** And the Liberal Party.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** There were some doubts within the Liberal Party, but I state categorically there is no division in the Parliamentary Liberal Party in South Australia on this question.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Tell the truth!

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

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Of course individual members of the Liberal Party have their reservations, because the Liberal Party is made up of a cross-section of the community, as is the Labor Party. For the Labor Party to say there is no dissension within its ranks is an absolute untruth. There is division within the Parliamentary Labor Party. I repeat that there is no division on this question within the South Australian Parliamentary Liberal Party. The Premier says there is no division, but on 22 January 1979 the *News* reported as follows:

The potential of uranium at Roxby Downs was hailed today by an SA Government Minister as a "Major, rich mine by any world standards". The discovery, at Roxby Downs could provide a much needed revival in the State's mineral industry, the Education Minister and former Mines Minister, Dr. Hopgood, said.

Speaking at the opening of an Australian Drilling Association symposium at Adelaide University, Dr. Hopgood said South Australia's mineral industry declined after an exploration boom from 1967 to 1973. "However, recent events have altered this gloomy situation, at a time when the State again would benefit from a growth industry to combat economic difficulties," he said.

"In the Olympic Dam Cooper uranium deposit discovered by Western Mining Corporation Limited on Roxby Downs Station we have potentially the basis of a major rich mine by any world standard."

If we follow the argument of the Premier today we will never mine uranium. The Premier has said that, regarding the disposal of the waste, the Swedes are lucky. Plutonium is the element about which there is some long-term problem, but the fact is that a person can sit on it without coming to harm.

**Mr. Klunder:** Only if you do not want to have children afterwards.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know what scientific training my friend has had but I know you can hold a piece in your hand without danger. The immediate danger comes from highly radioactive material which emanates and decays quickly. If one ingests these things into the body there are all sorts of effects. If material can be contained so that it is not ingested into the body there is no danger. Materials with a short half-life period that give off a lot of radiation are the immediate danger. They decay rapidly and their half-life period is small, so they soon decay away to negligible proportions. When we are talking about thousands of years we are talking about materials which decay slowly the danger from which comes only when they are ingested into the body.

The Premier would have us believe that the Swedes are

lucky because they have some granite deposits, and that other places in the world are not so well blessed in this connection. If we follow this argument to its logical conclusion, the Premier believes that if we cannot find a safe deposit for these wastes we will never mine uranium.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** He didn't say that.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I understood him to say that. The Premier berated the French for storing it. He said he stood over it in France. There is no danger in that. While the French can keep their eye on it there is no great danger. Danger arises only when it is dispersed and atomised. The Premier talked in emotional terms about this being digested or spread into the biosphere. While the French have it there and can keep their eye on it there is no danger from it. In the long term somewhere will be found to put this material. Most industrial processes produce noxious wastes which have to be watched.

The Premier has overdramatised this situation to a marked degree this afternoon. He quoted Mr. Justice Fox and the Windscale report, which dealt specifically with reprocessing. The report states:

This report is, as I understand it, intended to form, as was the inquiry, an element in a wide public debate on nuclear issues. Moreover it was repeatedly stressed by one or other party in the course of the inquiry that the public are badly informed and should be better informed. I have no doubt whatever that this is so, in the sense that the public should be provided with more in the way of digestible and reliable information. It is the lack of such information which renders the public or some members of it suspicious of those who operate the nuclear industry and exposes them to anxieties which are needless.

I suggest that the Premier's speech this afternoon will expose the public of South Australia to needless fears. I believe it was an alarmist speech. The Premier spoke about cancers, leukaemia and all those other dire results. This assumes that this material will be deliberately spread into the biosphere, that it is beyond the ken and wit of the human race to come to grips with this problem. The whole history of the survival of the human race has been its ability to come to grips with such problems. It was an alarmist and irresponsible speech. The Windscale report continues:

In saying this I do not intend to imply that there are no grounds for anxiety in certain respects. There clearly are. It is equally clear, however, that many of the anxieties which are felt are without foundation and spring from a fear of anything nuclear, no doubt partly due to the fact that the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs with their devastating effects were the opening events in the development of nuclear power. Furthermore the anxieties which are felt, and deeply felt, however irrational and misplaced they may be, undoubtedly exist and are elements which must be taken into account.

The report then went on to recommend that Britain should carry on with the reprocessing of nuclear fuel and that was what the report was all about. Anyone can make selective quotes from publications. The Premier quoted from the Flowers Report, which was commenced in 1971 and finished in 1976. What about the encouraging reports which came from the Premier when he was in France? *The Advertiser* on 22 February 1979 reported as follows:

Safe waste "nearer"—Dunstan: The solution to the problems of final safe disposal of highly radioactive waste was "much nearer than we thought." South Australia's Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today.

If we listened to the Premier this afternoon we would never mine uranium.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're talking through—

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am not. Of course, the Minister of Mines and Energy would not like the case

over-stated by the Premier today, because he is Minister of Mines and we know perfectly well what the Mines Department thinks about this Government policy. We have had the opportunity of reading its report to Parliament for the past two years. We know it is worried about the Government policy and what it thinks about Roxby Downs. We know the Minister of Mines and Energy would be sensitive to the Premier's over-stating his case, as he did this afternoon. The newspaper report continues:

The Premier, who will end his two week European study of developments in nuclear safeguards today, said the Swedes were a long way ahead. "By the end of this year they expect to meet all the requirements laid down by their Parliament and they talk about establishing complete safety within two years", he said.

They and the French were early leaders in the field of vitrification of waste in glass compounds. The French were operating a pilot plant on a commercial scale and would soon have a new plant for the vitrification of all spent fuel. "So, as I said last weekend, the question of ultimate safe disposal of nuclear waste has altered dramatically", Mr. Dunstan said. That is certainly not the impression I got today when listening to the Premier.

This motion centres around the future of South Australia and the Government's abysmal failure to make reasonable decisions to ensure the future prosperity and economic well-being of this State. The motion is prompted by the palpably phoney conclusions that the Premier reached as a result of his curious overseas trip.

He stated that evidence was put to him. He referred to the Flowers report. Other reports mentioned have been available freely for months. He said that he undertook the trip because of new evidence put to him towards the end of last year which he was able to assess during the Christmas break and which impelled him to go overseas to investigate the current situation. I, too, felt impelled to go overseas about six months ago, and I went to some of the same places visited by the Premier. True, my visit was not at public expense, yet I went and came up with a different set of conclusions.

The first fact (and the Premier wants to deal in facts) is that, whether we like it or not, the world is now in a nuclear age; whether we like it or not, numerous countries depend on nuclear energy. Another fact is that they require uranium fuel.

**Mr. Mathwin:** They have been using it for years.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** They have been using it since 1952 in Great Britain. Despite the arguments from the Premier and those we will hear advanced by the member for Mitcham, the sound, reasonable and common sense thinkers of this world have concluded that we are in a nuclear age, and that we cannot turn off the reactors. We must supply the uranium and do what we can to find solutions to these problems. I believe solutions will be found.

Less than a week ago Sir Mark Oliphant said that he had changed his mind. On a 5DN radio talk-back programme he said he believed that we should go ahead and mine uranium. He claimed that it was inevitable. He said some time ago on the radio programme *PM* that he believed the problem of handling nuclear waste had been solved. He said he was still opposed to uranium mining because of his fear, which we respect, concerning war, but only a week ago he said that he believed that we should proceed to mine uranium, that in the light of all the evidence it would be the best thing that we could do.

Great Australian thinkers like Sir Macfarlane Burnet have come to the same conclusion. It is not good enough to push aside the opinion of that eminent geneticist, and

say that he is an old man. Although old men have not much to gain personally in the future, they can do much for their descendants. Recently, Sir Macfarlane Burnet spoke out on this question—

**Mr. Allison:** He's one of our most brilliant minds.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. He states:

As one who has been concerned with the problem for over 20 years, I have oscillated from early enthusiasm for "Atoms for peace" to a firm recommendation to keep Australia's uranium in the ground, and then to a conviction that the use of nuclear power as at least an interim solution of the world's problems is inevitable and justifiable.

He goes on:

However sympathetic one may be to the arguments of Friends of the Earth at economic and social levels, they do not justify the hysterical tone of most anti-nuclear propaganda. The provision of energy for the future is a highly technical matter that just has to be left to the experts and to the administrators, who have the intelligence and character to assess and utilise expert opinion. The current political shibboleth, that time must be allowed for discussion by the community before a decision is made, means no more than exposing the community to emotionally slanted propaganda that has little touch with reality.

I suggest that the facts that I am putting are in touch with reality. Members are sent *Image Canada*. As I have said, we are in the nuclear age and there is nothing we in South Australia can do to stop that, except increase the price of fuel around the world and deprive under-privileged nations of quicker development. The most recent publication of *Image Canada* contains a report about the Canadian nuclear industry and states:

Uranium production: In 1977, Canada had six uranium producers:

It then names the producers. The report continues:

The first four producers are located in Ontario and the last two in northern Saskatchewan. In 1977 these operations produced some 5 800 tonnes U to supply Canada's domestic needs as well as its export markets which are primarily in Japan, Western Europe and the United States. Shipments in 1977 were slightly higher than mine production at 5 953 tonnes U.

The report continues:

Exports: The objectives of Canada's uranium export policy can be stated briefly: (1) to ensure long-term (30 years) full supply for existing and committed reactors, as well as for reactors planned for operation in Canada for a future ten-year period. (2) To ensure the availability of sufficient uranium production capacity for the Canadian domestic nuclear power programme to reach its full potential. (3) To increase the return to Canadians from the exportable surplus. (4) To strengthen the knowledge base for national decision making. (5) To contribute to orderly world uranium development and marketing.

There is then further elaboration of the Canadian safeguards policy. The report goes on to say that Canada supplies uranium to India, and this led to the resultant explosion in India. Consequently, Canada cut off the supply and tightened up its safeguards policy.

The Premier referred to the Federal Government's stance with which he agrees. I refer to the Premier the recent policy statement, which states:

Ten days ago the Federal Government decided to agree to companies in Australia entering into conditional contracts with customers.

I hope that the Premier will agree with that statement and not adopt the blanket stupid and irrational ban on the mining of uranium in the foreseeable future.

Time will preclude my making many of the points I had hoped to make, because I have dealt mostly with the

points raised by the Premier. Responsible thinkers in the community, men of standing, ability, judgment, and wisdom have examined this question. They realise that there are problems not solved but near solution, as the Premier acknowledges. The problem of waste disposal is near solution. If we were to follow the Premier's argument to its logical conclusion, many other facets of modern life would have to be extinguished, and I have referred to just one or two of those matters.

More radiation is expelled into the atmosphere from a coal-fired power station than from a nuclear power station. I have visited overseas nuclear power stations. I visited Hinkley Point in Britain, where there is an old nuclear reactor and a new one. I inspected those reactors and undertook close questioning about emissions to the atmosphere. More pollution comes from a coal-fired station than from a nuclear one. Further, the chances of an accident are remote. The safety record for coal mining is not good—

**Mr. Mathwin:** Did you talk to Wedgwood-Benn?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** No. The Premier quoted him, and we could quote the Labour Minister who came out here during the Federal election campaign and said that we should get on with uranium mining, but he was quickly branded as being out of step. Around the world the communist and socialist countries are engaged in the production of nuclear reactors. It is only little South Australia that is out of step in this scene. I do not believe that the so-called quasi-moral stance of the Premier bears examination. I support the motion. We have made the position of the Opposition abundantly clear to the House. We had some reservations, but they have been resolved.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy):** This is an extraordinary motion for one reason in particular: it suggests that anyone who is opposed to uranium mining is a left-wing extremist or under the influence of left-wing extremists.

**Mr. Millhouse:** It's incredible.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** To some of the Tories in the Liberal Party even the member for Mitcham would have to be described as a left-wing extremist. I will deal, first, with the publicity given to certain matters, and the way matters can readily be misrepresented. The Minister of Education opened a conference and made certain statements about Roxby Downs which led the *News*, in a headline on 22 January, to state:

Let's go Roxby—Hopgood.

That was a phoney headline, which completely misrepresented the position that Dr. Hopgood had stated. As Dr. Hopgood might not be contributing to this debate, I point out that he stated:

In the Olympic Dam copper uranium deposit discovered by Western Mining Corporation Ltd. on the Roxby Downs Station we have potentially the basis of a major rich mine by any world standard.

I emphasise the word "potentially", because Dr. Hopgood's position is that of the Government, that that project cannot go ahead until we are satisfied that it will be safe to do so, so it is only potentially a major rich mine. The interpretation given by the *News* was completely incorrect.

I have an objection to lodge about a whole spate of stories that appeared in the *News* that linked my name in one way or another with the Premier's trip and with all sorts of allegations about what was going on. I suppose one cannot expect much more from some of our newspapers because they have little else to write, I guess, so that if they cannot get a quote from someone they make it up or guess at what the person's attitude is. Almost

anything that appeared in the press with respect to my position is not an accurate reflection of it.

I want to lodge a particular objection to the ABC and the use by the ABC of Dr. Coulter. There was an occasion last year on the programme *This Day Tonight* and another on the television news on the evening of the Australia Day holiday when Dr. Coulter was quoted as blaming me and the influence of the Labor Party for all that was allegedly going on. Dr. Coulter gave the impression that he had spoken to me, that I would not listen, etc. etc. etc.. What the ABC has to do with Dr. Coulter, I do not know. I have had no dealings with Dr. Coulter whatsoever and I resent very much the ABC's misrepresenting my position through the mouth of Dr. Coulter. I do not understand for one moment how the ABC can allow that sort of misrepresentation to go on, and I propose to lodge a detailed objection with ABC about this matter. I was not asked to comment on Dr. Coulter's views. I have not been spoken to by Dr. Coulter. He has not listened to my views, to my knowledge. The ABC had the gall, without checking, to run Dr. Coulter's remarks. Again, that resulted in a complete misrepresentation.

I think that the Leader this afternoon in part gave the game away with respect to general mining for uranium, whether in this State or in any other State. He said that mining companies required a degree of political stability, that mining companies required reassurance that projects would go ahead and that Government policy would not change. There is a lot of truth in those statements. It is quite clear that the first cabs off the rank with respect to uranium mining in Australia will run the gamut of industrial trouble and various kinds of difficulty. If there is a serious division in the community on a subject, there is bound to be a significant potential for political difficulty. One could not legitimately say to any mining company that was contemplating a development in uranium in this State, or in any other State, that it had a guarantee that it would be able to go ahead in all circumstances.

They have not got that guarantee and could not have that kind of guarantee until there is a greater consensus of viewpoint within the Australian community than there is at present. It is no good Sir Macfarlane Burnet, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or anybody else saying, "Let us leave it to the experts." We live in a democracy. People are entitled to express their point of view, will do so and will not be satisfied with the proposition, "Don't worry about this, it is too complicated; let us leave it to the experts".

There is an educative process that we must go through as a community. There is no gainsaying that; it is something that we have to experience and go through. That process is continuing to go on in South Australia.

I am somewhat influenced by recent events in Sweden because, after all, what has happened in Sweden was not a case of "leave it to the experts", and not a case of pressure being applied by the major uranium suppliers. The advances that have been made in Sweden were as a direct consequence of the political disquiet that existed within the Swedish community about the storage of high-level wastes.

The Deputy Leader ought to get his facts correct in relation to the whole issue relating to wastes and nuclear proliferation. The reprocessing is designed to extract the uranium that is left over, and the plutonium, from the spent nuclear fuel rods. After those have been extracted (because they are still useful for further energy) there are other fissile products and actinides which involve high-level wastes and which require storage. The permanent storage relates to high-level wastes; that is the problem.

The problem with plutonium is not so much the

radioactivity associated with plutonium, but the fact that a small amount of weapons grade plutonium can lead to production of a nuclear device. The major worry that is associated with the non-proliferation treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency is the question of the control of the use and reuse of plutonium, because if there are a certain number of reprocessing plants in the world and if spent fuel rods are sent to those reprocessing plants and the material from those plants is sent back to the customer country, we have a situation where the world is involved in a large amount of transport of plutonium. The great concern, in relation to the plutonium issue, is not in storage as a high-level waste (because it is not), but because it is a worry that plutonium can get into the wrong hands and lead to proliferation of nuclear weapons.

What the Premier said this afternoon made it quite clear that, first, the facts overseas demonstrate that the world is much closer to the proving of effective methods of storing high-level wastes but that, secondly, there is a long way to go before we can be satisfied with the international controls, whether exercised through EURATOM or through the International Atomic Energy Agency, relating to the tracking down and accounting of uranium and plutonium.

Once we are into the reprocessing business, we are into the plutonium economy and, regardless of whether anyone likes it, we must be concerned with the issues that are involved in that. I am surprised that neither the Leader nor the Deputy Leader mentioned the fact that the Australian Government has been negotiating nuclear safeguards with Iran for the supply of uranium to that country.

**Mr. Millhouse:** A great country to which to send it at the moment!

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Quite. Is the Leader or the Deputy Leader happy for uranium to be supplied to Iran, in view of recent events?

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** You know the current position.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Whatever the current position is, the Federal Government is not a chicken in the political process. The Federal Government is aware of the Shah's position. Doubtless the Federal Government thought Iran was a politically stable country and proceeded to enter into negotiations with the Iranian Government for the supply of uranium. We have seen the recent events of political instability which have occurred there and which make one wonder whether, if we had a plutonium economy involving a country like Iran, just how safe would be the movement of plutonium into and out of that country. I raise this matter as the major issue relating to the nuclear economy, not so much the question of the storage of waste products.

While we can see solutions to the problem of the storage of waste products, it is highly relevant that political pressure in Sweden halted its nuclear power programme and produced the solutions. The experts seem like producing the goods in response to political pressure, and our Premier has made that clear. Therefore honourable members cannot knock the political process that goes on in every country in the world as a means to secure adequate safeguards. It is a basis for querying the extent to which we in Australia can be satisfied with what is going on elsewhere.

The Federal Government was about to sign a safeguards treaty with the United Kingdom, but the European Economic Community would not have it. The European Economic Community, which is heavily dominated by France (a non-signatory to the non-proliferation treaty), has told its members, "You are not permitted to enter into safeguard agreements which are more stringent than our

individual member countries are prepared to accept".

International control is necessary, and we cannot be satisfied with the present international control. The Premier's concerns expressed this afternoon on this matter are quite correct. In any event, it is absolutely inappropriate to contemplate developing uranium mining in this State, or in this country, effectively until there is a much greater effective consensus. Mining companies generally will not be willing to spend huge sums of money until they are satisfied that there is in the local community a consensus that is sufficient to permit them to go ahead without drastic swings of Government policy.

Roxby Downs cannot proceed on copper alone, with uranium being stockpiled, and for Roxby Downs to proceed would require a huge amount of front-end money, probably about \$1 000 000 000. Without a large measure of support, not just in this Parliament but in the South Australian community as a whole, no company will be able to take the risks associated with the expenditure of such a huge sum of money.

In any event, honourable members should note that the production of uranium, copper, or anything else from Roxby Downs, in the best possible circumstances, could not take place before 1985 or 1986. The lead time associated with that project is very extensive. For another couple of years the Western Mining Corporation and whoever are its associates will be involved in further exploration, proving up of the ore body, and further technical studies to determine what kind of mining process will have to be undertaken. Therefore, if Government policy with respect to uranium mining were changed today, that would not alter the prospective timing regarding Roxby Downs. No amount of blowing and beating of the breast by the Leader of the Opposition can alter that basic fact.

**Mr. Wilson:** Why is that?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Because of the lead time involved and the requirement for further studies and further exploration that Western Mining Corporation proposes to continue at this stage.

**Mr. Wilson:** How quickly would they do it?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** They could not produce uranium, copper or any other product from that site before 1985 or 1986 in any circumstances. A six-year or seven-year lead time is involved before anything can be produced, and another 18 months, two years, or longer if further studies and further exploration are to be undertaken before any final project can be determined. Western Mining Corporation is still continuing its exploration.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** It could start producing in 1983.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** That is not true; that is not the information given by Western Mining Corporation. The earliest would be 1985 or 1986. Indeed, some of the company's prospective partners, who put propositions to it, believe it might not be before 1989.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Aren't we to believe the Premier?

**Mr. Allison:** He said 1983.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Well, I am saying 1985 or 1986. The Premier has stated the position clearly. There have been significant advances with respect to the development of techniques and technology for the storage of high-level waste. We are now very much closer to a solution on that matter than we were previously. However, we have a very difficult situation regarding international methods of control relating to the use and re-use of uranium and plutonium.

**Mr. Wilson:** The Premier said yesterday that there was general agreement on this.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** General agreement on

what?

**Mr. Wilson:** On the safeguards and controls.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Safeguards relate first to the disposal of high-level wastes.

**Mr. Wilson:** And controls.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Secondly, they relate to the controls that are exercised on the movement and use of uranium and plutonium. On that second matter, the Premier at no stage has said that he is satisfied, or that other people are satisfied. There is general agreement about what ought to be, but we do not have the international agreements or a method of enforcing what ought to be, and that is the Premier's message.

**Mr. Wilson:** What will happen by the time the lead time expires?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** What does one do when France refuses to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty? France is not a member and is able to use its position in the European Economic Community to prevent a nation like the United Kingdom from entering into a safeguards agreement that is stronger than France is prepared to wear.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Does the South Australian—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Leader is gradually developing a vacant, stupid sort of look. He would do better to listen occasionally. I did not hear the interjection, but I am sure it would have been stupid.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Does the ban in South Australia in any way change the position in France?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Even if we had adequate safeguards, in no circumstances would I be a party to supplying uranium to any country that was not a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or that was supplying electricity, as part of an international grid, to a country that was a non-signatory, and that means France.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** In regard to France and its power within the European Economic Community, at the moment that country can prevent the United Kingdom from reaching a safeguards agreement that is tougher than France itself is willing to accept.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have allowed a certain amount of interjection. The Leader of the Opposition will have an opportunity to reply.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Since the days of De Gaulle, any international control over what France does is inconsistent with the glory of France. That has been the position of French Governments since that time: the glory of France and its position must be No. 1. The question arises—

**Mr. Tonkin:** How does the ban change it?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** If he wants to be a dill, I ask that the Leader confine himself to the times when he is allowed to make a speech, and then we can listen to his being a dill. Apart from the occasions when he is a dill, he should stop interjecting.

**Mr. Wotton:** Are you running out of material?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** No.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition was heard almost in silence, and the Minister also should be heard in silence.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** If in principle effective control of storage of high-level waste can be achieved, and if in principle we know what is required with respect to international agreements, the fundamental position is: what is the best way to achieve this? Some would argue that the best way to achieve it was to supply uranium and to use one's power as a uranium supplier. However, the

recent events involving the Australian Government's attempting to reach a safeguards agreement with the United Kingdom have thrown considerable doubt on that, because the United Kingdom is not allowed to reach a safeguards agreement with Australia that is not acceptable to the E.E.C. There are nine countries in Western Europe and we must have a safeguards agreement to cover all of them, so it is likely to be the lowest common denominator, namely, France. Is that going to be satisfactory?

Perhaps we are back on the question of moral pressure. Add to that the position in Sweden, because I think it is highly relevant. When the Centre Party come to power with the support of the right-wing Parties (not the left-wing extremists of the Leader's motion), they were committed to stopping the nuclear power programme, and it was stopped. That pressure brought better results from the industry. It started to bring a solution and, as the Premier has said this afternoon, it seems that the Swedes virtually are on the brink of a complete solution to the storage problem.

Was that a consequent of the tactic of being a supplier of uranium and using influence that way, or was it a consequence of political pressure within Sweden? If what we believe is true, and if the Swedes are on the brink of effective solutions with respect to the storage of waste products, we must reassess the question of the best way to achieve those results.

If Sweden demonstrates effective methods of storing high-level wastes, proves them, and uses them, are we willing to demand any less from the Philippines, Finland, or France? What is our position as a nation if we are going to supply uranium? We have an example of one country that adopts the highest standards which give a degree of safety that can be achieved by everyone else. Are we to be satisfied with a lesser degree of safety in those circumstances? I think not. I think we must reconsider our attitude on the matter.

We must be able to establish a system of international control which is not forever being modified because of commercial pressure and the demand from commercial interests about certain requirements making their activities less profitable. International control of the movement of plutonium is a much more important issue in the long run than is the question of storage of high-level wastes, because relatively small quantities of weapons-grade plutonium can be used to make nuclear devices.

We are aware of wealthy sections of the world that have the resources to carry out these things. As a world, we have never been able to have any effective system of international arms control. We will have to develop an effective international system for the control of the movement of uranium and plutonium, and there is no gainsaying that.

Again, we have a fundamental question: what is the best way to achieve that degree of international control? Can we achieve more by a refusal to supply, or can we achieve more by supplying and then trying to impose additional conditions? That is a matter of political dispute within our community. It will not do for members opposite to say that all that the Government needs to do is change its mind. It is necessary, if any kind of industrial development of this sort is to take place in South Australia, that there be a sufficient degree of consensus in the State to back it up, and there is not at present.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** They seem to have it in some of the States.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not believe that any of the other States have it to the degree that is necessary. The Northern Territory may have it, but I do not believe that

that is the case in New South Wales or Victoria.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Mr. Wran does.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** He is a part of the Labor Party, and I do not believe the honourable member's quotations or alleged statements about what Mr. Wran believes are likely to be any closer to the mark than are most of the other statements he make in this House when he is in his dill-brained frame of mind.

This motion tries to suggest that any opposition to uranium mining is idle and is expressed by left-wing extremists or people who are bowing to them. What is the history of this matter elsewhere in the world? How many left-wing Parties in the world are opposed to uranium mining? I challenge the Leader to name one.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** You name them.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I do not have to name them; I cannot. The Communist Party and the so-called extremist Parties in France, Italy and elsewhere in Europe support it. What sort of nonsense is the Leader carrying on with, and what sort of attitude is it to say to all the people who vote Liberal but who are opposed to uranium mining that they must be bowing to left-wing extremists? What sort of argument is it to say to the member for Mitcham—

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

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** I admire the way in which the Minister set about making his speech this afternoon, and it could not have been easy for him to do it. It is an open secret that he is a pro-uranium-miner.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You're carrying on.

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

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Why do you have to misrepresent all the time?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** It is an open secret that the Minister is a pro-uranium-miner. He has shown that he can be, and is, loyal to his Government and to his Party, and he has backed up, as well as he possibly could, the arguments that were put eloquently and, I believe, forcibly (I suppose it is easier for me to accept them, because I believe they are right) by the Premier this afternoon. It cannot be easy for the Minister, because there is no secret, nor should there be, that he is being fed all the time by his departmental advisers with arguments and facts to show that this State should go ahead with uranium mining. For all I know, it may be his natural bias as well, but every influence that is brought to bear on him departmentally and from the business community is contrary to the way in which he has spoken this afternoon and the way in which he will vote. I admire him, despite his disparaging remarks as he walked out a moment ago, for the way in which he approached the subject.

What I must say, as I have implied already, is that there is little in what the Premier has said with which I take issue. Indeed, I strongly agree with the conclusion to which he came, and I may say that the Leader of the Opposition was either foolhardy or foolish in taking on the Premier on a subject like this, which, whatever the reasons for it, he has been studying in some depth for the past fortnight, and there is no doubt that that shows up, too, if one compares their two speeches.

I must admit that about a fortnight ago I was perplexed, alarmed and annoyed when, apparently, the Premier had changed his mind on the question of uranium mining and was going overseas, apparently to justify supporting a change of policy by the Australian Labor Party. I must admit that in his speech today he gave no explanation as to why he suddenly decided to go overseas; admittedly, it was not strictly relevant to the motion we are debating, and,

therefore, he can be excused for it. However, many people are still curious about the real reason why he went overseas, if it was not the one that was apparent to me at the time. If he had been flirting with the idea of changing his mind on this subject, I am relieved that, so far, he has not changed his mind.

Despite what has been said, particularly by members on this side, this is not a matter of Party politics. We have heard much about Sweden from nearly everyone who has spoken. The fact is that nuclear development in that country has been halted, temporarily at least, because of the election of the first non-Social Democrat Government in that country in 40 years. It was the Social Democrat Government that had gone ahead with nuclear development. It was the fact that this centre Party (as I interjected when the Premier was speaking, it is made up predominantly of conservative farmers, for all the world like the Liberal Party in South Australia) was elected as the largest Party in the coalition that has caused the halt to nuclear development in Sweden. Sadly enough, the three partners have now fallen out, and the Government has fallen. However, it is still an influential force in Swedish politics, and it is completely and absolutely anti-uranium.

If nothing else does, that gives the lie to the talk that it is only left-wing extremists who are opposed to nuclear development in this country, or anywhere else. The contrast is the United Kingdom, and we have heard something about Anthony Wedgwood-Benn today. There is a Socialist Government in the United Kingdom, and it is going ahead with nuclear development in that country.

**Mr. Mathwin:** They have had it for 30 years.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** They have had it for a long time, as the member for Glenelg has said. I do not know what the members of the Liberal Party think of me, but I am not, in my own mind anyway, a left-wing extremist, yet I am convinced that we would be wrong in exploiting our uranium resources, certainly at this time. This is a matter of judgment. I must admit, as any sensible person must, that there is no objective test to decide this question. We have to balance all sorts of factors but, while I acknowledge that this is a matter of judgment, I am convinced that my view is the right one.

Opinions change, and they change genuinely, and it may be that some time in the future, if there are developments, my opinions on this matter may change. I also admit that I may be wrong now, although I believe that I am right. One thing that causes me some doubt (and which gives everyone some doubt) about this matter is that, despite the United Kingdom Flowers Report and the quotations from it by the Premier, the United Kingdom is still going ahead. That shows that that, of itself, was not the be-all and end-all of it. On balance, I am convinced that we are right not to exploit our uranium resources.

Why has this motion been moved? It is, despite the eloquence of the Leader of the Opposition in his final sentence, for purely Party-political reasons. The Premier handed this issue to the Opposition on a plate a fortnight ago, with his curious, unexpected, and sudden action in going overseas. What he said before he left must have unsettled opinion within his own Party on this issue, especially after what he had previously been saying. I will quote a paragraph from an article on page 15 of the *National Times* of 3 February which, in its turn, quoted what he had said at the biennial conference of the Labor Party in Perth a few years ago. That paragraph states:

Dunstan said at the time: "The ban endorsed by the conference will not be a short one—there is no way it will be. There could be quite grave harm to Australia's economy. We are not looking at the economic safety of one country—we are looking at the safety of the whole world."

I agree with that, yet some of the things he said before he went abroad a few weeks ago would make one wonder whether he still held that view. Allied to that curious, unexpected and sudden action of his in going abroad is what we must, I hope, all admit is a fairly dismal outlook for this State economically. Again, I will quote from that same report in the *National Times*, because it sums the matter up, and perhaps it is some justification for what I said about the Minister of Mines and Energy a few minutes ago. The article states:

Crucial to Dunstan's current stance are the facts that South Australia now has the highest unemployment rate in the country (8.3 per cent against a national average of 7.7 per cent) a contracting manufacturing base and receding chances of securing the long-awaited ICI petro-chemical plant at Redcliff.

The Liberal Party sees an opportunity to capitalise on people's anxiety about our economic position to say that, if we do not proceed with mining at Roxby Downs, we will lose thousands of jobs and prosperity for the State, and that this is the last opportunity we have to retrieve our position. I believe that that is nonsense, although it is sufficiently attractive superficially for them to try to capitalise on this issue.

Having said those things (I do not want to speak for my full half hour), I should like, if I may, to state again (I hope in different words) my own position on this issue. I can do it best by quoting from a letter which I wrote to the *Advertiser* a couple of weeks ago but which was never published. I thought that it was quite a good letter, although they obviously did not think much of it. However, I think it is good enough for me to quote it to the House. I wrote this letter just at the time that it became known that the Premier was going abroad. I wrote it not because of that but because of the full-page advertisement that Mr. Norman Shierlaw had inserted in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday 17 January at a cost of, I understand, about \$2 500. With that advertisement, I heartily disagree. I wrote a letter in reply thereto, and took it in to the *Advertiser* myself, hoping that it would be published.

**Mr. Evans:** Why didn't you put in an advertisement at the same time?

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am afraid that I do not have the financial resources available to me that Mr. Shierlaw apparently had available to him. Whether it was that the letter was not good enough or that the *Advertiser* (which of course takes and always has taken the same line as that stated in the advertisement) considered that it would be against its policy to publish my letter, or that it was against its policy to attack one of its advertisers—

**Mr. Max Brown:** There were 2 500 reasons for them to do that.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** That may be so. However, whatever the reason, my letter was not published. This is what I said and indeed what I say now in reply to the motion that has been moved by the Leader today. Dated 18 January, my letter states:

Dear Sir, It took me an hour or more to read Mr. Shierlaw's advertisement in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday about mining uranium at Roxby Downs. I read it in the hope that it might contribute something new to the debate on whether or not we should mine and export uranium. It did not but was simply an appeal to our greed by promising to make South Australia rich if only Roxby Downs is mined.

I doubt if even in this Mr. Shierlaw is correct. What he wrote reminded me of a sentence in Lord Hailsham's recent book, *The Dilemma of Democracy*, which I am at present reading.

This is something that ought to appeal to the Liberals

because, after all, Lord Hailsham (Quentin Hogg) has been a Conservative politician. They had him out here last year, and he spoke to them at a dinner. They lauded him, and one of the things that I regret is that I was not able to hear him. However, this is what Lord Hailsham was able to say in his latest book:

A decaying society cannot achieve salvation by the possession of a new natural resource, especially when based on an extractive industry.

My letter continues:

Hailsham is there, of course, talking of Britain and North Sea oil but the point is just as apt for us and it does not matter whether our society should be described as "decaying" or not.

In his enthusiasm for the money Mr. Shierlaw has ignored two of the three great arguments against the use (and therefore the mining and export) of uranium and is wrong about the third. He says nothing about, first, the danger of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the more uranium there is in use in the world, nor about, secondly, the problem of terrorists getting hold of nuclear weapons and holding communities and maybe nations to ransom.

The third argument against uranium is the impossibility of disposing safely of nuclear wastes. On that he says, "Recent technology, adopting a vitrification process, has been successfully developed in France ensuring a safe permanent disposal of these fission waste products." That simply is not accurate. As recently as last September, Sir John Hill, Chairman of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, said in his annual report, "I have no doubt that the next 25 years will see . . . the waste question . . . resolved." Yet Mr. Shierlaw makes the assertion that the problem has already been solved! It has not been solved, and he must know that.

Of course, the Premier dealt with that question at length this afternoon. My letter continued:

The Australian Democrats say, "We regard nuclear energy in its present form, with the waste disposal, proliferation and terrorism problems unsolved, as the desperate resort of the clever but unwise."

I am not sure whether one can describe the Liberals as clever, but certainly they are unwise. My letter continues:

I agree with that and am opposed to the mining and export of uranium. Mr. Shierlaw should know that there are far more Australians opposed to his point of view than merely the members of the Labor Party, and for good reason, too.

That was my letter, which summed up what I thought a fortnight ago. It sums up what I think now, and what I say in reply to the motion, to which I finally come.

I cannot support the motion, first, because the whole thrust of it is that we should proceed and mine uranium at Roxby Downs and, secondly, because it is utter nonsense, as I have said and as is known to all members, be they on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, if they are honest about this: the Government is not merely bowing to the left-wing extremists in the Labor movement in maintaining the policy for which we all voted unanimously in March 1977.

For those two reasons, I must oppose the motion. It is not often that I support the Government on a major matter, but certainly on this one I do so with conviction and without hesitation.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport):** I found the speech made by the member for Mitcham to be interesting, especially as the honourable member was for five or six years a member of a Government in this State that actually mined, purified to a certain extent into the form of yellow cake, and exported uranium from South Australia. At no time in those six years did the honourable member come out and speak against the activities of the Government of

which he was a member.

When dealing with this debate today, one needs to ask three pertinent questions. First, why did the Premier make this sudden overseas trip? Secondly, is the Premier qualified to reach the conclusions that he has reached after a rushed two-week overseas trip; and, thirdly, what is South Australia's future after the Premier's speech and decision today?

I return to that speech made and decision taken today by the Premier. There is no doubt, having heard the Premier's speech today and the conditions that he has now laid down, that the mining and export of uranium from South Australia will never be permitted. There was no qualification about that. The sort of standards and conditions upon which the Premier insisted in his speech this afternoon showed clearly that this State will never mine, enrich or export uranium. Therefore, we can assume from his speech this afternoon, even though the Premier has not had the guts to come out and say so exactly in those words, that we will never have a uranium enrichment plant or a Roxby Downs while his Government is in office.

I return to the first of the three questions to which I referred earlier, namely, why the Premier made this sudden, rushed trip overseas. Before Christmas, the Premier was told, I understand, that the New South Wales Wran Government was making a strong bid to establish a uranium enrichment plant in that State. It is well known (and I understand that the Federal Government is fully aware of this) that the Wran Government has decided that New South Wales, irrespective of Labor Party policy in Australia, should have a uranium enrichment plant and that he will strive for that.

The New South Wales Premier has ensured that the best possible people are employed to achieve that objective. Even the New South Wales Agent-General in London was placed there on a contract with the specific object of ensuring that a uranium enrichment plant is built in New South Wales. In the light of this strong bid from New South Wales, the Premier has obviously decided that, if he is to maintain our position as the fore-running State in at least the technology for a uranium enrichment plant, he should immediately go overseas and, if possible, change his mind on this matter. There is no doubt that the Premier saw that, unless the motion carried by this House in 1977 was reversed at some time in the next six months, South Australia's chances of achieving a uranium enrichment plant here would be lost for good.

I will shortly come to the timing of that decision and to the timing for the removal of the motion of March 1977. So, there was tremendous pressure on the Premier, and he could see the wisdom for it, to ensure that the 1977 motion was removed. To do that, he would need to go overseas and give some sort of excuse to the South Australian public as to why he was about to reverse his policy and do the big flip. So, the Premier took off overseas. It was obvious from statements released while he was away or just before he left from the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Education, from their approval, and from the suggested change in policy that came from a Labor Party subcommittee, that the Government and the Labor Party in this State were about to change their minds. They were looking at coming back here and setting up a referendum to ensure that this State could mine and export uranium. Unfortunately, while the Premier was overseas the anti-uranium forces, led wholeheartedly and dominantly by the left-wing elements of the Labor Party, obviously mustered far more support than the Premier expected they ever could. Obviously this was the reason why the Premier changed his mind.



He also gave another reason why he changed his mind; another group had a strong influence on him—his own personal staff, comprising Mr. Guerin and Mr. Rann, his Press Secretary, who accompanied him overseas. As the Premier said, both people are strongly opposed to uranium mining and export. It has been well known for ages that the Premier is closely influenced by his personal staff. It is widely known in this State that the Public Service resents the fact that his personal staff are much closer to the Premier and have a far greater influence on his policies and decisions than does the Public Service. It is obvious that those two individuals, along with the left wing of the Labor Party and the pressure that they were exerting, had the final and deciding influence on the Premier. Those factors led to his speech here today.

I now come to the second question: whether the Premier is qualified to reach the conclusion that he reached after his rushed two-week trip to Europe and the United Kingdom. It is well documented in the press and in radio reports that the Premier arrived in England at a most unfortunate time. He was almost constipated in his movements by a snow storm and the industrial disputes in that country at that time. As a result, the Premier's schedule, which was busy and scanty from the beginning, was interrupted. Once his plans were interrupted, his schedule was made even scantier and less comprehensive than before. Then he took off for Europe.

A number of world authorities, largely based in Europe, are totally insulted by the types of remark that the Premier is now making. First, he has no qualifications in this area. Secondly, he has given them the courtesy of only a skimpy, two-week Cook's tour of some of their establishments. I understand that in many instances where he was due to spend time in an establishment he could not spend time there. It was far from being a comprehensive inspection of the facilities. I understand that these European authorities are insulted, particularly in the United Kingdom, by the Premier's conclusions and the sorts of remark that he has now made about the level of their technology.

I repeat that the Premier is not an authority in this area. He has no training in the area. He has no basis for making the insulting remarks that he has made about the level of technology or for making the judgments that he has made in the House this afternoon. He has come back and set himself up as a prima donna, a world expert, who can comment with apparent complete authority on these research establishments and institutes. He has even set himself up over and above such Australian authorities as Justice Fox, who has been working solely in this field for about four years. It is well known that Justice Fox believes that it is essential to mine and export uranium.

Justice Fox has altered his views about safeguards since he prepared his first report and his second report. Despite those statements coming from such an authoritative and impartial person, the Premier is prepared to stand up and contradict the conclusions of Justice Fox. The Premier has no authority whatever to come back and reach the sorts of conclusion that he has reached and put them forward in such a dogmatic manner as he has done today and as he did at the press conference yesterday.

I come now to the third question: what is the future for South Australia after the Premier's speech today? I believe that today is a black day for South Australia. The Premier has made a major decision that will influence the future development of this State for the next 25 years at least. The Premier is well known for reaching the wrong conclusions when he is making major decisions. Let me remind the House of one or two examples. It was the Premier who picked Chowilla dam in place of Dartmouth dam—a wrong decision. It was the Premier who said that

development at Monarto should proceed—what has now been found to be a wrong decision. It was the Premier who insisted on a certain company being picked finally to develop the Redcliff petro-chemical plant—again, that has been found to be a wrong decision.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Having read the motion, I find that there is nothing in it concerning the matters that the honourable member for Davenport is talking about at present. He will have to refrain.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry. I did not wish to stray. When we look at the Premier's decision-making on major issues, we see a series of failures. I come back to this major decision. As the *News* editorial suggests today, again the Premier has made the wrong decision. What is the cost of that decision to South Australia? It will mean that this State will now not get the uranium enrichment plant. The 1977 resolution putting a ban on uranium mining will need to be lifted within the next six months if this State is to have any chance whatever of getting that plant. It is well known that there will be only one such plant in Australia and that other States are strongly competing for it. Other States now have technology and planning equal to those in this State. Therefore, unless the 1977 resolution is reversed within the next six months, that enrichment plant will be lost.

This motion is put forward today to test once again whether the Government is prepared to reverse that motion. The Government has turned it down. It was obvious from what the Premier said today that the Government will not change its mind in the next six months, let alone the next 12 months. So, it is clear that South Australia now has no hope whatever of getting a uranium enrichment plant in the next 25 years. The State will therefore lose an investment of \$1 500 000 000 and it will lose a project which, conservatively, would employ directly between 1 500 people and 3 000 people and indirectly five times that number of people. Through losing that uranium enrichment plant, this State has lost a chance to see some new hope on its horizon, and let us remember that South Australia has the highest unemployment and the least resources of all the States in Australia. So, today we have lost, through the speech and the decision of the Premier and the Labor Party, the chance of obtaining that uranium enrichment plant.

But the decision also means indefinite deferral of Roxby Downs, which is the world's largest or richest single mineralisation. Its present recoverable value of minerals based on existing values is \$54 000 000 000. It consists of uranium, copper, gold, and rare earths. Production, on the Premier's words, could start in 1983. The Minister of Mines and Energy disputes that; he said 1985. But, from what the Premier has said today, there is no chance within the next 10 years, if the present Dunstan Government stays in office, of this decision being reversed.

Thirdly, this State, because of the indecision of the Government in other areas, is losing its other employment bases, and that is why we have the highest unemployment in any State. The chances of establishing a petro-chemical plant now are very remote, because of decisions made by this Government in 1973 and 1974. Our manufacturing industry is automating and the chance for employment in that sector is reducing all the time. There have been significant drops of about 7 per cent to 8 per cent in employment in that area in the last 12 months. South Australia is now faced with having no blueprint whatsoever for its future. We have a Government that is trying to lead this State with no plans as to where it should be led. This Government, with record unemployment in this State, has no plans whatsoever about how to solve that

problem. South Australia is leaderless, and the Government is not prepared to allow potential development.

The Premier opened his speech by saying that South Australia would not participate in the destruction of mankind. Of course, he was emphasising the threat of radioactivity within our community. Figures from different sources on the existing levels of radioactivity already present in Britain (which has long established nuclear power plants) show that natural background accounts for 74 per cent of radiation exposure; medical radiation for diagnosis and treatment, 23 per cent; fall-out from atomic weapons, 1.5 per cent; occupational exposure, that is, workers using radioactive material (the sort of area we are talking about in terms of nuclear power stations) accounts for 0.5 per cent; television, air travel, and luminous devices such as wrist watches account for 0.7 per cent. To put that into perspective, air travel and wrist watches cause a greater radiation danger to the community than all the nuclear power stations that currently exist in the United Kingdom. Nuclear wastes, which the Premier suggested would destroy mankind, account for 0.2 per cent of radiation exposure.

That puts into perspective the emotional argument that the Premier has tried to put forward this afternoon. He is playing on the ignorance, unfortunately, of the South Australian public, or attempting to do so. He is trying to make the community fear his argument and support it simply because he has been forced into adopting this position by the left-wing of his Party. The Premier says we are looking at the risk of death through uranium mining enrichment and using it for nuclear energy. On 30 March 1977 the Minister of Mines and Energy said:

... per billion megawatt hours of electric power consumed the cost of fatal accidents is 189 lives in coal mining for coal-fired power, and two lives in uranium mining for nuclear power.

In other words, producing electricity with coal involved 189 deaths, whereas the equivalent produced with uranium involved only two deaths. The Premier has the hide to talk about this grave risk to mankind from uranium mining.

**Mr. Wotton:** Scaremongering.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Scaremongering, of course. The Premier did not refute the figures produced by the Minister of Mines and Energy. He has never refuted them, because he has no answer to them. He merely picked on parts of reports, many of which are out of date, and quoted those to the House. He said that the Government would not proceed until it was considered absolutely safe. "Absolutely safe" means no danger at all, no risk of death whatever. One would never produce coal electricity on that basis, or drive a motor vehicle, either. One would wrap oneself up in cottonwool and not expose oneself to the community at all on that basis. Yet that is the sort of safeguard that the Premier is now asking us to accept. He knows it cannot be achieved. That is why this afternoon the Premier put forward a case which clearly spelt out that his Government will not allow uranium mining, enrichment or exporting while it is in power.

The Government has spelt the death of our future industrial development. It has painted what I believe is a black cross over the future of South Australia. It has damned this State to above-average unemployment and has also ensured that it misses out on future industrial development. There will obviously be no private investment in South Australia whilst such a Government threatens the private sector. People will not invest \$1 000 000 000 in a uranium enrichment plant or any other sort of development project while there is even a whiff of a Government such as this around. It is well known that the

Minister of Mines and Energy supports one side of the case and the Attorney-General supports another. I support the motion, and I am gravely disappointed that the Government will not do so. In not doing so, unfortunately, it has retarded the future development of South Australia for at least the next 25 years.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works):** I oppose the motion. We have heard from the member for Davenport the usual diatribe this afternoon. He is completely and utterly cynical in his approach to this question. The effect of his remarks on me is absolutely nil. Nevertheless, I think that some things that he has said ought to be answered.

First, I will comment on the construction he placed on the reason for the Premier's overseas visit. He heard the Premier explaining the reason why he went overseas. Even though it may have appeared to be at relatively short notice, the member for Davenport was evidently not prepared to accept one word of that explanation. I was privy in mid-December last year to the knowledge that the Premier would be going overseas in connection with uranium. I was also privy to the reason why the Premier had decided to take this fact-finding journey overseas.

He had received the third interim report of the uranium enrichment committee, and the papers connected with that report, as probably will later be seen as I believe it is the intention of the Premier to release them publicly, in fact demanded that he check certain features or facts in them to confirm them or otherwise; hence the sole reason for his trip overseas. It was indeed nothing more than a logical extension of what this Government had been involved in over the past three years. We have kept up with technology on this particular question and, indeed, we have been condemned and criticised for doing that. This trip overseas was simply a logical extension of keeping up with the technology involved in this particular area.

The Premier certainly never said to me that he contemplated any change in policy of the Labor Party. I say that quite candidly. The Premier never said it to me nor did I get any indication from anything he said to me that he ever contemplated a change in the policy of the Labor Party on this question. Indeed, the things he was going to look at were to confirm or deny whether or not the pure and simple technology that was now being put into practice could in any way fit the policy now adopted by the Australian Labor Party. That is what he was attempting to do and that is what he went overseas for.

In listening to the Premier this afternoon I think that he has adequately demonstrated, in spite of the condemnation of his address by the member for Davenport, that he did see things that convinced him that the safeguards or the international proliferation agreements that now exist do not satisfy the policies of the Labor Party.

I do not have to go over the points he made, as he made them very well indeed, so well that I am certain that the Leader of the Opposition is a little embarrassed, as the honourable member for Mitcham has suggested, that he ever moved this motion today. Can I say to the Leader that I think he is a little out of his depth, and I do not hold the sort of qualifications that could deal with this very complex question. I give the Premier credit that, whilst he may not hold a science degree, he has the basic common sense and brains to grasp rapidly—

**Mr. Allison:** The numbers game!

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:**—any complex problems. The member for Mount Gambier is not funny; he is pathetic. The Premier has the brains and ability to grasp a complex situation and a complex problem. He has a deep

and abiding interest in this question, as every member of this House who has any moral concern for the welfare of his fellow men should also have. For members to say that the Premier's trip was a Cook's tour, as I think somebody referred to it, illustrates how little understanding they have of what is involved. I point out that the Premier was not well when he left, and he had an extremely tight schedule.

The member for Davenport called it a busy but scanty schedule, which appears to be a contradiction. I can assure him it was not scanty but it was very busy indeed. However, he managed to keep up with most, if not all, of the appointments that he had arranged before his departure from Australia. The member for Davenport said of the Premier this afternoon, "How on earth could he come back here and tell us what the situation is? He hasn't the qualifications." The Premier would be the first to admit that. I have already pointed out the great ability the Premier has of grasping complex matters, but he took with him Mr. Dickinson. I do not think anyone in this Chamber would dispute the qualifications of that gentleman. He also took with him Mr. Wilmshurst from Amdel, again, whose technical qualifications I do not think anyone in this House would question.

The Premier said this afternoon that, on the facts as he presented them to the House, it was the unanimous view of all the people with him, whether they were pro or anti-uranium on the facts. That is important, because we have these two people, Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst, agreeing with the Premier on the facts as stated by him this afternoon. I am not talking about emotional arguments; I am talking about facts. It seems that for this debate to have been properly based we should have been arguing this afternoon as to whether or not, since March 1977, there has been any change at all in safeguards, because the position in 1977 in relation to the motion moved was clear: it was a unanimous decision of this House. For the sake of the record I read the *Hansard* report of the debate on 30 March 1977 during a speech of the member for Davenport, as follows:

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

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

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

The honourable member then said:

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

the public of South Australia was prepared for the State to mine, enrich and export uranium.

The question I want to ask, not only of the member for Davenport but also of the Leader of the Opposition, is what has changed since 1977 that now satisfies them that it is safe to mine and enrich uranium. The Leader has not told us what has changed. I will tell you what has changed. The politics of the situation has changed markedly. The Opposition sees an opportunity to try to embarrass this Government and hoodwink the people of South Australia by convincing them, as the member for Davenport suggested in the final stages of his speech, that the economic well-being of this State relies entirely on the mining of uranium.

That is a fallacy and the member for Davenport and the Leader know it full well. In the next two years they will try to convince the South Australian public of the validity of that argument. They will fail because, as the Premier has already pointed out, mining is a capital intensive proposition. There is no question about that, but it is not labour intensive and it will become even less labour intensive as technology is applied to mining methods.

Mr. Chapman: Is that why the A.L.P. supports it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am talking about the development of Roxby Downs. Irrespective of whether or not we said, "Go, right now", as all members know we have a proposition that I hope will bear fruit and reach fruition shortly concerning the development of a petro-chemical works in this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Tonkin: What a joke, we won't get anything!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Again we have the cynical attitude of the Leader saying "What a joke, we won't get anything."

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the floor, not anyone else.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader knows fully what will be involved in the cost of the infrastructure of that plant if it proceeds: about \$250 000 000. Has anyone looked at the other side of the ledger regarding Roxby Downs and asked what will be the cost of that infrastructure if it goes ahead? The sum of one billion dollars is referred to, but who will foot the Bill? Somebody referred to 20 000 jobs, but I can tell the Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition was heard in silence. If there are any more interruptions, I will take action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be demonstrated adequately by the Government that the sort of propaganda that the Opposition is peddling around this State now in relation to the economic well-being and the effect that Roxby Downs will have is absolute hogwash. We will do that without any fear at all. On the other hand, the Leader thinks that he has a great election issue, but I can tell him that he has a shock coming to him because the people of South Australia are not so foolish and not so easily hoodwinked that they will give away the principle that I believe more than a majority of South Australians hold in relation to the dangers associated with uranium mining. How the Leader of the Opposition can so blatantly and cynically take every member of his Party with him and abort the stand that they took in 1977, for no apparent reason, is a catastrophe.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to tell us what has changed to alter his stand in relation to the mining of uranium? Members opposite got the message all right: they can talk about left-wing pressures, but what happened to them a couple of days after they supported

unanimously the motion in this House? I condemn them for being so cynical about such an important question.

I congratulate the Premier on the job he has done in such a short time. I have listened to the Premier twice since his return from overseas, and the second time was more impressive than the first, yet he has presented only half of the information that he has gathered. I hope that he will demonstrate even to the members of the Opposition when he is able, in about a fortnight, to put down the papers on which his journey was based. From the facts he obtained whilst overseas, the Premier found that even at this time it is not safe to proceed with the policy adopted by the Opposition as the alternative to this Government.

I urge members to examine the cynicism in this motion, as was pointed out by the member for Mitcham, who will oppose the motion. He is hardly influenced by left-wing elements! This motion is merely a cynical exercise, and ought to get the fate that it deserves by being thrown out the window.

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Having listened with great interest to the Deputy-Premier, all I can say is that he is a very loyal Deputy Leader to his Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr. TONKIN:**—and so loyal that he is willing to close his mind to reality.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have already warned the House and the Leader of the Opposition. This is an important matter, and I hope he will be heard in silence.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is important and one of the most critical matters ever to come before this House and the people of South Australia. The Deputy Premier claims that he knows of no apparent reason why the Opposition has changed its stance. We have changed our stance because of plain common sense. The question to which the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Premier, and no-one on that side has been able to answer is, in what way has the ban on uranium in South Australia in any way brought benefit to this State or, more particularly, how has it influenced uranium technology, safeguards, safety, and waste disposal anywhere else in the world? The answer clearly is that it has not: not one piece of influence overseas has that ban brought, and the Ministers know that well.

Further, I was astounded to hear that the Deputy-Premier apparently believes that this State's economic future is pretty good without Roxby Downs and without any other development. That is probably what is wrong with this State, if that is a reflection of the Government's attitude. The Minister of Mines and Energy made a remarkable speech, speaking for 30 minutes filling time without positively committing himself one way or the other. True, he disagreed with his Premier about a lead time, and I wonder about how much more he disagrees with the Premier but is unwilling to say so.

While dealing with the safeguard situation he referred to the position in France and said that the position was unsatisfactory. Certainly, he could not answer how the ban in South Australia could possibly change that situation. I am not sure whether he would not say, or could not say, but I believe that he could not find an answer and was reduced to using personal abuse across the Chamber to cover up his inability to answer that question. Immediately the Premier arose he referred to the motion passed in this House on 30 March 1977 as I predicted he would do. He referred to the Fox Report as being the only reason why the Opposition has changed its mind. That is totally misleading, and the Premier knows it perfectly well. He

chose to ignore all the other factors.

I cannot understand why South Australia should have to wear a ban on uranium and everything that it is costing the State merely because of the Premier's whim, because that is what it is all about: the ban is achieving nothing. Regardless of safeguards and safety, there is no point whatever in keeping it. The Premier used the emotional arguments that are usually used, but he was not able to answer the question how a ban in South Australia can change the situation.

Does the Premier really believe, as he claimed this afternoon, that the ban in South Australia has protected or saved the world? As he said, has it enforced safety and reason throughout the world? No, it has not, and the Premier and everyone else in this Chamber knows that that is the case, but the Premier cannot admit it because it would make him look even more foolish than he already does.

It is a measure of the strength of the left-wing of the A.L.P. that the Premier has maintained his present attitude in spite of all the trouble he has been in the past three weeks to travel overseas and prepare the ground for a change of mind. The Premier prepared the ground admirably. He had the press accepting that he was going to change his mind. He had tacit approval from the community for his change of mind. He went to all that trouble, and he cannot tell me now that it was not a lot of pressure from the Attorney-General and his supporters that made the Premier change his mind, because that is the only reason to explain it.

The Premier has implied, and so have other members opposite, that the Opposition is not interested in safeguards. That is not true. We are interested in safeguards and always have been interested in safeguards. We have made quite clear from the start that any contract must be subject to safeguards. How does putting a ban on uranium mining in this State enforce those safeguards that the Premier, Deputy Premier, and Minister have been talking about? What a ridiculous situation. How can the South Australian Government threaten not to supply uranium to a country unless proper safeguards are observed, when it has no uranium to supply? That is the stupidity and fallacy of the situation that the Government has put this State into. It is plainly ridiculous.

Although I do not like it, other countries can be forgiven for laughing at South Australia and its Government. The Premier's further account of his rushed trip simply served to confirm the fact that the ban in South Australia has had no influence at all on the world uranium situation. This is the reality that the Labor Party will not accept. South Australia is suffering as a result. The Premier attempted to play down the magnitude of the cost in loss of employment and investment to South Australia, but in playing it down he did not at any stage deny that that loss was occurring to the people of South Australia. He did not deny that, potentially, jobs and investment were leaving this State because of the Government's attitude. I suppose we should be thankful that he had not chosen to try to misrepresent that aspect of it, but we are paying an enormous price.

Uranium mining, processing, and enrichment cannot occur under the Government's present policy. Planning and development for Roxby Downs will be impossible for as long as the uranium ban exists. The investigation and exploration which the Minister talks of will go ahead slowly, perhaps at \$3 000 000 a year instead of \$15 000 000 a year, which could be the rate if Roxby Downs were given the clear run of a lift of the uranium ban. Job security is what South Australians are paying for in the price, and they are paying dearly. What are they paying for? They

are paying for a ban which has achieved no benefits for South Australia but which is causing harm to its people. It has no influence at all on safeguards, safety, and waste disposal developments in the world generally. The price that is being paid by South Australians, both now and in the future, is far too high. It is a price that we as a State cannot afford, and that is the truth of the situation.

The ban is the result of a political gesture, which has achieved absolutely nothing. The Government can only be condemned for the enormous loss to South Australia of potential investment, industrial development, and employment resulting from its continued attitude to uranium. It has much to answer for to the people of South Australia, and I have no doubt that they will make their feelings well known at the first opportunity. This Government deserves to lose its office and to be replaced by a Liberal Government, which is concerned with people and this State and not with ideological Party tactics.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (27)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negated.

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

#### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending on 30 June 1980.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue the sum of \$220 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending 30 June 1980.

Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for the appropriation of \$220 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date, usually in October, on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of

the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

The Bill now before the House is for the same amount as that provided by the first Supply Bill last year. Normally, it would have been necessary to provide an increased amount to cover higher cost levels. However, the provision in last year's Bill included an additional amount to cover a contingent advance to establish revised arrangements between Government hospitals and the South Australian Health Commission. It will not be necessary to provide for this payment next year and the amount involved is expected to be sufficient to cover any cost increases during this year. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clause 1 is the short title. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$220 000 000. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

**Mr. TONKIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 1978-79 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), 1979.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending 30 June 1979, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I move:

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

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

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

In moving the second reading of the Bill, I propose to make a few comments about the State's general financial situation before explaining the items in the Supplementary Estimates. In presenting the Revenue and Loan Budgets to the House in September last, I said that the Government proposed to maintain a balance on the 1978-79 operations of its combined accounts and, accordingly, planned to hold the accumulated deficit to about \$6 500 000 at 30 June 1979.

Recent reviews indicate that, in spite of the difficult financial and economic background against which the Budget was framed, it is likely that the Government will achieve its planned objective. While the outlook for the overall Budget result remains the same, there have been variations in some of the elements which make up the Budget.

With respect to the Revenue Account component, recent reviews suggest that pay-roll tax is likely to be down by about \$3 000 000 and the recall of funds from the Pipelines Authority of South Australia may fall short of the original budget expectation by about \$5 000 000 due to the difficulty in refinancing, fully, the original advance provided from Revenue Account. On the other hand, there are indications that receipts from the Commonwealth-State personal income tax sharing arrangements could exceed the original budget forecast by about \$5 000 000. All other receipts seem likely to show a net increase of about \$1 000 000 made up of some movements

above and some below budget. In short, overall receipts are likely to be down on budget by some \$2 000 000.

Although the Supplementary Estimates appropriate a total of nearly \$24 900 000, much of this is simply to cover transfers of functions from one department to another, accounting and appropriation arrangements and specific departmental appropriations in respect of the round sum allowances provided in the original Budget to cover salary and wage increases and price rises. These arrangements are explained in subsequent comments on the details of the Supplementary Estimates. Suffice it to say for the moment that overall there is likely to be a net under-expenditure against the original Budget expectations of about \$2 000 000.

In summary, an expected short-fall of some \$2 000 000 in receipts offset by an expected under-expenditure of about \$2 000 000 would maintain the Government's planned balanced result on Revenue Account.

As to the Loan Account component, with the exercise of continued restraint, it seems likely that the Government will be able to maintain its budget objective of a balance on the year's operations, after providing for the planned transfer of \$5 000 000 to Revenue Account. Thus, the expectation on the two accounts combined is still for a balance with the accumulated deficit at 30 June 1979 being held to \$6 500 000. Of course, with nearly five months of the year still to run, there is the possibility of changed trends or individual variations and a different result. Relatively small proportionate variations could change the final result by several million dollars.

#### APPROPRIATION

Turning now to the question of appropriation, members will be aware that, early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Expenditure. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are three other sources of Authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

#### APPROPRIATION ACT—SPECIAL SECTION 3 (2) AND (3)

The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations with a small amount being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is available only to cover salaries and wages increases formally handed down by a recognised wage fixing authority in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. Rainfall this financial year has exceeded expectations and, as a result, it will not be necessary to call on this special appropriation. In fact, I expect that savings will be made against the original provisions for pumping.

#### GOVERNOR'S APPROPRIATION FUND

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the

Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. I have explained the operation of this fund to the House several times previously. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations and this is the reason why some of the smaller departments do not appear on Supplementary Estimates, even though their expenditure levels may be affected by the same factors as those departments which do appear.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Where payments additional to the Budget estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or excesses are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented. Further, although two block figures were included in the Budget as general allowances for salary and wage rate and price increases, they were not included in the schedule to the main Appropriation Act. To cover the costs of higher prices or of wage increases not falling within the special Section 3 (2) of the Appropriation Act, the House is being asked now to appropriate moneys specifically for some part of these general allowances.

I point out to members that, whilst these sums represent the best estimates of needs presently available, nevertheless, in most instances they cannot be regarded as accurate to the last dollar. In authorising the funds which may be actually needed, I propose to treat departmental requests as if they were requests for excess warrants on the Governor's Appropriation Fund. Excesses from that Fund are permitted only with my specific approval after examination by the Treasury and I propose that, although the procedures will not be quite so formal, the additional appropriations now sought will not be released without continuing examination of changing departmental needs.

#### DETAILS OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

**Police:** An additional \$700 000 is required for this department. Of this amount, \$300 000 is required to cover increased salary costs and \$400 000 to cover additional contingency charges. The payment of a bonus to police officers, together with a lower level of staff separations than was anticipated originally, offset partly by delays in filling some vacancies, accounts for the additional salary requirements. The effect of increased fuel prices on vehicle operating costs and increased workmen's compensation premiums has resulted in additional contingency costs.

**Correctional Services:** This financial year, there has been an increase in the number of offenders held in custody and, as a result, it has been necessary to increase the number of callbacks to ensure prisons are manned adequately and to provide for hospital watch and court escorts. It is estimated that these services will entail additional salary and wages costs totalling \$250 000 this financial year.

**Law Department:** There has been an increase in the number of criminal court sittings. Also, there has been an unusual number of long trials. In addition, fees for jurors and witnesses have been increased. As a result, the original provision for reimbursement of jurors and

witnesses is no longer sufficient and an additional \$250 000 is required.

**Treasurer, Miscellaneous:** An additional appropriation of \$800 000 is required to provide for the State's contribution to the Electricity Trust of South Australia for subsidies in country areas (\$530 000) and for interest on Trust Funds and other moneys (\$270 000). The additional contribution to the Electricity Trust is due chiefly to the unusually high expenditure necessary to maintain the generating plant at Coober Pedy. This includes additional interest costs. Other services requiring higher subsidies include those at Ceduna, Hawker, Streaky Bay and Wudinna.

The additional amount needed to cover interest on trust funds and other moneys is associated with special arrangements between the State Bank and the Electricity Trust of South Australia to provide additional funds for welfare housing purposes. Treasury has acted as a financial intermediary in these arrangements and will be paying interest to the trust and receiving interest from the bank to offset the payments. While appropriation is required to provide for the payments, the Revenue Account result will not be affected by them.

**Education:** A few years ago, the cost of annual increments payable to teachers was largely offset by the effect of resignations and the appointment of replacement teachers at a lower level of the teachers' salary scale. With rising unemployment, resignations have been less than formerly and, as a result, the net cost of teachers' increments has been much higher than anticipated and provided for within the round sum allowance for future salary and wage increases.

In addition, the Government has authorised the department to employ an additional 75 teachers in 1979 and there has been an increase in the need to employ temporary relieving assistants and hourly paid instructors. Further, there has been an increase in fixed charges incurred by schools, particularly in respect to fuel and power. The additional appropriation requirements to meet all of these costs (\$9 600 000) is reduced by the transfer of the Museum and Botanic Gardens Division to the newly created Department of Community Development. Accordingly, the Supplementary Estimates provide \$7 250 000 for these purposes.

**Further Education:** An additional provision of \$850 000 is sought for Further Education. Of that amount, \$520 000 is required to cover incremental steps in teachers' salaries and additional costs resulting from changes to conditions of employment (which were included in the round sum allowance in the original Budget), additional teaching staff and staff transfers to this Department following the closure of the State Immigration Hostel and increases under the Refugee and Migrant Education programmes. In the case of the Refugee and Migrant Education programmes, there will be no budget impact as this expenditure is subject to reimbursement by the Commonwealth.

An amount of \$180 000 is sought to cover the cost of additional enrichment courses introduced under arrangements where the Government has agreed to support courses which are expected to earn sufficient revenue to offset the cost of providing them. Again there is no budget impact.

The remaining \$150 000 is to meet charges levied for the first time this year by the Department of Services and Supply for supply services provided to Further Education. These charges were not included in the Department's original budget.

**Libraries:** In its recent report to the Government, the Library Services Planning Committee identified a number

of high priority areas for improving library services. The Government has accepted the aims of the report. Particular attention is being directed to the decentralisation of library services and the support and encouragement of Local Government initiatives for the purchase of books and the erection or extension of library buildings. Since the budget was framed, libraries urgently needing additional support have been identified at Prospect and Tea Tree Gully and a further \$170 000 is sought for this purpose.

**Transport:** \$200 000 is required to cover additional costs faced by the Motor Registration Division of the Department of Transport. These funds are to finance the operation of the Crash Repair Industry Steering Committee, to replace some existing cash registers and to improve security measures.

**Highways:** This department has faced increased salary costs in a number of areas, particularly through an unexpectedly high proportion of work being charged to Revenue Account rather than against other funds and because of fewer staff vacancies in the administrative and traffic inspection areas than is usual. The additional provision sought is \$300 000. It has no budget impact as it will be offset by a corresponding reduction in the amount transferred to the Highways Fund under Special Acts.

**Minister of Transport, Miscellaneous:** The revised fee structure for bus and rail services is being introduced somewhat later than was planned and this will have an effect on the cash deficit of the State Transport Authority to be funded from Revenue Account. In addition, recent increases in fuel prices have been very costly. For these requirements and higher interest costs on borrowed funds than was originally forecast, an amount of \$1 000 000 is sought.

Following the support generated for intra-district bus services, the Government is introducing Community Bus Services in the Campbelltown, Tea Tree Gully and Thebarton districts. These services are independent of the State Transport Authority and cater for children and youth groups, senior citizen clubs and organisations and other community groups in need of welfare transport services. An amount of \$100 000 is sought for these services.

**Community Welfare:** Members will be aware that it is Government policy to adjust Financial Assistance Rates to equate them with pension and benefit rates paid by the Commonwealth Government. Commonwealth rates were increased earlier this year and demand for assistance has continued at high levels. The additional cost of these increases is expected to be about \$360 000. The amount of \$300 000 provided in the Supplementary Estimates is arrived at after taking into consideration savings of \$60 000 expected from the transfer of the Community Division from the Department of Community Welfare to the newly created Department of Community Development.

**Community Welfare, Miscellaneous:** The Government has obliged to increase its provision for Community Welfare, Miscellaneous in three areas. First, it will be necessary to provide an additional \$500 000 to cover Government payments of portion of the water and sewer rates for pensioners and other needy persons.

Second, in order to qualify for the maximum Commonwealth Government support, we must provide an additional \$133 000 for women's shelters. Since this expenditure will attract Commonwealth funds totalling \$92 000, the net additional cost to the State will be \$41 000.

Finally, we are providing additional support to the unemployed by giving transport concessions. The

Government believes that this will increase the mobility of unemployed persons and assist them with their efforts to find work. It is difficult to gauge the likely demand for this service and, therefore, a tentative allocation of \$100 000 is sought at this stage. Altogether, a total of \$733 000 has been provided on the Supplementary Estimates for these purposes.

**South Australian Health Commission:** The further \$2 600 000 being sought on the Supplementary Estimates for the South Australian Health Commission is attributable to a number of factors. When South Australia first entered the Medibank agreement, the Commonwealth advanced funds to non-government recognised hospitals to provide a working cash balance pending reimbursements of actual expenditures. The Commonwealth has advised recently that it is unable to advance these payments over the end of the financial year and that we will need to repay them before 30 June. The amount involved will be re-advanced by the Commonwealth early next year. An amount of \$800 000 is sought for this purpose.

The Government's contribution to the superannuation pensions of employees of Government departments is met initially from the provision under Special Acts. However, statutory authorities are usually billed by the Superannuation Fund for their share of employer's contribution and, as a result, these costs are reflected in their accounts. To date, the Commission has followed procedures established for departments whereby these costs are included as an addition to their accounts from information supplied by Treasury memoranda but without formal charge. It is proposed to vary these procedures to align the Commission with standard practice for other statutory authorities. Although it will be necessary to increase appropriation by \$1 200 000 for this accounting purpose, there will be no net impact on the budget.

Recent reviews of expenditure by the Home for Incurables indicate that the original provisions for overtime and penalty payments will not be sufficient and a further \$500 000 is needed to cover these costs. Finally, a further \$100 000 is required to cover costs inadvertently appropriated under Minister of Health, Miscellaneous in the original Estimates. A corresponding saving will result, therefore, in this latter division.

**Department of Community Development:** In October 1978, the Community Development Department was created to advise the Government on its community development policies and to provide for the co-ordination of these activities. These functions, carried out previously by the Premier's, Community Welfare and Education Departments, have been grouped now under the Community Development Department as part of a general restructuring aimed at improving delivery of the services. Therefore, while funds are sought for this new department, offsetting savings will occur in amounts provided previously for other departments.

The amounts sought provide for the operation of the department for the whole of this financial year. Costs incurred in discharging these functions by the Premier's, Community Welfare and Education Departments prior to creating the new department will be transferred. Whilst this is not strictly necessary, I am conscious of the need to provide meaningful information in the published accounts at the end of the year. The procedure adopted here will help in an understanding and in any comparison of year with year.

While the funds sought for this department will be largely offset by those transfers, the Supplementary Estimates include provision for an increase in expenditure of some \$190 000. This includes the cost of staff to operate both the Minister's and the Director's offices. Consistent

with its no-growth policy for the Public Service, the Government has taken steps to ensure that the positions involved in the additional expenditure will be offset by savings elsewhere as appropriate vacancies occur. The Supplementary Estimates propose \$2 780 000 for this department.

**Minister of Community Development, Miscellaneous:** The Supplementary Estimates provide \$6 578 000 for this purpose. Of that amount, \$6 180 000 results from the transfer of existing functions from other areas to improve the delivery of these services. Offsetting savings will occur under Premier, Miscellaneous; Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, Miscellaneous; and Minister of Education, Miscellaneous.

The proposed provision includes \$725 000 for the operation of the Parks and Thebarton Community Centres. While \$375 000 was provided in the original budget estimates under Minister of Education, Miscellaneous (and will therefore be an offsetting saving), further developments, particularly at the Parks Community Centre, have necessitated the appointment of additional staff. It is anticipated that a further \$350 000 will be needed to cover these developments.

A further \$48 000 is proposed to meet the costs of a working party to inquire into information services and also to provide a contribution to the Progressive Music Broadcasting Association.

**Mr. TONKIN** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 9 November, Page 1882.)

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** This Bill provides for the registration and enforcement of orders made under the Contracts Review Act affecting titles to land, and it also provides that a person who has instituted proceedings under the Contracts Review Act seeking an order affecting titles to land shall be deemed to have a caveatable interest in the land. The only flaw in that argument, which was advanced by the Attorney-General in introducing the Bill, is that no Contracts Review Act operates at present. The Attorney-General seems to be a little out of time, or sequence, when he refers to the Contracts Review Act, when that legislation is still before the other place.

The Contracts Review Bill was referred to the Law Reform Committee and came back to this place with amendments suggested by the committee and was debated. An amendment to this Bill was moved in this place and it proceeded to the other place. However, my perusal of *Hansard* indicates it has not been debated in the other place and in fact there is no Contracts Review Act. For the Minister to talk about this Bill seeking to provide enforcement of orders made under that Act is misleading, because that Act does not exist. For that reason, this short Bill is somewhat premature.

An amendment was moved in this place by the member for Light to circumscribe the operation of the Bill, and subsequently the Act, to a sum of \$15 000. It was argued that if consumers could not be careful to get advice for contracts over \$15 000 there was something sadly amiss. It was further argued that the Bill should apply to consumer transactions, excluding dealings in land and real estate. The Opposition unanimously voted for that amendment. Debate in the Upper House has not yet taken place, but it could well be that the same amendment moved by the member for Light in this place could be moved in the



Upper House and carried, making this Bill redundant.

**Mr. Evans:** It could be introduced by a Labor member in the other place.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** We cannot presume to know what the end result of a Bill before the other place will be, but it is not an illogical conclusion to draw that somebody in the Upper House could well move the same amendment as moved by the member for Light. This could pass into law or could come under scrutiny by the Attorney-General, with the end result that there was either no Contracts Review Act, or that there was a Contracts Review Act framed in such a way that this Bill was entirely superfluous. In these circumstances I cannot support this Bill in the interests of consistency, and the Opposition cannot support the Bill.

The first ground for opposition to the Bill is that it is premature, because we do not know the fate of the Contracts Review Bill as yet. Secondly, the attitude of the Opposition was made abundantly clear by the member for Light when he debated the matter and moved the amendment put to this House.

The Attorney-General has got his time table wrong, and he is in error in referring to the Contracts Review Act, because it is simply a Bill and the end result is quite unknown to us. It would have been far more appropriate to have delayed discussion of this measure until the fate of the Contracts Review Bill was known. We oppose the Bill for the very same reasons as we supported the amendment when the Contracts Review Bill was previously before the House. The Opposition is not prepared to support the passage of this Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 November, Page 1882.)

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** The Opposition supports the Bill, which is consequential on previous similar legislation passed in this House.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### TRADE STANDARDS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 November, Page 2322.)

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** This is the resumed second reading debate on this Bill, debate thereon having been resumed about four times that I recall during the earlier part of the session. I cannot turn up quickly the last occasion on which the Bill was debated. Nonetheless, on the occasions on which I have spoken in the debate I have

made most of the points that I wanted to make. I have indicated that the Bill seems to have general support from the people and organisations likely to be affected by it.

I have only one query about the Bill which I will raise later and which came to me from the Master Builders Association. Otherwise, all the people who seem to be affected by the Bill seem reasonably content with it. Those people were told about its contents, and were consulted by the Attorney-General, a somewhat unusual and not the normal practice for the Attorney, in my ken, anyway. They are reasonably happy with it. I have discussed at some length what the Bill is all about and, because I do not intend to repeat that, I indicate simply that the Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** "Goods" is defined as follows:

"Goods" means any tangible personal property.

Are houses considered to be tangible personal property? I would not have thought it appropriate for houses to be encompassed by this Bill. However, in the terms of that definition they could be encompassed. I think my query came from the Master Builders Association.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General):** The answer is "No". It is not intended that houses will come within the Bill.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Is that clear from the terms of the definition?

**Mr. EVANS:** The Attorney-General says it is not intended. We are not here to accept what is not intended. Does it or does it not cover that area? In connection with the Residential Tenancies Bill we were told that certain things were not intended, but it has turned out to be different in practice. "Not intended" is not good enough. Does the definition cover houses, or does it not cover them?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It does not cover houses. The term used, "personal property", in law is a term of art, as against real property. It is a term of art that covers those goods that are portable articles, apart from titles to land and a few other things of that sort.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Minister may require information."

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I move:

Page 9, line 5—After "furnish information" insert "on the ground".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Publication of harmful product."

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I move:

Page 11—

Line 17—After "may" insert "on the advice of the Council".

Line 17—Leave out "whatever".

Line 17—Leave out "he considers necessary".

Lines 19 to 23—Leave out all words in these lines after "standard" in line 19 and insert "and, if the Council so recommends, he may publish in the *Gazette*, or in any newspaper, or by radio or television—

(a) the trade name or description of the goods;

(b) the name of the manufacturer or supplier of the goods;

or

(c) any other information in relation to the goods."

If an advisory council is set up, the Minister ought to take action on its advice. It is not a radical amendment.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** In opposing the

amendment, I point out two matters that the honourable member may not have taken into account. This provision does not give the Minister any protection against action that may be taken in the courts for defamation or any other action that may be launched by someone as a result of any action taken under this provision. It is really a statement of the power that the Minister has at present. The Minister can warn people, as I and other Ministers responsible for these matters have done from time to time. It is simply a statement of that practice. There would be nothing to stop me at present from publishing a notice in the *Gazette* if I so desired. Further, there would be nothing to stop me from making statements where I considered they were necessary for the protection of the public in a particular instance. The important thing is that the Minister, where goods have been shown to be a proven risk, should be able to act rapidly to warn the public about the danger that may be involved: that is the intention of this provision. It is really only a statement of the power that the Minister has in any event.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Now that I know that the Attorney-General will turn down my amendment I will add weight to my argument. We are not happy with the proclamations and statements made by the Attorney-General from time to time in relation to the activities of some firms. We had the report of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs before the House earlier this session in which firms were named unfairly. There was no list given of consumers who had wrongfully complained about the activities of some of these firms. I believe that a list of firms was unfairly stuck up in Rundle Mall at the instigation of the Attorney-General.

I have moved this amendment with a view to reining in the Attorney-General, because he acts irresponsibly quite often. This advisory council, comprising representative people, may restrain the brash Attorney-General occasionally. The whole record of the Attorney-General is one of unfairly attacking firms. He has named firms under Parliamentary privilege: outside, he would have been liable to prosecution and to an action for libel. In fact, that has transpired from things that he has said outside the House. He is unrestrained in his attacks on these firms. The amendment is therefore highly desirable.

**Mr. EVANS:** As the Deputy Leader has said, the Attorney-General names companies and firms, often unfairly. He is establishing an advisory committee, yet he will not accept an amendment by which he or any future Minister could take action only when the committee recommended it. If the Attorney has any faith in the committee he is appointing, he surely will accept the amendment.

The Attorney should wait for evidence from the committee before acting, and should approach the committee regarding complaints. I hope the Attorney will have faith in the committee and consider the recommendations before publishing facts.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It is not a question of having faith, or not having faith, in the committee. The point is that the committee would not meet on a regular basis, and this provision is in Part III, dealing with safety standards. It enables the Minister to warn the public swiftly when examples of unsafe products are brought to the attention of the Government. Surely members opposite do not want to hog-tie the Government so that it is unable to act quickly in advising people of the danger involved in certain goods. Such goods do come on the market from time to time. One example is the cookie monster. Another is a doll with internal wiring; in this case, when worn, the wires poke out, causing danger to eyes.

The public needs to be warned of the dangers involved promptly, and that is the intention of this provision. The clause deals not with quality standards, but merely with safety. The question is not one of giving the Minister power to say that a certain product is not satisfactory or is poor value; it is an opportunity for the Minister to warn the public in appropriate cases that particular products are dangerous. In some cases the public should be advised how the product should be used.

**Mr. EVANS:** The cookie monster was banned in New South Wales, subsequently found to be quite safe, and brought back on to the market. A mistake like that can destroy a market. Errors have been made concerning other articles where a Minister has acted on advice received from a department without a full inquiry being made. When an error is made it is often too late to correct the mistake, as the market has been destroyed.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Attorney-General should act only on advice. Obviously, he receives information regarding safety from some source, and this source should be the committee.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** The Commissioner of Standards would have first dealt with it.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** This committee was set up to advise the Minister. The amendment puts the Bill in the proper perspective. I am not persuaded by what the Attorney-General has said.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Slater, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 43) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 November, Page 2311.)

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** This amending Bill makes provision in the parent Act to bring the institute into line with various facets of the other colleges of advanced education. The measure is non-controversial, most of the clauses being acceptances by the Government of requests made by the institute over many years.

First, the Bill empowers the students to elect an extra member to the institute council, and the House will recall that a similar provision was in the Murray Park College of Advanced Education Bill, which was before the House during the last sitting. Another clause gives the institute power to hold land in the name of the Crown and to lease that land. This brings the institute into line with the other colleges of advanced education and also puts it on the same footing as institutions such as the museum and Art Gallery. Other minor amendments are consequential on those that I have mentioned, not only increasing the number on the institute council but also making the requisite alteration to the number required for a quorum.

The last amendment refers to the powers of the institute in respect of making by-laws and covers evidentiary

procedures, in particular giving the institute power to impose expiation fees for parking offences and other breaches of the institute by-laws. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

### EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 23 November. Page 2312.)

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** The Bill contains a *pot-pourri* of amendments. It provides rights to long service leave for members of the Education Department and, to all intents and purposes, it is aligning the rights of teachers with those of members of the Public Service Association. However, is the measure doing exactly that? I have spoken with several former teaching colleagues, some of whom have protested about rights that were being given to members of the Education Department, and the members of the department seemed to be conscientious people. One of the voices raised in opposition said that members of the department were receiving a little too much consideration from the Minister, and I believe that some of them may have written in a conscientious vein, advising him of their opinions.

The first amendment is an example of the South Australian Government's leading once again, in giving additional rights to public servants, in this case members of the teaching profession. Last year, similar legislation was enacted to give members of the Public Service Association additional long service leave rights, increasing their leave entitlement after 15 years of service from the former nine days per annum to 15 days per annum. That meant that after 10 years of service 90 days had accrued, and for each additional year of service another nine days would accrue and, once the magic period of 15 years had been completed, then 15 days for each year of additional service would accrue.

This Bill was promised as an election promise, but it is a follow-on from the amendment to the Public Service Act passed late last year. A point made by industry is that private enterprise is finding it increasingly difficult to compete with the conditions being given to public servants. It is possible that the Minister may be embarrassed by the present Bill, partly because departmental salaries represent more than 80 per cent of the department's annual budget.

There is no doubt that this Bill will increase the annual budget, partly because it gives an extra six days per annum leave for people who have served 15 years and over for each year of service and partly because, in addition, one clause removes the definition of "continuous service", which used to restrict the number of claims being made against the department for long service leave. It replaces that definition with the term "effective service", which means that in many cases different periods of service can be accredited to establish an officer's entitlement, despite the fact that they have not been served continuously.

I contacted the Public Service Association as recently as this morning to inquire whether that would apply in all cases where public servants had served for intermittent periods, with a small or long break in between, and I was assured that it would vary with different cases and that, where a person resigned and had been paid superannuation payments paid into the benefits scheme, this would represent a definite termination and it was highly unlikely that that period would be considered for reinstatement as

effective service if that person subsequently reapplied on entering the Public Service later.

However, there is no doubt that the change will increase the annual salary bill for the department. Some teachers have already pointed out that they feel embarrassed at receiving increases similar to the 17½ per cent loading for four weeks of their holiday pay when, in fact, they are receiving 12 weeks annual leave. In this situation they are different from the normal member of the Public Service, because they receive eight weeks additional leave, only four weeks of which attract the 17½ per cent loading, but still it represents a considerable difference, having regard to the holidays awarded to normal public servants.

It is not the same as the situation that confronts the normal public servant, and to suggest that the teachers should be entitled, in addition to that 12 weeks of holidays, to an extra six days a year long service leave, after 15 years of service, does create an imbalance so far as many association members are concerned. That does not quite meet the situation, and I wonder whether there might not be a counter-request for a follow-on by members of the association wanting some equation of their rights with those of teachers.

That argument aside, the point must be made that we have 2 000 unemployed teachers, yet we are giving additional benefits to existing staff. It seems inopportune for this Bill to be introduced now, especially as it has a retrospectivity clause dating its provisions back to 1 January 1978. I am sure that many of my former teaching colleagues will be embarrassed to think that they are receiving additional benefits at a time when many teachers are unemployed and striving to get back into the profession.

One problem currently facing the department is also relevant to that argument, in that it is difficult for the department's staffing branch to predict accurately the number of teachers who may be taken into the department, simply because teachers and other public servants have a habit of not advising their Heads of department when they are going to take their long service leave. For example, they do not plan well in advance and are permitted by their department (the Education Department is certainly no exception) to accrue their long service leave and to stall off the time when they will take it.

In some cases it may be many years before they decide to take that leave, and that presents problems. I have referred to one, namely, that it is difficult to predict what staffing will be needed if one does not know whether a person who has accrued 15 years of long service leave is going to take it. The second problem is that one does not know how big the department's salary bill will be for any particular person.

If long service leave accrues after 15 years and if that officer does not take his or her leave until, say, 20 years service or even longer, the officer is paid for long service leave at the salary ruling at the time the leave is taken. The officer may be on \$15 000 a year when the leave accrues, but his salary may have increased to \$20 000 or \$25 000 a year when he decides to take it.

Despite the provision in the original Act providing that the employer, in this case the Education Department, has the right to give to a person who has qualified for long service leave 60 days notice that the officer must take the leave, I stress that in most cases the departments have not been insistent on that provision and have tended to say that an officer can take that leave when he feels like it, but that generous attitude leads to problems of finance and staffing. With those arguments, it is only fair to tell the Minister that we intend to oppose this clause on the basis

that the time for its introduction is inopportune. Many teachers are unemployed, it will increase the department's annual bill, it will create an imbalance between the teaching profession and the general class of public servant because of the differential in the number of weeks leave per annum to which teachers are already entitled, and there is the obvious implication that private enterprise will be faced with the problem of competing and trying to keep up with Government departments. That is something about which private enterprise has been complaining: it has long said that South Australia is a leader in the field of giving additional benefits to public servants.

The next clause with which I deal is the one empowering the Minister to provide for pre-schools as well as primary and secondary schools. It has long been my personal contention that pre-schooling is an absolutely essential part of the education system and that the Community Welfare Department or the Federal Social Security Department should have been less involved than the Federal and State Ministers of Education in the provision of these services. There are those who will disagree and say that pre-schooling is really a baby-sitting organisation, but I feel that it best belongs within the education system, because I am convinced that pre-schooling, particularly in areas of under-privilege, can help to redress some of the under-privilege by helping to bring the student up to a better standard of education by the time he reaches primary school.

The State Minister of Education having the right to provide, where he sees fit, for pre-schools, as well as primary and secondary schools is, I think, a step in the right direction. The only question that stays in my mind is whether there will in fact be any problem involving liaison by the State Minister of Education, with his control over this branch of education, and the funding available from the Childhood Services Council. The point was raised by my colleagues, and I had assumed that it would simply be a question of one Federal Government department liaising with the responsible Government department in South Australia. I assume the Minister will comment on that, if not during the second reading then while we are going through the clauses in Committee.

The Bill adds to the present range of disciplinary powers against members of the teaching service a couple more strings to the Minister's bow if he chooses to discipline any member of the Education Department. We are not going to disagree with it. Disciplinary powers are certainly necessary, and the additional means given to the Minister are certainly not stringent ones. They allow for members of staff to be placed on probation, for example, until they have satisfied the Minister that they are appropriately qualified to become permanent members of the teaching profession.

My next point deals with the date of commencement of awards. Where before there have been some problems in deciding when an award commences, the Bill clearly provides that the date of commencement of the award laid down by the tribunal is the date which is applicable instead of a date dependent upon publication in the *Government Gazette*, which was sometimes the subject of debate and dissent. This provision clarifies the position. The Bill also provides for a single curriculum advisory board for primary and secondary education. There have, of course, been moves to rationalise primary and secondary education generally. For children to pass through primary school and then be faced with a lot of repetitive work in early secondary school, or with a great barrier over which they cannot leap, because the subject matter is far beyond them, means that something was wrong with having separate curriculum advisory boards, and this is a step in

the right direction. Children moving from primary to secondary schools should do so on a continuous ladder from which it will be much harder to fall. I assume that one of the obvious outcomes will be that children will progress steadily from primary to secondary school.

There is, however, much work still to be done on curricula in primary and secondary schools. I do not know whether the establishment of a single board will do much towards ensuring, for example, that additional finance is made available for English and mathematics curricula to be written up. I understand that there has been a shortage of staff in those fields during the past two or three years and that there are still great shortcomings within the mathematical curriculum. Perhaps the Minister will comment upon what steps have been taken to redress that situation.

Finally, this Bill gives greater flexibility to school councils in obtaining loans for educational and other purposes, and I am pleased about that. I assume that the money will be made available from Loan funds. We have already seen a general circular that was sent out to schools by the Minister through regional education offices advising the process by which loans are to be applied for and granted. It is pleasing to see that regional groups will be established whereby State politics, I assume, will have a smaller impact and the consideration given by local groups to local problems will have a greater influence. The Government will be servicing the loans, giving school councils greater flexibility in planning for additional facilities that the department has been unable to or reluctant to provide. I know that the Minister has already received a number of applications for some of that \$500 000 made available for 1978-79.

Generally, we will be supporting this legislation. We will, however, oppose clauses 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. It is Part II that we will be opposing, involving the amendments relating to long service leave. Should this legislation pass, there is another point that I make. In clause 6 (c) the formula does not seem to work out. It seems to give a teacher taking advantage of that formula a tremendous advantage over those to whom the other formulae apply. I merely inserted a hypothetical figure of \$100 for the base salary, in each case the same figure, and I found that in every case the formula worked out quite satisfactorily, but in this case, where

$$P = SD + \left[ s \times \frac{AM}{12} \right]$$

there seems to be something radically wrong with the AM

12

I am not sure where the error is but there is obviously something radically wrong there. It can give an officer a much higher entitlement than I imagine he would have received. I would ask the Minister to have his staff check that. There may be two errors there, as I am not satisfied that A multiplied by M is correct. I assume that this will also apply to the identical clause present in the Further Education Act Amendment Bill. Given those comments, we support the majority of clauses in the Bill but, on the grounds I have enumerated, will be opposing Part II relating to long service leave.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** As indicated by the member for Mount Gambier, who has taken the debate for the Opposition, we support the Bill. However, I want to make one or two remarks in relation to the measure, because all is not well with education in South Australia: it

is in a state of flux, and there is a very serious situation in relation to the employment of teachers. It is the most serious situation, I think, in the whole of my lifetime, although I cannot remember in detail the conditions which prevailed during the depression in the 1930's. The fact that we have 2 000 highly trained and expensively trained teachers who cannot find jobs indicates that all is not well with education in South Australia, and I believe that this is a matter for very deep concern.

The Government wants to make sectional handouts in the community. In fact, the Government went to a previous election promising the Public Service Association that their conditions would be equal or superior to those existing anywhere in Australia. Consequently, we saw a long service leave Bill with the same sort of provisions as we now see introduced in the House, legislating for the best long service leave provisions in Australia.

**Mr. Evans:** In fact, the world.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** That interjection leads me to elaborate on this point. My understanding is that Australia is the only place where we have this long service leave, and that puts us in a very odd situation if we are looking at the world scene. The argument and the rationale was that New South Wales had slightly better conditions in relation to long service leave than South Australia had, and because the Government had come to an election promising the best, we had to consider a Bill, despite the declining economic situation in South Australia, which gave the Public Service in South Australia conditions which are mirrored in this Bill. That is not a very responsible attitude for a Government to take, and in fact it could be accused of buying votes.

We now have 2 000 highly trained teachers unemployed. At the end of last year I met a young graduate who had a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Diploma of Education. She was an excellent young person who had a letter from the Education Department saying, "Sorry, we cannot offer you employment." In my opinion she would have made a first-class teacher, and should have been employed. That is the background with which we approach this Bill. When will the Government call a halt to sectional handouts? When we look at the world scene, I believe that long service leave is a fairly cranky provision. It does not exist anywhere else, and it is indeed a peculiar provision when we think of the world situation and the fact that we have to compete with the other countries. Perhaps this is a wealthy country and perhaps we can sustain conditions of employment superior to those elsewhere, but at present one cannot find much evidence to sustain that argument, and certainly not in this State where we had the highest unemployment and now have the second highest at 8 per cent.

The employment situation is not rosy, especially for young people. South Australia has the highest percentage of unemployed young people anywhere in the Commonwealth. This Bill might be aimed at giving an additional handout to teachers, but it is certainly not aimed at employing more of these excellent young people who have been trained at considerable expense and who, at the cost of a sheer hard grind on their part, find they are now at a loose end. They are highly trained professionals with no jobs. Where is the sense of balance or the sense of responsibility? When is this Government going to draw the line? When will it come to terms with economic reality and decide that this handout mentality must come to an end?

Perhaps this sort of sentiment is not terribly popular, and perhaps it will be said that the Liberals are lousy. I do not care what is said. I say what I believe, and I believe that we live in a fool's paradise and that the Labor Government in this State has done more than anyone to

establish that fool's paradise. Unfortunately, that paradise is not looking too rosy, and it more closely resembles another place at present.

I make no apology for saying that I am not happy about these long service leave provisions. As has been mentioned, the rationale for the initial introduction of a 17½ per cent leave loading was to compensate for overtime, because when people went on holidays they lost their overtime, and this was extended to teachers. My own daughter, who is a high school teacher, says she cannot understand it, and believes that they do not deserve a 17½ per cent leave loading; they do not work any overtime and are on a set salary. She has a fairly questioning mind and does not accept everything I say without question. It is just a Government handout.

I do not give a damn whether we are making ourselves unpopular; I am saying what I believe, and I believe that Government members are fools. They have been fools, and they continue to be fools while they introduce this sort of legislation and when they go to elections and buy votes with the sort of promise which has led to this type of legislation. Maybe it is smart politics to get all the votes in the metropolitan area where mainly professional people live. Maybe it is smart to buy their votes, but it is not being responsible. Young unemployed teachers at the present time would certainly not subscribe to this idea. It is cold comfort to them that those people who are fortunate enough to get a job have been given an extra handout. The number of unemployed teachers is a disgrace to this Administration.

This situation has occurred during the life of the Labor Government in South Australia. In 1970 when Labor came to office we had full employment for teachers, but since that time the situation has drastically declined. Who would have envisaged that we would have 2 000 highly trained teachers unable to find jobs? On whom does that reflect? It reflects sadly on the Administration of this State. Where is the planning? The Government has been able to get accurate school population projections, but what has gone wrong with the planning departments? Even if the Government could find more funds, as it promised, to give relief time to teachers in primary schools, that would not absorb this surplus. We have highly trained high school teachers with degrees and diplomas sitting at home twiddling their thumbs, unable to find any employment. No doubt the Minister will get up and give the Federal Government a blast, but we know perfectly well on the Federal scene—

**The Hon. D. J. Hoppood:** I will give you a blast, too.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** You can go your hardest. It has been a dull day as far as the Minister is concerned; we have not sighted him. We know where the rot set in—in Canberra, where the same sort of policies were running loose for about three years there, and we are still trying to climb out of the mire. Even our dear old friend Mr. Hayden, the insignificant Leader of the Federal Opposition says in his shy little way that he thinks things are improving but that we will have to change the policies. What does he think has brought about the change? Even he acknowledges that there are encouraging signs, but he says the policy is no good.

I do not want to get personal, but that poor little fellow came out tonight and said that something was working: that we had turned the corner, and that there were encouraging signs. However, the promises were no good. We know damn well that they were no good when his crowd was in Government.

The rest of the Bill is fairly sensible, except for a query that I have regarding clause 9, on which my colleague the member for Coles will elaborate. As the rest of the Bill is

sensible, it does not need much comment. As I said, things have not been in turmoil, although they have been a little disturbed. One area in which there has been much controversy and which is referred to in the Bill relates to curriculum. In these hard times, pressure is coming from parents for something to be done about curriculum. It seems that the setting up of these boards to include primary and secondary people is a sensible move.

It would appear (although this is not spelt out in the Bill) that some more help and guidelines will be given to schools by the curriculum boards and committees. The latter have been in existence in the past, particularly when the public examinations scheme was in vogue. However, that system has been dismantled over the years, and there are current moves to dismantle the matriculation examination.

These committees have been in existence in the past, and it seems that moves are being made to strengthen the recommendations made in relation to the help that will go to schools via the curriculum committees. We know that this was popular, and that the former Director-General earned himself something of an Australia-wide reputation with his famous memorandum that allowed schools to do their own thing. One thing that it did generate was fair variety in curriculum standards within schools. Perhaps that is a good thing, but I certainly need to be convinced about it.

As usually happens in education particularly, as in other areas of social life, the pendulum swings to and fro. It goes too far and comes back again to somewhere in the middle, where common sense prevails. In the past, things were not quite right, but the pendulum swung to one side.

As members probably know, I was a school teacher before I entered this place, and I was rather disturbed at some of the changes in curriculum that were occurring at that time. I remember querying one of the mathematics consultants. I forget what his title was, as titles have changed since then. However, that man came to the school, and I complained that the students in the upper classes of a big high school could not do elementary mathematics to work out a sum in physics. He said, "What does it matter? They are getting ideas." He said that it did not matter that they could not add up in matriculation. I may have been labelled conservative, but I was, and still am, proud of it!

However, the facts of life are that the pendulum is swinging back as a result of parental pressure, because things have gone too far. They went too far in mathematics and English and, although this is pooh-poohed by the educationists, we get employers complaining that they get youngsters coming for a job in, say, a supermarket, when they cannot add up. Apparently, that does not matter now because they have a machine that they can punch: as long as they can recognise the figures on the machine, they are fairly right!

However, in an office where one has to spell or construct a sentence, one is at a disadvantage. With the shortage of work that exists at present, and when competition is particularly keen, if one gets complaints from employers that none of the applicants for a job can do these things, one wonders what is happening in the education system. I know that the Minister goes to bat for them, as succeeding Ministers always do. I suppose that, if the Opposition Party was on the Government benches, its Minister would do the same, although the policy might perhaps be different. The Minister says that the statistics do not bear out what I am saying, but my observations and those of parents do bear out what I am saying.

In attempts to get rigidity out of primary school teaching, anything that smacks of repetition is out. One

cannot learn tables or have spelling tests. Anything that smacks of repetition is no good for the kids! They must go along and have a good time. They have to develop the whole personality, the whole being! The Minister is shaking his head.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** You're having trouble keeping a straight face.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It is just my pleasant countenance. I am deadly serious about what I am saying. I have just had a good meal and am feeling at peace with the world. The only thing that I have learned about the Minister in the past fortnight relates to Roxby Downs and uranium mining, but after today I have even got doubts about that.

**Mr. Allison:** There's even hope for him yet.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I thought that he was a fellow who was prepared to buck the machine.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae):** Order! I hope that the honourable member will return to the Bill instead of referring to meals and Roxby Downs.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It was just an aside, Sir, by way of explanation to the Minister, who was referring to me in rather personal terms. Anyway, there is certainly a need for something to happen in relating to curriculum, and this seems to be happening, as is spelt out in the Bill. Some of my colleagues will have something to say in this respect.

The present moves being made by the Federal Minister are to be welcomed. More choice should be given to parents regarding the school that they choose for their youngsters. I am sure that, if they could afford it, more people would be opting for an independent school education for their children, because most of such schools offer a more formal and rigid style of education that is rather more to the liking of the parents concerned. I am sure of this from my own observations, but unfortunately, as with all other things, this has got out of the reach of most people.

Therefore, the moves being made by the Federal Minister to make more choice available in relation to schools is desirable. The Minister has said that zoning is out for secondary schools in South Australia, and I welcome that.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** In 1980.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I knew that it was coming, and I will wholeheartedly support that move. If we can give parents more choice, they will perhaps shop around a bit and find a school to their liking. Regarding curriculum development, the Labor Party came into power with the idea that we had inferior schools. We had to get rid of technical high schools. The word "technical" somehow reflected an inferior school. It was said that there should be no division between technical high schools and high schools, so they merged. We were going to have comprehensive high schools, in the same way as this move spread over Britain, when it moved to comprehensive high schools. However, now the move is back again. At Goodwood, a new technical school is being set up.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** No, you have misunderstood.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Perhaps it is an isolated development. However, it is recognised at Goodwood that there is a need for specialised technical training. I know of some youngsters whose parents took them away from their present school and sent them to get specialised technical training. Whether we like it or not, we can develop the whole personality and turn them into the most gracious souls in the world (although there is little evidence of that), but the fact is that these youngsters still must find themselves a job that is satisfying to them for about 40 years of their lives. So, all in all, with these rather diverse remarks on this rather diverse measure, I support the Bill.

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I support the Bill in general terms, although I have serious reservations about clause 9, which refers to the definition of "non-government schools". My first criticism deals with the Minister's second reading explanation, which I regard as being quite deficient in terms of explanation of the reasons for the amendments contained in the Bill. The Bill certainly deals with miscellaneous topics but, in the space of one and a half columns of *Hansard*, the Minister (page 2312 of 23 November 1978 *Hansard*) dealt with these miscellaneous topics. He simply stated the intention of the Bill.

However, the Minister failed to state in virtually every instance, in relation to the amendments and the content of the Bill, what was the justification for the amendments. In the Committee stage he should be closely questioned as to the reasons why these amendments have been included in the one Bill now before the House. It is not good enough simply to introduce the Bill and say what it will do. Surely it is essential for the Government to say why these things need to be done. In almost every instance the taxpayer will be paying, sometimes quite heavily, for these amendments. Parliament therefore needs to have demonstrated to it that the expenditure is justified, and in the best interests of the community.

Clauses 4 to 8 deal with long service leave. The member for Mount Gambier and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have dealt with these clauses in detail. I support what was said in relation to the importance of the Education Department's enforcing section 19 (6) of the original Act, which provides:

Any long service leave to which an officer is entitled under this Division shall be taken by that person at such time and in such periods as may, in the opinion of the Director-General, be convenient to the department.

With the new provisions being enacted and the additional sums being expended, it is even more important that section 19 (6) be quickly implemented and that the department be instructed to ensure that it is adhered to. I telephoned the department yesterday following representations from a young constituent of mine who is an exit student from Murray Park college and who has been finding it difficult to get a teaching job. She wanted to work but she did not want to spend a whole year waiting and hoping that she would be accepted by the Education Department. She said, "Isn't it possible that the department can give some kind of guide as to whether a person will have to wait three months, six months, nine months, or a year for a contract teaching position?"

When I telephoned the department, the officer to whom I spoke was sympathetic. He said that the major sources of contract jobs were two-fold: first, *accouchement* leave, which is obviously impossible to predict and plan for; and, secondly, long service leave. The officer maintained that it was almost equally impossible to predict and plan for long service leave. In any well-run department those predictions would not be impossible in respect of long service leave. It is clear that Parliament has given the Minister and the department the requirement and the need to plan for long service leave and to ensure that it is taken when it is due. If long service leave was taken when due, it would be possible to engage in the forward planning that would enable the department to give applicants for contract teaching jobs a much better deal and a far more accurate indication of how long they might have to wait for a position. It is scandalous that this has not taken place. The Minister should give instructions to see that it takes place forthwith. Clause 9 deals with the registration of non-government schools, which are now defined under section 5 of the original Act, as follows:

A non-government school means any school or institution

(not being a Government school) at which any person or body of persons provides or offers to provide courses of instruction in primary or secondary education.

I acknowledge that that is a very general definition that is in fairly stark contrast to the provisions of the Education Act, 1915-1935, which the Education Act, 1972-1974, repealed. That Act required considerable accountability from non-government schools. At that time non-government schools were genuinely private schools—privately owned and run and receiving no subvention whatever from Governments. Clause 9 provides:

Section 5 of the principal Act is amended—

(b) by striking out the definition of "non-government school" and inserting in lieu thereof the following definition:

"non-government school" means any school or institution approved by the Minister (not being a Government school) at which any person or body of persons provides, or offers to provide, courses of instruction in primary or secondary education;

I would be bound to oppose that clause on the ground that it gives the Minister a blank cheque in terms of determining the nature and future of independent schools in South Australia. It literally means that the Minister has unfettered power to determine what is and what is not an independent school; that is far too great a power to be granted to one person, who is in a political position. The clause does not give any kind of requirement for advice, despite the fact that the Minister undertook in his second reading explanation to seek the advice of the Advisory Committee on State Aid to Non-government Schools. There is no statutory requirement for him to do so. There are no criteria, no guidelines, no provisions for appeal, and no provisions for provisional registration. The Minister, and the Minister alone, has the statutory power to determine what is and what is not a non-government school.

I am not questioning the need for registration. There is no doubt that registration is needed, and it is needed because some organisations have been setting up schools that purport to be schools but are, in fact, not fulfilling the proper function of schools that people in this State would expect. Some have been exploiting children, and it is reasonable to assume that this type of school will continue to crop up when groups holding views at variance with the rest of the community decide to inculcate those views into the minds of their children. I do not oppose the principle of registration, and I acknowledge the need for it, but I oppose the method that the Minister and the Government are using to implement that registration. We should look at what is involved in terms of the potential for control that the Minister has taken unto himself through this clause.

The South Australian office of the Australian Bureau of Statistics released figures relating to non-government schools in South Australia on 13 November 1978. There were in 1978 in South Australia 628 Government schools and 151 non-government schools, comprising eight Church of England Schools, 16 Lutheran schools, 102 Catholic schools, five Uniting Church schools, and 20 other schools. In the same period there were 230 455 students in Government schools, while there were 39 441 students in non-government schools. So, a considerable percentage of students are attending non-government schools in South Australia, relative to the total number of students. I suspect that the percentage attending non-government schools may be higher in South Australia than in any other State.

The Minister has the power under this clause to determine what is, and what is not, a non-government

school. That is far too wide and sweeping a power to give to one person in a political position. That power should not be given to any Minister, either Liberal or Labor. The key thing about non-government schools is their independence. The late Alex Ramsay, when Chairman of the Executive and Finance Committee of St. Peter's College, at a school speech day in 1977 said:

The important thing about independent schools is that they continue to exist. Like Mount Everest they are there, and must continue to be there.

However, like Mount Everest, there are some people who wish to conquer independent schools. There must always be statutory protection for these schools as desired by parents, children, and sponsors. Mr. Ramsay also said:

In the modern world it is a good rule to take nothing for granted.

I know the Minister has a very good relationship with non-government schools in South Australia and I hope he would want to see the great independent schools continue and flourish. However, his successors might not feel the same way and might try to use and abuse this clause for ideological ends.

Sir James Darling, C.M.G., in Adelaide on 18 July 1973, referred to the importance of true independence for non-government schools, and said:

I believe first in diversity rather than uniformity in education as in other things. This is part of what we mean by liberal democracy, not the undisputed power of the majority to dominate completely all our lives. A majority can be just as tyrannical as a dictator. We believe in the right to be different, provided that we do not hurt other people in the process.

He continued:

The State can, within limits, provide diversity within the system. It cannot easily provide the corollary which is my second criterion, namely, the right to chose.

The Minister has encouraged diversity in the State system, and I congratulate him on his efforts to dezone high schools. If a nation is to enjoy independent thought, it is essential that it enjoy and maintain a system of education that is independent from the states. This clause does not guarantee that system. I will seek to amend that clause in the Committee stage, and I hope that the Minister will accept that the undertaking that he gave in his second reading explanation to exercise his powers on the basis of recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Non-government Schools should be included in the Bill in statutory form and not just given as the word of the Minister that could be departed from by successive Ministers.

Clause 13 refers to the extension of disciplinary powers over teachers. The Minister's second reading explanation was deficient on this point. He did not say why an expansion of disciplinary powers is necessary. If we are to approve that clause, we must know why it was included and what is the justification for it. Clause 17 refers to the Advisory Curriculum Board. Again, we have not been given justification for this clause. The Auditor-General's Report, 1978, page 94 states:

The Directorate of Curriculum is mainly responsible for the development and implementation of curriculum policy. The directorate also administers the following branches of the department: school libraries, music, physical education, Educational Technology Centre, and the Wattle Park Teachers Centre.

From the estimates of payments in 1978, this section cost the taxpayer \$20 500 000; \$8 600 000 for primary, \$9 800 000 for secondary, \$400 000 for special, \$900 000 for general, and \$680 000 for transport of students. One wonders what the Advisory Curriculum Board costs, and

to what extent it duplicates the work of the curriculum directorate. These are questions that I hope will be answered by the Minister.

Clause 18 deals with the power for school councils to borrow, and gives greater flexibility to these councils in obtaining loans for educational purposes. I support this, but I hope that the system that the Minister has established to enable the School Loans Advisory Committee to operate on a regional basis will not bog down applications and lengthen the time schools have to wait for approval for loans. I asked the Minister last year whether it was possible to speed up approval for a loan for Thorndon High School, which was urgently seeking a loan to build a gymnasium. The speed with which approval can be given makes an enormous difference to the life of the school and to the sum that is ultimately spent.

The Thorndon High School student representative council had raised thousands of dollars and was prepared to donate this money to the gymnasium. However, with the wisdom of youth and with some cynicism bred of experience, the council decided that the school had been messed around considerably in the past regarding loan grants and facilities and did not want to see the money held. The council wanted the money spent while its members were still at the school to see the benefits, not in 10 years time when the money would have lost half its value.

I have not had a satisfactory reply to my question from the Minister. The regional committee has not been set up, approval has not been given, and about six months has passed since the request was made. If this is an example of what will happen under the new system, the State would be better off without it. In principle, I support the system if it operates in a speedy fashion so that applications do not get bogged down at the local level and never reach the School Loans Advisory Committee.

Generally, I support the Bill. However, I find it impossible to support clause 9 unless the Minister is prepared, in statutory form, to undertake that the Advisory Committee on Non-government Schools will be the body whose advice he accepts and which will have the primary responsibility over registration of non-government schools.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the comment the member for Coles has made in relation to private schools, and I will say no more than that except that I do not believe we should give any present or future Minister any opportunity to, at his own whim, cast a private school into the wilderness because he may object to the private school system. In relation to borrowing, I believe that it is more power that should be given to school councils in the local community to seek borrowings, with the Minister's approval, but, at the same time, I am conscious that it can create another body in between that can slow down, rather than speed up, the process.

The main reason I raise this matter is in relation to long service leave provisions. As I have many teachers in my district, I believe that I should indicate my attitude towards the provisions that the Minister would like to include in the Bill. I do not support the clause relating to this matter. In retrospect I am disappointed that we accepted the Public Service changes last year as readily as we did, because we have placed a burden on the State that will be an embarrassment in future, unless Ministers of the Crown are prepared to say to members of the Public Service, "We want you to take your long service leave when it is due." Under the Public Service Act the Minister has the opportunity to give 60 days notice to people who are entitled to long service leave to take it. If that



happened we could plan a lot better for those needed on contract in the teaching profession or, in the case of the Public Service, those needed in that work force. While we allow people to let leave accrue and take it at the end of their career we are placing a heavy burden on the State's finances, because often, when long service leave is first due, people would be on a much lower salary than they would be if they let their long service leave accrue. They are actually being paid significantly more for whatever period of time it is in real money terms than if they had taken leave when it was due.

Under the provisions of this Bill a teacher who started teaching at 22 and served to 37 years of age would be entitled to 90 days leave. If he served for another 15 years until he was aged 52 he would be entitled to 15 days for each year, which is another 45 weeks. In fact, at age 52 he would be entitled to 63 weeks long service leave. Under his own Act, the Minister can force teachers to take long service leave when it is due at 15 years and, if he did, the cost to the State would be less than if we allowed them to collect it after they had progressed to a higher position, when they would be paid for those 18 weeks at a much higher salary. I do not oppose the principle of giving the teachers a fair go. I know that teachers can argue that the Public Service enjoys these provisions, but I should like the House to consider one other aspect. First, I admit that most teachers are dedicated. I know that because of my close association with many of them. I know that they do not go to school for 39 weeks of the year and forget about their job for the rest of the time. Many of them spend much of their time after hours working out programmes for students and meeting students to help them with problems they may have. Many teachers take an interest in the musical, cultural, and sporting activities of their students, and spend Saturdays and other times out of the normal five-day week period helping students develop as young people. For that reason I believe the community should be grateful and should appreciate what they do. They spend open nights meeting parents and explaining to them the children's progress within the school.

I think we should recognise this as a genuine contribution of the teaching community, but in real terms teachers are obliged to attend school for 39 weeks, that is, 195 days a year. They have the public holidays off and they usually have some sick days: not all of them either because most, if they are not ill, do not attempt to manipulate it to gain the sick leave. As the period of time they spend in school is 195 days, apart from other activities I referred to earlier, then 170 days are not committed to the school. One could argue that the Public Service employees work 47 weeks of the year at five days a week, that is, about 220 days if we take off some for sick leave and some for public holidays. That is significantly more than the time that teachers spend at school. I am not saying that it is wrong; I am saying there is a difference in that category. The original purpose of long service leave was that people, after serving in the Public Service or serving their master (whatever term you like to use), need a rest after a period of 10 years or after the period for which long service was first available. That is why long service leave was introduced. What has happened in the public sector, not only with schoolteachers? Ministers have been too afraid to say to those employees, "You should take your long service leave and have a rest. Come back refreshed, revitalised, and with new enthusiasm." This has not occurred, and we have this accrual going on that is costing the State much money.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** Millions!

**Mr. EVANS:** As my Deputy Leader says, millions. I believe that the concept on long service leave should be

enforced so that people such as officers in the Education Department will know when somebody is to be on long service leave within a reasonable time and can programme for contract teachers, as the member for Coles suggested. We have about 2 000 young people whom the State has educated at a high cost. Most of them would be excellent teachers, given an opportunity. There will be some failures; that happens in every profession. Probably, some in the profession now would not have the capacity of some of the young ones who cannot get in, but that is a difficult situation to alter.

We should be attempting to get as many of these people as possible into the work force, even if it is under contract. One way of doing that is asking teachers who are now entitled to long service leave to start taking it and to continue to take it on an on-going basis as it falls due. That would help considerably to give new confidence and enthusiasm to the many young people in the queues awaiting an opportunity to use the qualification the State or Commonwealth has helped them to gain to become teachers.

Within my own area I know that many teachers look forward to having the long service leave provisions that are included by the Minister in this Bill. However, a vast majority would look at this situation and say, "Do we really need it? Should we at this stage make a contribution to help those young people waiting to get into the work force as teachers? Do we really need to say that after 15 years service we want three weeks extra long service leave every year?"

What would be the position if we took a survey of the teachers themselves? Knowing all of the other aspects of their employment, would they really vote, as a majority, for it? I would like to see a survey of teachers. True, some would be stirred up and would write letters, make attacks on television, radio and through the *Teachers Journal*, but the vast majority (usually the silent majority) can probably see the problem that this State is in and can recognise how the ambitions of many dedicated young people have been destroyed.

I would ask the House to consider the position that these young people are in, the enthusiasm with which they went through school, the hard work they did and the sacrifices they made to obtain a piece of paper, which means that their capacity to teach is recognised but no job is available.

Indeed, I would like to see this provision left until some time in the future, perhaps not far in the future. Perhaps if the economy of this country, and especially this State, improved or if we could get some of the major projects off the ground that have been recently discussed, perhaps we could afford such a provision, but we should give these young teachers the opportunity to get into the work force now and not commit ourselves to such a programme until we are sure we can afford it.

I know that the Minister will argue that, if we pass this provision tonight and it becomes law in a fortnight, it will not have a significant financial effect on the State for a considerable time, but it may be that we can never afford such a provision and give job opportunities to those people who we have educated to be teachers, at any time in the future. We have another batch of teachers coming out next year, yet we have a decreasing student population.

I ask members of the Public Service about whether they really need the sort of provisions we passed last year. The Deputy Leader made the point that we are the only country in the world that provides long service leave and 17½ per cent annual leave loading. Teachers get 17½ per cent annual leave loading as do the remainder of public servants and other workers for four or five weeks during

their annual leave. As we are the only country in the world providing such conditions as we do under the Public Service Act, and as the Minister is hoping now to include teachers in the award, we should ask whether we are the richest State in the world? Are we the richest part of the world? I do not believe that we are.

If the Government believes in sharing the wealth and spreading it around, here is the opportunity to help young people knocking on our electorate office doors and asking members why they cannot get a teaching appointment, either under contract or under permanency. We can ask teachers not to ask for these provisions, but to wait and see whether or not the position improves and whether we can afford it.

I respect the hard work that teachers do, I respect the extra work that the dedicated teachers do outside of normal working hours, and I am sure that they understand the position that these young people face. Indeed, I hope that we all understand that there is some need for restraint at this time. I oppose that provision of the Bill.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education):** The Opposition has indicated by its remarks that it regards this basically as a Committee Bill, that the intestines of the Bill will be in the Committee stage, and we are merely passing through the oesophagus at present. Further, as some members of the Opposition may be aware, I will not be asking of the Committee that we push the Bill beyond the first clause this evening, because there are some Government amendments to be considered.

All Opposition speakers have referred to the clauses dealing with long service leave provisions and, in that regard, I want to say, first, that this Government is not in the habit of renegeing on commitments that are made on the hustings and, secondly, it would be quite insupportable, because of the accident of the Premier's getting the attention of the drafting mechanism in this place before the Minister of Education, that the public servants should finish up in a more advantageous position than teachers.

I have not checked through the records; I was unable to glean from what Opposition members said during their speeches, for example, whether they specifically opposed this provision in regard to the Public Service Act. If they did not, and the Opposition Whip said that he wished that they had opposed it more vigorously, or something like that, then that is extending differential treatment as between different sectors of public employment, and I believe that that is insupportable. Even if the philosophy that lies behind the remarks of members opposite is granted (and I do not grant it for one moment), for the reasons that I have outlined it is important that the Government proceeds with these provisions.

The member for Mount Gambier asked a question about pre-school education and whether the passing of the provisions of the Bill that affect my powers in relation to pre-school education would have any impact on the way the Childhood Services Council operates, or the way in which the Office of Child Care of the Social Security Department in Canberra operates in relation to our pre-school education. The answer is that it would not have any effect. At present the Education Department is involved in pre-school education and has been since the initiatives were first taken by my predecessor (the present Minister of Mines and Energy), I think, in 1972 or early 1973. What we are seeking here is a clause in the Act that will put beyond doubt the department's powers to be operating in this area. It has been operating in this area.

**Mr. Nankivell:** They were play groups rather than kindergarten groups.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** It is a matter of definition.

**Mr. Nankivell:** There's a significant difference because of parental involvement.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** Maybe. The reasons for bringing forward the clause in the Bill is to put beyond doubt my legislative powers to do what we have been doing. We have called them child-parent centres. Generally, they are regarded on the same sort of level as kindergartens. True, there is perhaps a more aggressive intent on the part of departmental centres to involve parents. Without their involvement the things virtually fall to the ground, whereas the kindergarten centres could continue with a much lower level of parental involvement. I do not want to hide behind that in any way. What we have been running has been pre-school education, as understood by the Childhood Services Council and, indeed, by the Office of Child Care in the Social Security Department. In the Bill we are seeking to put beyond any doubt my powers to proceed.

To answer the specific question for the honourable member, I do not envisage that the Childhood Services Council will operate any differently, as to disbursing funds between the Kindergarten Union on the one hand and the Education Department on the other hand, than it has in the past, simply by the passage of this clause.

The member for Mount Gambier was, I think, involved in a slip of the tongue when he was speaking about buying powers. I believe I heard him say that he assumed that this borrowing would be from Loan Council funds. In fact, it will not be and that is the whole point of the exercise. By allowing school councils to borrow outside of the Loan Council agreement we are not impacting on the normal school building programme—we are not robbing Peter to pay Paul.

**Mr. Chapman:** No budgeting control at all?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** That is the point I was going to make. The budgeting control comes from the fact that the school councils are not expected to service the loan. The loan is serviced from State revenue, and that is where the control comes. That is why school councils have been told that they can only borrow, as a whole, in the first portion of the year of operation, \$500 000. If, in fact, they were servicing their own borrowings, why should we impose any limit? In fact, we have imposed a limit because of the impact on the revenue programme. We believe that this is a sensible provision because otherwise there would be a raid on funds from Loan Council which can be put in the normal school building programmes. That is the reason for this provision. We are setting up school councils as mini statutory authorities for this purpose.

**Mr. Chapman:** How does that \$500 000 compare with the sum they are already enjoying?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** It really cannot be compared, because the rules have been changed completely. In the past in theory a large number of schools could have said that they were in a position where they could apply for a subsidy, but in practice they did not because not all schools are in the fortunate position of being able to do that. In practice, I suppose it would be about a line ball situation. It is a different sort of arrangement because now we will be saying that we think schools should be allowed to apply for this money and that it has to meet only 10 per cent or 20 per cent of the requirement because that is where the need is. In the past it was not a matter of need, it was a matter of who had the money and who could meet the subsidy arrangements.

**Mr. Chapman:** There is no means test under this new scheme?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** There is no means test as such, but I would imagine that the committee that will be making recommendations will look at the facilities at

schools and say that, for example, Elizabeth West High School has no proper assembly hall *cum* gymnasium whereas Wirrianda High School, which was recently built, has a very good one, so that if Wirrianda wants another gymnasium it will have to wait longer than Elizabeth West.

**Mr. Chapman:** You are seeking to establish a needs rather than a means programme?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** That is right. I hope I have cleared that matter up. The matter was fairly thoroughly canvassed in the Parliament when our intentions were first announced. The member for Coles spoke about clause 9. I will have an amendment on file in relation to clause 9 and, therefore, I think it is improper for me to speak further on that. I do not know that my amendment will altogether meet her objections, but that is for us to speak further about in Committee.

That leaves me with the Deputy Leader, who was the one person to inject some humour (and I use that term rather than "party politics") into this debate. He went over all the sort of right-wing shibboleths we have heard before, things which are unworthy of a former teacher and a person of his alleged intelligence. I want to pick up one point in relation to this right wing nonsense about curriculum. He has completely misunderstood the comprehensive programme which was, in fact, endorsed by his Party when it was in Government. The comprehensive programme did not turn all of the technical high schools into high schools although they may have been named that; it turned all the high schools into technical high schools. I am surprised that a former secondary school teacher did not understand what was going on to that extent. It put the old academic high schools much closer to the work place than they had been previously.

The other substantive point he made was about unemployed teachers and he criticised the State's lack of planning in dealing with this matter. If the problem were as simple as the honourable member suggests I would invite the Parliament to consider this point. If we look around Australia we find that the same sort of problem, of roughly the same magnitude, occurs in all States, so what the honorable member is inviting us to conclude is that this simple-minded lack of planning occurred in every single state: in Queensland, where Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's Government has been in power for much longer than this Government has here; in Victoria, where Mr. Lindsay Thompson has been Minister of Education, I believe, for about 11 years; and in Western Australia, where Sir Charles Court has been around for some time. The honourable member invites us to suggest that in each State, there was a foul-up in the planning process.

One can accept that argument if one likes or one can say that it is too preposterous to believe and that there must be some other factor at work. Of course, there is another factor at work. That is what the member for Torrens missed in his non-political column in the *News* some weeks ago when he addressed himself to this problem. The factor which is at work and which could not have been predicted by anybody is the dramatic fall in the wastage rate in the teaching profession over a short period. Four years ago the wastage rate was about 14 per cent. Last year it was down to about 4 per cent. That is where, basically, the problem resides. People are not leaving the teaching profession in the way they were. How could anybody budget for that? Who could anticipate that there would be that sort of deterioration in the wastage rate? No-one could, of course.

I invite the honourable member to consider that matter and consider the culpability of his Federal colleagues in relation to the lack of job opportunities outside of teaching

and the effect that has had on the wastage rate. As I indicated previously, this is basically a Committee Bill and I urge members to support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 November. Page 2312.)

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** This Bill implements the recommendations in relation to the rights of long service leave for teachers and, with one exception, the clauses are similar to the first eight clauses of the Bill we have just debated. That exception is that this Bill makes it possible for theological colleges to be excluded from the ambit of the Act. It is not for me to go over the ground that has been covered on the last Bill, because all the remarks of my colleagues apply equally to this Bill.

The Opposition is gravely concerned at the effects of these long service provisions, although it acknowledges that the teachers should not be disadvantaged in relation to other public servants. Nevertheless, the Opposition wishes to put on record its protest that these provisions, which flow on from the Public Service long service leave legislation of last year, will be costly. The Opposition makes the point that this money could well be spent in other ways, such as providing jobs for other teachers, especially the unemployed teachers we have at the moment. The whole debate has been well canvassed by my colleagues in the previous debate, and I support their remarks entirely.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### TERTIARY EDUCATION AUTHORITY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 November. Page 2314.)

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** There is no question but that for many years there has been a need, not only in South Australia, but throughout Australia for a co-ordinating body or bodies to deal with the increasing problems that have emerged in tertiary education, and in post-secondary education if we are to include the technical and further education departments. The various problems that have arisen include the more recent one where we have a decline in student population at secondary level, which will throw an additional burden on tertiary education, in that there will be a scratching around for more students.

This was not happening five to 10 years ago. As recently as 1968, in South Australia, we were rapidly building more and larger colleges of advanced education and the Flinders University project was in full swing. At that stage it seemed that everything would be in an expansionary phase

for a long time. It was not until 1975, when the Borrie Report brought to everyone's attention the fact that Australia's population was stabilising, that we realised, a little too late, that we had a surplus of more than 20 colleges of advanced education in Australia. That problem is still with us and we in South Australia have been tackling it recently, with the amalgamation of at least four of our colleges.

The decline in the number of apprentices being trained in Australia, the questioning of the whole rationale of apprenticeship training, and the very expensive nature of apprenticeship training have led to the emergence of Further Education Department classes and a rapid burgeoning of Further Education Department courses in South Australia, especially in the past few years.

Throughout the university, college of advanced education, and further education department spheres, plus at the Institute of Technology in South Australia, we have had increasing competition for the students available and a considerable change in the kinds of students coming on to the market for tertiary training. The Further Education Department has been quite remarkable for the number of students who have gravitated towards that form of training.

The colleges of advanced education are now experiencing a shortage of students going through for teacher training, largely because Education Departments can no longer promise that teachers will be employed, even though on emergence from college they may be excellent graduates. Of course, the whole rationale of universities has been questioned in the national press and by a whole variety of people across the structure of Australian education.

Who decides who should survive, what amalgamation should take place, what courses should be introduced, what courses should be phased out, who should get the lion's share of funding, and so on? These decisions obviously cannot be made by any one State Minister or by the Federal Minister without his having much expert advice from across the education field.

In 1975 the Tertiary Education Commission was established at national level by the then Whitlam Government and in 1977 the commission's field of influence was expanded to include technical and further education. This was some move towards a rationalisation for co-ordination of educational funding across Australia. The Tertiary Education Commission has strongly supported moves that have been made in Victoria recently, with the passing of its Tertiary Education Authority Bill. South Australia, New South Wales, Victoria, and Western Australia are all following suit, and across the whole of Australia we will have a series of secondary co-ordinating bodies who will liaise with the Tertiary Education Commission and the various education institutions in each State.

The whole rationale behind the establishment of a tertiary education authority is unquestionably good. There certainly is a need for some authority to examine all the funding, accreditation, establishment, opening or even closing of colleges, amalgamations, and all the other associated problems. Therefore, at the outset, we would say we will certainly support this Bill.

There are few clauses to which we will take exception and I will mention a couple of them at the outset. One of them, which will be dealt with at greater length by my colleague, the member for Torrens, deals with the rights of the South Australian Institute of Technology to accredit its own courses.

The other one is clause 12, which involves a sweeping delegation, whereby the authority can, in what it considers

to be an appropriate case, by instrument in writing delegate any of its powers or functions either to a post-secondary institution or (and this is the part with which the Opposition would disagree) to any committee or person. That virtually means, in effect, that some person overseas might be delegated with considerable powers under this Bill. Although that is unlikely and is an extreme case, it may happen, and the Opposition does not consider that sweeping powers like that should be included in the Bill.

I believe that the Minister is already having second thoughts about this clause. Probably one happy solution might be simply to delete "or person" from that clause (this can be considered in Committee), and leave it with the authority's having power to delegate its functions to any post-secondary institution or committee, on the assumption that certainly they will be reputable bodies. A different proposition was put forward to the Minister in the original drafting of the legislation, and perhaps the Minister will consider that as an alternative, whereby under paragraph (b) any officer or committee under the authority had to receive the delegated power or function. That, too, would probably be a better solution than the clause now in the Bill.

Generally, then, the Bill represents the body of recommendations put to the Minister in the Anderson Committee Report on Post-Secondary Education in South Australia. Certainly, that committee strongly recommended the establishment of a tertiary education authority in South Australia, and indeed the Minister has chosen the recommended name for his authority.

The Anderson Committee, along with submissions made to the Minister by the universities and colleges, generally supported the establishment of a tertiary education authority to co-ordinate post-secondary education in South Australia. There was, in fact, some inference in the Anderson Committee Report that the South Australian universities opposed the establishment of such a co-ordinating authority but, on checking with those two august bodies, I find that generally it was not so much that they were opposing the principle of establishing a tertiary education authority but simply that they considered that their autonomy might be too severely impinged upon, and they hoped that a co-operative spirit would prevail should a tertiary education authority be established.

In fact they strongly supported the establishment of such an authority. I say that to remove any air of doubt, because I am sure that the Anderson Committee misinterpreted or misstated the submissions of at least one university, namely, Flinders, in chapters 9 and 10 of its original report.

The Anderson Committee said that, if the co-ordinating powers of the tertiary authority were to be effective, they would certainly have to override some of the powers with which tertiary institutions are currently vested. Therefore, the Bill provides for the establishment of the authority and repeals the South Australia Board of Advanced Education Act, making that board redundant. It also amends the Colleges of Advanced Education Act, the Roseworthy Agriculture College Act, and the South Australian Institute of Technology Act. The last Act to which I referred will be discussed by my colleague, who will move an appropriate amendment in Committee. I assume that he will also discuss the matter in the second reading debate.

The point has already been made that there are many examples of co-ordination in other States, either by Ministerial departments or advisory committees, or by statutory committees. This is one more step to rationalise the whole of Australia's post-secondary education to bring into line the problems of establishing and accrediting

courses between States. This problem exists not only in Australia but across the world, where people can obtain qualifications from one institution only to find that those qualifications are not accepted or they are not given any credit for them when they try to continue courses at an alternative institution. This is probably the problem that most concerns the vast body of people which uses our tertiary institutions, namely, the students themselves.

Various Royal Commissions in Australia have strongly recommended that tertiary education authorities be created. I do not intend to reiterate all the points (and there are a great number of them) that were made by the Anderson Committee supporting the establishment of tertiary education authorities. This ground has been covered a number of times, and, to prolong the debate unduly, when the Opposition supports the whole concept of establishing a tertiary education authority, would be to waste the time of this House unnecessarily. However, I point out that some of the problems pointed out to the Minister by various tertiary authorities in South Australia have, in fact, been covered by the legislation.

One of them is the important aspect referred to by the South Australian universities namely, that they hoped that co-ordination could be effected without the autonomy of the universities being destroyed. It is pleasing to note that the legislation now before the House not only gives the tertiary authorities some teeth, and allows universities, Further Education Departments and colleges to place submissions before the authority but also enables universities to advise and contact the Tertiary Education Commission and allows the Further Education Department still to have direct contact with the Minister. However, there is a provision that the Tertiary Education Authority in South Australia must be informed at all stages of any moves made to bodies other than the authority itself. The Tertiary Education Authority will keep a close eye on what is happening in relation to education in South Australia. It will be one of the most important institutions in South Australia. One has merely to see that the Chairman is to receive an annual salary of \$40 000 to realise the importance attached to his appointment and the fact that there is also a Deputy Chairman. It is interesting to note that the Bill allows for the appointment of a full-time Chairman, and for a full-time or part-time Deputy Chairman, when the Anderson Committee strongly recommended that the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman should be full-time officers to allow them to become closely familiar with all aspects of post-secondary education in South Australia so that they could make adequate recommendations to the Minister and to the Tertiary Education Commission.

I am not sure whether the Minister has doubts on whether he can obtain the services of a full-time Chairman. I do not think he would have many problems, but there is that area of doubt, in that he does not provide definitely for the appointment of a full-time Deputy Chairman; this is an optional extra.

The co-ordination of tertiary education in Australia has been covered effectively not only by the Tertiary Education Commission but also by the National Universities Council, which co-ordinates the work of universities across Australia. As we have only two universities in South Australia, there should be no great co-ordination problems between them.

However, the Tertiary Education Authority has quite considerable power, in that universities have to submit courses for accreditation, and the authority itself has the authority vested in it to approve or reject applications for new courses and for them to be accredited. There is the proviso that we have an accreditation committee

comprising the Chairman of the authority and eight other members. So, there appears to be little doubt that co-ordination in South Australia will be most effective. There are representatives on the co-ordination committee from responsible bodies appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the Tertiary Education Authority. The main need for the establishment of an authority is that this is removed from the political field. That is extremely desirable, particularly when we are considering advanced education and university education for the whole of Australia.

It is most desirable that political influence be as far removed as possible. This was the aim of the last two Federal Governments in first promoting and subsequently expanding the tertiary education committee, so that its recommendations could be as independent of politics as practicable. I do not intend to go through the whole of the Anderson Committee Report. The amendments that we will move have probably already been considered by the Minister, along with drafting amendments. Generally the legislation is most desirable, and we support it.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** We are somewhat disadvantaged, as I am sure the Minister realises, in that we are not aware of what amendments he is considering at present.

**The Hon. D. J. Hoppood:** None of a fundamental nature.

**Mr. WILSON:** That is very reassuring. I know that the Minister has received submissions on this Bill. Generally, my inquiries outside this place from interested parties reveal that the Bill is, in the main, well received. We all realise that the Bill is a necessity. Of course, the Minister cannot please everyone. Some organisations believe that they have probably been disadvantaged, but not very seriously. Nevertheless, very soon after the passage of this Bill there will be a Tertiary Education Authority of this nature in every State. Most States have already founded such authorities. This is very important in connection with the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission. I have spoken to Senator Carrick's office, which is very keen for these authorities to be set up in each State, because co-ordination is vitally necessary in connection with Commonwealth funding. It brings benefits to this State, too, because it will be possible to prevent the type of duplication of courses that we have had in the past, not through the fault of anyone in particular.

Institutions being what they are and Directors being what they are, there is a tendency to provide course content which duplicates the content provided elsewhere. This is very costly for the community and, with declining enrolments at tertiary institutions, there is no excuse for this sort of thing continuing. For example, I do not know how much longer the State can afford to have two schools of engineering. I cast no reflection on either school of engineering. I notice that the Minister of Education is smiling. I do not believe that this State can afford that type of duplication. I look forward to the implementation of this Bill, because such duplication will be one of the things that I hope will be corrected. The Bill is important in that it also differentiates between universities and the other bodies that come under the ambit of the legislation. The universities are not included in the third schedule, which includes the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, Hartley College of Advanced Education, Roseworthy Agricultural College, Salisbury College of Advanced Education, the South Australian Institute of Technology, Sturt College of Advanced Education, and the Further Education Department, which is a very important inclusion.

As the Minister said in his second reading explanation,

although it does not give the Tertiary Education Authority overriding control over the Further Education Department, nevertheless, a means of control is contained in the Bill. A distinction has been drawn between universities on the one hand and colleges and the Further Education Department on the other hand in regard to course approval.

For universities, course approval is granted by the Commonwealth Universities Commission. For those not familiar with the terms, I point out that "course approval" refers to the monetary consideration, as to whether a course can be provided, while "course accreditation" refers to the academic standard, as to whether a course meets a required academic standard. For universities, course approval is granted by the Commonwealth Universities Commission, whereas for the other institutions it is necessary for the courses to be approved at the State level by the Tertiary Education Authority, which will have the power to accredit courses given by colleges and the Further Education Department. However, universities will be empowered to accredit their own courses.

Secondly, it is proposed that post-secondary institutions will be obliged to ensure that the Tertiary Education Authority is aware of and can comment on their intentions in relation to teaching activities and related methods. It is not clear at present, and no doubt we will deal with this in Committee, whether this refers to research activities, as far as universities are concerned. The Minister and the House will be aware that universities guard their research rights very zealously. The Bill also provides that any post-secondary education institution will comply with directions given to it by the commission in the performance of its duties. Also, there will be a feed-back and a feeding of information to the institutions, so that the authority can better serve tertiary education in this State. At this stage I shall deal with only one clause—clause 12. That clause provides:

(1) The Authority may, in any appropriate case, by instrument in writing, delegate any of its powers or functions—

(a) to a post-secondary institution;

or

(b) to any committee or person.

(2) A delegation under this section shall be revocable at will and shall not prevent the Authority from acting in any matter itself.

I believe that the clause provides sweeping powers, namely:

The authority may . . . delegate to any committee or person any of its powers . . .

The Tertiary Education Authority will be a very important and powerful body, and for it to be able to delegate any of its powers to any committee or person is a very wide and sweeping provision indeed. I do not believe that the Minister would consider that anything untoward would occur under that clause but, as has been pointed out before, the Minister will not always be in his present position and there will in due course be another Minister of Education. That is a clause that Parliament should consider during the Committee stage.

One of the reasons for the clause is that the authority could give the power to any one of those institutions that I mentioned in the Third Schedule to accredit its own courses. That would be one of the main intentions of the delegatory clause. I have received a submission from the South Australian Institute of Technology, which is not as happy about this Bill as are the other institutions I have mentioned. I have had considerable contact in the past with the Institute of Technology, as has my predecessor Mr. John Coumbe, who is still a member of the institute

council. The submission states:

The council of the South Australian Institute of Technology has made known to the Minister of Education that it believes that the proposed legislation to establish the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia will extend the restriction of council's autonomy which began with the setting up of the Board of Advanced Education. Council accepts the need for co-ordination over the whole tertiary area and therefore welcomes TEASA in principle. But it is disappointed that the opportunity has not been taken to recognise the unique position of the institute and its special contribution to the State, by legislating for it a position distinct from both the universities and the other C.A.E.'s.

The institute, and its predecessor the School of Mines, had full academic autonomy for 80 years until the establishment of the B.A.E. For all of those years, it developed and validated its own courses, and made its awards which achieved wide recognition nationally and in some instances internationally. The quality of those courses was shown by the willingness of the University of Adelaide to co-operate with the institute for the 19 years from 1957 to 1975 in the joint Faculty of Technology arrangement whereby institute courses were approved to lead to the award of university degrees.

I can vouch for that, because I was for several years a member of that joint Faculty of Technology and Applied Science. The submission continues:

Nevertheless, for no reason ever advanced to the satisfaction of council, when the B.A.E. was set up it became mandatory for the institute, with all its experience of independent action, to have its courses academically validated by the B.A.E., which of course had no experience whatsoever. Since 1973 the institute has had over 57 post-graduate and undergraduate courses successfully accredited (academically validated) by the B.A.E. The board's policy, in fact, as expressed in its submission to the Anderson inquiry, became to move towards making its colleges self-accrediting.

That is a very important point.

There is little doubt that, if the board had still been in being in 1980, the institute would have been given that power of self-accreditation in implementation of that policy. Such an action would have returned to the institute, as an act of grace on the part of another organisation, the power which it had exercised in its own right for 80 years. The proposed TEASA Act would give the authority the power to delegate, which would enable it to delegate accrediting powers to the institute. But this again would be an act of grace; council believes that the Parliament should express its confidence in the institute by itself restoring to the institute the right to accredit its own awards . . .

I will save the rest of the submission for the more pertinent clauses in the legislation. The South Australian Institute of Technology is absolutely unique in the history of education in this State. It is the one institution that trains its diplomates and graduates for the work force, and it has been advocated by the trade unions and people on this side of politics that people should be educated for their work. Very rarely are the graduates or people who pass through the Institute of Technology unable to find employment, even in these troubled times. I believe because of that that the institute should receive special consideration and, depending on what amendments the Minister is considering, I would be prepared to move an amendment in the Committee stages. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

**ADJOURNMENT**

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday  
7 February at 2 p.m.