

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 25 October 1979

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3)

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

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 112 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by Mrs. Adamson and Mr. Becker.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Millhouse.

Petition received.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS

The **SPEAKER**: I advise the House that pursuant to section 187 of the Electoral Act, 1929, as amended, the Master of the Supreme Court has forwarded to the Clerk of the House a copy of a petition in the Court of Disputed Returns by Gregory John Crafter against the return of Frank Raymond Webster as a duly elected member to serve on the House of Assembly for the said district at the election held on 15 September 1979.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COAST PROTECTION

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment)**: I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: The member for Semaphore has been reported as stating that the Coast Protection Board has neglected the beaches in the Semaphore, Taperoo and Largs Bay area, and that the board is to blame for the occurrence of scrub, snakes and seaweed nuisance at these beaches. I am aware that the Port Adelaide council and the Coast Protection Board have previously discussed these matters and that there seems to be some misunderstanding of the board's area of responsibility. The Port Adelaide council has arranged to meet with me to discuss this matter.

There are problems at these beaches, and I am sure that the board will do its best to help solve these and to continue to assist the council to improve this foreshore for public enjoyment. However, it is unfair to say that the problems, which have existed for many years, are due to the board's neglect. The board encourages local councils to preserve natural coastal scrub, because this helps avoid sand drift and coastal erosion, and it assists councils to

provide walkways to beaches, but the board must rely on local authorities to manage these areas, which are placed under their care, control and management for this purpose.

The board has commissioned studies into the seaweed problem and into possible uses of the seaweed. These have shown that there were substantial seaweed accumulations even before the Outer Harbor breakwater was built. However, construction of the breakwater and the more recent construction of the North Haven breakwaters may have resulted in more seaweed on Taperoo Beach. The reports have been considered by the board and Port Adelaide council. This is one of the matters I will be discussing with the council.

The member for Semaphore has stated that other metropolitan councils have received more financial assistance from the Coast Protection Board than has been provided for the Semaphore area. This is to be expected, because some other council coastlines are eroding, whereas that at Semaphore is not. Money has needed to be spent on rock protection and sand replenishment for these coastlines. The member for Semaphore is incorrect in stating that \$500 000 has been spent on removing sand from the Semaphore area to Brighton and Glenelg. Between 1973 and 1977, \$148 289 was spent in removing sand from Taperoo and Semaphore to Brighton and Glenelg. No sand has since been taken from this area, but it may need to be considered for this summer's replenishment programme. Sand has mostly been obtained from the beach at Glenelg and from south of the Torrens outlet.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SERVICE TRANSFERS

Mr. BANNON: I would like to congratulate the Premier on his fresh appearance, which contrasts to the appearance of his colleagues. My question is directed to the Premier and also relates to his capacity as Minister of Ethnic Affairs. Who was involved, directly and indirectly, in the preparation of the list of people who were to be transferred from the Premier's Department and the ethnic affairs branch of the Department of Local Government? Why were some Public Service officers allowed to transfer to what have been described as core departments, while others were not allowed to do so? Was any inquiry carried out by the Public Service Board into the efficiency of these officers and, if not, where did the Premier and the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs obtain the information that led to the officers being transferred?

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I take it that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to both the ethnic affairs branch and the Premier's Department. Regarding the ethnic affairs branch, the matter was handled entirely by the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs. Regarding the Premier's Department, officers of the department and Commissioners of the Public Service Board were closely involved in the transfer of those people. The board was not requested to make any inquiry into the efficiency of those officers, as far as I know. It was simply a matter of finding suitable positions for them. Those positions have been found.

BUS DESTINATION SIGNS

Mr. MATHWIN: In the absence of the Minister of Transport, who has gone interstate on Ministerial

business, will the Premier investigate the possibility of restoring to State Transport Authority vehicles the destination signs which were removed hastily by the previous Government? The Premier will recall that the former Minister of Transport caused anxiety, concern, and distress to the general public, and great problems to pensioners and older people in the community, by removing destination signs from buses. People are expected to memorise streets, roads, subdivisions, crossings, local areas, and various landmarks by numbers. The past Minister, a great numbers man until the last election—

The SPEAKER: Order! Comment is not necessary.

Mr. MATHWIN: Very well, Sir. The Premier would know that placing the information at bus stops would not be satisfactory because of the work of vandals, and because some older people have difficulty in reading such information.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The subject of numbers and bus destination signs has been a matter of recent concern in the community, and one which is constantly brought forward to honourable members. Certainly, we will examine the prospect. I believe that it is not only important that people should be able to know, without difficulty, where the bus is going, but elderly people do have trouble reading notices at bus stops. Visitors and tourists in the city have difficulty in getting around.

Basically, the situation that the honourable member has raised in referring to the previous Minister of Transport is worthy of comment. There was a tendency for that Minister to take rather more interest or to exercise more direction in the affairs of the State Transport Authority. I believe that the proper place for that decision to be made is with the State Transport Authority itself. Accordingly, I will ask my colleague, the Minister of Transport, if he will again refer the matter to the S.T.A. for consideration.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTING

Mr. HAMILTON: Will the Premier request the Minister of Recreation and Sport to reconsider the Government's decision on Tuesday last regarding the lighting of Football Park, at West Lakes? Will the Minister call for submissions from all interested bodies and residents of West Lakes with a view to reaching a consensus agreement regarding lighting of the stadium? Yesterday, I received correspondence from Mr. A. M. Nottle, M.B.E., J.P.

Mr. Keneally: Was he the Liberal who disaffected from the Party?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes. He is Chairman of the West Lakes Action Committee, and his address is 7 Marlee Court, West Lakes. His letter, dated 24 October 1979, states:

On behalf of the residents of West Lakes, I wish to express our dissatisfaction over yesterday's announcement by the State Government concerning the above matter.

We are disappointed that the height of the posts are not being reduced. It is also felt that the 1 000 lux restriction is merely a "token" move by the Government and the lighting could easily be increased again to 1 500 lux unless the system is installed in such a manner as to prevent this.

We now have a situation that the Minister of Recreation and Sport has stated that telescopic lighting will cause environmental problems at Adelaide Oval (with its high-rise surroundings and low-level sporting field).

Surely, the environmental problem will be far greater at West Lakes. They do not propose to put telescopic columns in that flat area.

I draw attention, too, to the advertisement of the Liberal

Party candidate in the *Messenger* of Wednesday 12 September. The advertisement, headed "Lights not on at Football Park, says Liberal candidate," states:

Scale down the lights to suit the law—not the law to suit the league! How safe is your investment? Vote to protect your rights under the West Lakes indenture. Vote to save your lifestyle.

That was authorised by R. MacKenzie (who is unknown to me), of Amarina Court, Semaphore Park. I understand that the Premier, or his representatives, last night met with a delegation from the Woodville council. Will the Premier report on the outcome of that meeting?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The matter of lights at Football Park has been a vexed one, as the former Government found to its cost. The previous Government decided, quite bluntly, that the lights would be installed at Football Park. It then appointed a Royal Commission to decide the terms of reference on when and how the lights would be operated, and so on. The Royal Commission's report has been received and made public, and the conditions under which the lights will operate have been made clearly known. During the election campaign, it was a matter of concern to people living at West Lakes that the Royal Commission's report did not, perhaps, go far enough, given that the Government had decided that lights would be installed, anyway. Accordingly, it was agreed that the Liberal Party (and I think the Liberal candidate made this clear), if elected to Government, would re-examine the report of the Royal Commission, particularly in relation to the intensity of illumination, the height of the poles, and the possible screening.

There has been much consultation with people who have been concerned about this problem, as a result of which an undertaking has been given that the intensity of the lights will be reduced from 1 500 lux to 1 000 lux, a significant change from the position that would have applied had the previous Government been returned to office, because the lights would then have remained at exactly the same level without any modification whatsoever.

However, because I believe that a sensible compromise should be available, and because so many people in the community are concerned about this matter, I have asked the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Transport to convene a meeting tomorrow of all interested parties as a last attempt to reach a consensus of opinion. That meeting has been arranged for tomorrow morning, after which, I hope, a report can be made.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Chief Secretary tell the House whether the Government intends to introduce amending legislation to the Police Offences Act further to control the production and distribution of pornographic material, and whether it will be amending the criteria under which the Classification of Publications Board operates, so that the board can be given clear guidelines in the execution of its duties? Over recent months many members from both sides of the House have introduced petitions seeking clarification and action to be taken in this area. Even today I think another petition was presented seeking a tightening of the law. Has the Government plans to act in the immediate future and, if so, will the Chief Secretary tell the House when that action will be taken?

Mr. RODDA: A large number of South Australians share the concern being expressed by the member for Flinders. My colleague, the Attorney-General, is examining this matter in depth. The point raised by the

honourable member has been the subject of petitions and concern, and my colleague in the other place is examining it. When a decision is reached, I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member and the House accordingly.

SAVINGS BANK

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Premier say what discussions took place between the Chairman of the South Australian Savings Bank Board and himself before the announcement he made, at the celebration held to mark the one billionth dollar of savings lodged with the bank, that a new building would be built by the bank on the corner of Grenfell Street and Gawler Place? Also, did those discussions centre around current and future demands for office space in Adelaide? Some little time before I ceased being Premier, I had discussions with the Chairman of the South Australia Savings Bank Board, Mr. Bakewell, who made perfectly clear to me at that time that the current and future demand for office space in Adelaide (although I have seen something in the press that tends to suggest a different view), was such that he could not recommend to me that the bank should proceed with that building. I accepted that recommendation. Therefore, I had no intention, had I been involved in those celebrations, of announcing such a building; in other words, construction was to be deferred or delayed. Did the Chairman of the bank draw the Premier's attention to that matter, and if he did, what forecast did he give the Premier and what was the Premier's reaction?

The Hon D. O. TONKIN: The decision regarding a new building for the Savings Bank of South Australia was made by the board. The Chairman of the board informed me of that decision, and suggested that it would be a propitious time at the dinner celebration to make that announcement, so I agreed to do so. The availability of office space in Adelaide was discussed briefly. There has been a considerable change in forward projection, and the information now available is that, on present projections, there will be a shortage of office space in Adelaide by 1982. I understand the concern of the member for Hartley, because the last thing he would want would be to see office space unoccupied in this city. There is no doubt that, by the time this bank building has been completed and is ready for occupation, it, will be filling a need, and there is no reason to suppose it will not be fully let.

MANUFACTURING BUSINESS

Mr. LEWIS: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs outline the incentives that this Government is offering any new manufacturing businesses to establish in South Australia? What additional incentives are there to employ apprentices instead of unskilled labour or tradesmen? Are even further incentives to be provided by the Government if such businesses are set up in a country town and employ people living there? What Government instrumentalities could be approached to provide advice or assistance to entrepreneurs interested in establishing this type of business in this State, and what advice and/or assistance do they respectively provide?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will briefly run through the range of industrial incentives now offered by the South Australian Government. Perhaps the most important one in terms of the establishment of new businesses is the establishment payments scheme or the "carrot" scheme, on which I have commented briefly and to which, I understand, an allocation of up to \$1 500 000 could be

made this financial year. I draw members' attention to the line in the Budget which shows a total of \$6 000 000 allocated overall for industrial incentives. That sum includes part of the pay-roll tax rebate.

The Leader of the Opposition has deliberately created confusion about this matter. He said last weekend that he could see only a total allocation in the Budget of \$3 000 000 for pay-roll tax incentives. The member was so ignorant in making that statement that he did not acknowledge the fact that at least two-thirds of the scheme required no collection of the money, so that there was no need to put any allocation in the Budget lines whatsoever. It is an exemption from pay-roll tax, and to talk about putting such a sum in the Budget would have been quite stupid. The claim that he could find only half the allocation for our actual cost can be clearly explained because it is an exemption rather than a rebate.

The honourable member referred to an industry establishing in the country. The State Government has increased substantially the benefits for industries (including established industries) establishing in this State. For a decentralised industry, as suggested by the honourable member, the Liberal Government has promised a rebate of pay-roll tax and land tax. Full details of that will be announced soon.

In fact, this afternoon the Premier is introducing legislation which will allow that scheme to operate under the Pay-roll Tax Act. Under that scheme, any company a certain distance from Adelaide paying pay-roll tax will receive a complete rebate of pay-roll tax. That goes substantially further than anything the previous Government ever offered for decentralised industry. The poor incentives offered by the previous Government allowed Adelaide and South Australia to become the most centralised State of any State of Australia, there having been a 3 per cent increase in the number of people living in the metropolitan area compared to the rest of the State.

In addition to those incentives offered by the State Government, there is an offer of guarantees and of loans to companies. Also, the South Australian Housing Trust will examine propositions to establish a factory where appropriate and, as the honourable member said, in a country area the trust will also look at establishing any additional housing that is needed.

The member has asked where applications for Government guarantees and loans should be made. They should be made to the South Australian Development Corporation. Applications under the Establishment Payments Scheme, and for the decentralisation rebates of pay-roll tax and land tax, companies should contact the Department of Trade and Industry or my Ministerial office. I urge any company about to expand its operations (and I know many are currently examining that possibility) or companies about to establish in South Australia for the first time to get in touch with the Department of Trade and Industry, which will assist them in relation to all the various incentives that can be offered by the Government, whether they are offered and administered by that department or by another department.

The honourable member specifically referred to the incentives now offered by the new Government in relation to the employment of young people. This afternoon the Premier will introduce legislation that seeks to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act to allow an exemption from pay-roll tax for all additional people employed under the age of 20 years. In addition to that, a scheme will be administered by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment that will mean a rebate of \$150 a quarter for every one additional full-time employee taken on under the age of 20 years.

Mr. Bannon: How long does it operate for?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It operates for 12 months.

Mr. Bannon: What if the person turns 20 during the 12 months?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It will still apply for a full 12 months from the date on which the person is engaged, provided that the person stays in employment during that period.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible comment from both sides of the House.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: A sum of \$150 a quarter, or \$600 a year, is involved for the first person taken on. For an additional full-time person under the age of 20 who is taken on, the benefit is \$1 800 a year. That, as I believe all members can see, is a substantial way of helping this State's special unemployment problem. If every company in South Australia that currently pays pay-roll tax takes on one additional employee under the scheme, additional employment for about 6 000 people could be created. Of course, if two people are taken on by each company, permanent employment could be created for an additional 12 000 people.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is trying to answer a question asked by the member for Mallee.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I suggest that, before the Leader of the Opposition makes any further statement about this matter, he look in detail at the proposal that has been put forward. Certain aspects of the scheme will operate for two years, and details of that will be released this afternoon by the Premier. The important point is that realistic benefits are available to encourage additional employment in this State. This Government has given the scheme top priority, and I believe that it will be effective.

FOOTBALL PARK LIGHTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question to the Premier is supplementary to a question asked earlier by the member for Albert Park. With whom did the Government consult over the lights at Football Park before it made the decision, announced by the Minister of Recreation and Sport in this House last Tuesday? Yesterday, the gentlemen mentioned by the member for Albert Park, Mr. MacKenzie, called to see the Hon. Mr. Milne and me about this matter, and he handed me a pamphlet that was put out by the West Lakes Action Committee before the elections. The pamphlet, headed "What the Parties have to say about floodlighting Football Park", states:

The short answer is: Liberals and Democrats, No lights!

Labor, Yes, Lights up, up, up.

From the tenor of the member for Albert Park's question, it seems that it is not only the Liberals but also the Labor Party that can change their minds about these matters after an election. I was also given a copy of the minutes of a meeting of the Woodville council, held last Monday night. The council had received a letter from the Minister of Marine dated 5 October (less than three weeks ago), part of which stated:

For your information the following recommendation was adopted by the Liberal Party and released as a policy statement during the recent election campaign:

"The Liberal Party—

(a) expresses concern that the proposal to erect floodlights at Football Park would entail legislation which affects land rights of residents in the West Lakes area;

(b) expresses concern that the four towers proposed are

230 ft. high and contain floodlights which would be as bright as any installation in sporting arenas in the world and nearly twice as bright as those of V.F.L. Park at Waverley; and

(c) resolves that before and Liberal Government introduced such legislation it would investigate whether the towers could be lowered, the lights dimmed in intensity, and what methods of screening could be introduced to lessen the inconvenience to nearby residents."

The Minister wrote that letter since the election and since his taking office. The letter ended as follows:

Your correspondence is receiving consideration, and I shall write again to arrange a meeting with a committee of council to discuss the matter in the very near future.

The next that they knew about it was the announcement made by the Minister in this House last Tuesday. It is obvious that someone had got at the Government to get it to worm out of its promises made before the election. I wonder who are the people so influential as to be able to change, in less than three weeks, an understanding which was given before the election and which has been repeated since by one of the Ministers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The letter written by the Chief Secretary sums up the position as I outlined it before, in reply to the member for Albert Park.

Mr. Millhouse: Michael Wilson didn't say anything about it on Tuesday.

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As a result of representations made by members of the Woodville council, and because we are concerned to get every interested party together so that they can put forward a point of view and, hopefully, come to a solution to the problem which is acceptable to everyone (and that might not be easy), the meeting has been arranged for tomorrow.

Mr. Millhouse: He didn't say that the other day.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Minister of Transport will be at tomorrow's meeting, as will the Chief Secretary. Because of the commitments that were given, we hope that people will be able to get around the conference table and come to a proper and a reasonable compromise. Unfortunately, feelings on the matter are running high on both sides. Whatever compromise is reached, no-one will be totally satisfied, but I believe that that is the essence of compromise, and it is the obvious responsibility of the Ministers involved to make every effort to ensure that that compromise is reached.

NOVAR GARDENS LAND

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Premier give an assurance that the land purchased from Lightburn and Co. Pty. Ltd., at Morphet Road, Novar Gardens, for use by the Housing Trust, is not to be rezoned from residential back to light industrial use? During January 1978, the previous Labor Government purchased the land, which was formerly owned by Lightburn and Co., of Novar Gardens, for the sum of \$1 174 000. The same parcel of land had changed hands 17 months earlier, when the purchase price was \$800 000. For the information of members, I point out that this purchase by the Government allowed the vendor to make a profit of some \$334 000, a 47 per cent capital gain on the money over 17 months, which is not bad with taxpayers' money.

The property was purchased to enable the Housing Trust to build new dwellings and cottage flats, which will

be offered for sale and rent. It was planned to commence work in the 1979-80 financial year. The land was subsequently rezoned to allow this development to take place, but since the election I have received numerous letters and deputations in which residents of Novar Gardens have expressed concern as to the future use of the land following the change of Government. While the motive behind the previous Government's rush to establish this as a low-cost housing area is debatable, a great deal of work went into having the land rezoned from light industrial to residential. The public disquiet has resulted from a Labor Party newsletter circulated during the campaign. It was not dropped in my letter box.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Morphett is now straying rather wide and is starting to comment.

Mr. OSWALD: I come back to the subject. I shall quote a letter which explains the disquiet in the area. It is from one of my constituents, and it states:

The purpose of this letter is to express my concern with a statement relating to the 22-acre area of vacant land immediately north of the Police Department transport depot, Morphett Road, Novar Gardens. The residents of Novar Gardens have desperately fought to have this land rezoned from general industry to residential.

An election campaign letter from the Labor Party stated: "The residential development which is not scheduled until the 1980-81 financial year is opposed by the Liberal Party and Mr. Tonkin also in the *Advertiser* newspaper has called for the return of such parcels of land to industry for industrial development. The Liberal Party evidently believes the residential development to be a waste of money."

In the light of that newsletter and the disquiet that it has created, will the Premier give a clear indication of Government policy regarding this land and, if this was an A.L.P. rumour to promote fear and win votes, will he strongly refute it?

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier to reply, I indicate to members on both sides that it is not necessary to restate a question once it has been asked.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was amazed to hear the honourable member's quoting of that letter, which comes from an A.L.P. source, but I am not surprised, really, considering the tactics that have been adopted in the community ever since the Labor Party lost the last election. I have heard, for instance, that the Queen Victoria Hospital will close because we have been elected. I have heard the most terrible rumours including one that there is a shockingly low morale in the Public Service.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I heard the opposite only this morning.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have heard exactly the opposite, that the Public Service is working extremely well and efficiently. It has our total support. Efforts of members opposite to try to stir up a false sense of lack of morale certainly do them no credit whatever. I turn to the undertakings that the member for Morphett has asked for. His question does him credit, and his representation of his district is a great improvement on the previous representation of that district.

The trust has no information to hand which suggests that the Government, local council or organised residents' groups are proposing that the subject land be rezoned from residential to industrial. Currently, the Housing Trust is engaged in negotiations with the previous owner and the corporation of West Torrens in an endeavour to resolve an issue relating to stormwater disposal. It is not envisaged that this matter will in any way hold up the residential development proposal put forward by the trust. There is no question of the land reverting back to

industrial use. The development scheme proposed that 152 new dwellings will be erected on the site, including 36 cottage flat units for elderly persons.

Mr. Payne: As I announced before the election.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am well aware that the member for Mitchell made this announcement. For that reason, I doubly condemn the false and misleading statements made by Labor Party representatives in that area, for they should have known what was happening.

Apart from the cottage flats, all dwellings will be capable of sale. Consideration will be given nearer the time of completion to allocation of the properties for rental or sale purposes. All of the cottages will be available for sale. The total cost of the project is of the order of \$5 250 000.

Application has just been made to the Director of Planning for subdivision approval for the development and the West Torrens council has already granted formal consent to the proposal to construct 36 cottage flats. Pending the outcome of negotiations (on the stormwater problem that I referred to before), it is anticipated that the cottage flat development may be commenced late in the 1979-80 financial year and the first stage of the remaining development in 1980-81.

URANIUM SPEECH

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Deputy Premier say why the Mines Department sent an officer to Flinders University yesterday to tape-record, without my consent, a speech I made against uranium mining? What was the name of the person who instructed and authorised the officer to attend the meeting and tape the speech? What was the name of the officer who attended the meeting and taped the speech? Was the officer who attended the meeting a public servant? Has the tape of the speech been transcribed, or is it being transcribed by an officer of the Mines Department? Who is the officer who transcribed or is transcribing the tape of the speech? Who instructed or authorised the officer to transcribe the tape of the speech? Is it the Government's or the Minister's policy to use public servants for political spying in this manner? Why have officers of the Mines Department kept political dossiers on individuals and members of Parliament? If the Government was unaware of this action, what steps will the Government take to ensure that political spying will not be tolerated in this State? Particularly, will the Government assure the House that public servants will not be used or permitted to be involved in political activity and spying on members of this House? With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House I seek to explain my question.

Mr. Mathwin: Questions.

The SPEAKER: "Question" having been called, I call on the Deputy Premier.

Mr. DUNCAN: You bastard, Perce.

The SPEAKER: I call on the honourable member for Elizabeth to withdraw that unparliamentary comment.

Mr. DUNCAN: I withdraw, Sir.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point or order, Sir, I did not intend to call "Question".

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders require that "Question" having been called the question will be put forthwith.

Mr. MATHWIN: It was not called, Sir. On a point of order, with due respect, Mr. Speaker, I said "Questions". I was indicating that the honourable member had asked a number of questions, and not a question.

The SPEAKER: I will accept the explanation of the honourable member for Glenelg, I take the opportunity of indicating to all members that it is extremely important, in any interjection (and, after all, interjections are out of order), to make sure that a connotation such as was taken by the Chair should not be possible. I restore the opportunity for the member for Elizabeth to briefly explain the question.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sir, and I apologise to my friend, the member for Glenelg, for my untimely outburst. I believe this is a particularly serious matter, and does not simply involve me. Yesterday, I went to Flinders University to speak to a meeting that had been organised by students on the question of uranium mining. Following the meeting I received a telephone call at Parliament House from a person at Flinders University who told me that he had had a conversation with a person who had tape-recorded the contents of my speech and who said that he was an assistant to the Director-General of the Mines Department, and that he had been instructed to go to Flinders University to tape the contents of the speech that I made. I think that that is an example of political spying by public—

The SPEAKER: I would ask the honourable member not to comment.

Mr. DUNCAN: Indeed I will not, Sir. The Mines Department appears to have been involved in an attempt to develop a dossier on the comments that I made at Flinders University yesterday. The election of this Government is only six weeks behind us, and already we find that the rights of citizens to make statements on political issues in this society seem to be under threat, and particularly under surveillance. I am concerned that the freedoms of members of this House are obviously seriously challenged by yesterday's spy episode, and this is of such seriousness that the Government should give the House an unqualified assurance that the rights of members of this place and of the community will not be infringed into this manner in future, and in particular it should assure the House that public servants will never again be used for political spying or for other political purposes.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Deputy Premier to answer the question, I would indicate that the Chair recognises it as a single question, albeit that it had many facets. The form in which the question was put to the House was not such as is normal in Question Time. I ask all honourable members in future to contain their questions to a simple question rather than a many-headed question, such as the member for Elizabeth has just asked.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know nothing at all of the incident, and it would appear that the lengthy explanation was based on hearsay.

FESTIVAL CENTRE CAR PARK

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister of Public Works find out the cost of damage caused to the exit area of the Festival Centre car park during the early hours of Wednesday morning, 24 October, and whether the damage has been reported and restitution made to the Festival Theatre Trust? Many members observed an incident on Wednesday morning in which a vehicle came into collision with the boom and steel gate at the exit to the Festival Centre car park but did not stop following the collision. This caused damage to the boom in particular, and much inconvenience to those following. An officer of this House was required to unlock the gates to enable the other cars to leave. I am fearful that an incident such as

this could possibly jeopardise the privilege that we enjoy in relation to this car park.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will certainly obtain a report on the aspects raised by the honourable member. It would concern me, if what he said is true, that a member of this House should damage wilfully public property and in damaging public property that member did not even—

Mr. KENEALLY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask for your ruling, Sir. First, the question was asked about a boom gate at the car park. That is not part of Parliament House, and I wonder whether it is the business of this House. Secondly, the question did not mention that the person who damaged the boom gate was a member of Parliament. I wonder whether, first, it is in order for the Minister to answer such a question and, secondly, to reflect on a member of Parliament who was not the subject of the question.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. The area so concerned is under contract to a Minister of the House, and therefore it comes within the broad ambit of the affairs of this Parliament. Ministers replying to questions are responsible for the veracity of their statements, and I cannot uphold the point of view that the Minister is answering a question which was not asked of him if, in fact, that be the case.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: As Minister of Public Works the matter does come under my responsibility, and the repair costs will have to come out of the lines for the Public Works Department.

The fact that I referred to a member of Parliament was simply because I had heard reports, which I will confirm when investigating this matter, that a member of Parliament was involved. I simply continue to make the point that, if a member of Parliament was involved and wilfully damaged public property and did not have the courtesy, let alone the common sense, to stop, I think it is a serious offence. I will certainly obtain information about the incident.

HOSPITALITY REGISTER

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Tourism say when the feasibility study into a register of home owners prepared to accept tourists will be undertaken? The study was part of the Liberal Party policy statement on tourism before the State election. Can the Minister elaborate on the purpose of the proposed scheme and how it will assist tourists in this State?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The honourable member has certainly exhibited great anxiety to hear the fine detail of Liberal policy, when we have been barely six weeks in office. That tourist policy obviously will be implemented over a three-year period. The particular programme that was in mind when that policy was enunciated, namely, to establish a hospitality register, was put forward on the basis that South Australians are renowned for their personal hospitality to visitors. I think this is one unique aspect of this State which we could rightly promote. I am not in a position to say at this stage when that feasibility study will be established. I would like to see it established as a matter of priority because I think that one of the things that we are trying to promote within Australia and within South Australia is that people should see and understand their own State and nation. I would like to try to attract tourists from other States.

The cost of accommodation is such that families would be more inclined to travel if they could find low-cost accommodation, and this feasibility study would be based on the notion that families, in particular families in school

holidays, would be wanting to find low-cost accommodation in various parts of the State. Therefore, as soon as the study is put into effect the better. It may well be that such a proposal is not feasible, but our belief is that South Australians are renowned for their hospitality and they would want to open their homes to visitors. I said as a matter of principle when I received this portfolio that I would like to think that every visitor to this State would feel as welcome and well looked after as would a guest in my own home.

I think many other South Australians share that attitude, and we could make it quite something for this State if we could establish such a system and register. In view of the fact that the honourable member has evinced such interest in the feasibility study, I will put it to the Director of Tourism as an item that should be regarded as a priority by the excellent research and development section of the Department of Tourism and will wait and see what results from that.

HOME HANDYMAN SCHEME

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say whether any application has been received from the Marion council for an additional grant under the home handyman scheme and, if it has, has approval been given for such a grant? Approval for the additional grant is necessary to allow the completion of the work listed by that council before those presently employed under the scheme are released.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The home handyman scheme was devised under the SURS grants which allowed funds of up to \$10 000 to be allocated to each individual local government authority. Those funds could then be allocated to unemployed people to do work on certain types of homes for under-privileged people.

An allocation was made on 10 September, just before the 15 September election, involving an additional sum of \$350 000. I accept the assurances of the former Minister of Labour and Industry that it was a coincidence that this happened only five days before the election. As I said in the House yesterday, the present Government has undertaken to uphold previous commitments under the SURS scheme and will uphold that allocation of \$350 000.

A letter has been received from the Marion council requesting additional funds. I understand that the council has already received \$10 000 from a previous application. Although that application is still being considered, an interim allocation of \$5 000 has already been decided and approved by Cabinet. So, Marion council has a further specific grant, at this stage, of \$5 000.

I remind the House that so far there have been very few applications from local government authorities for handyman grants under this allocation. The Government has allocated \$350 000, and I urge members to get in touch with local government authorities and ask them, if they wish to participate in this scheme, to lodge applications with the department. I believe that the scheme is good in terms of helping under-privileged people to repair their homes.

The people involved are usually pensioners, aged or under-privileged people. The work is done on the basis that the home can be repaired or repainted, but there must be a labour component of at least 70 per cent of the cost allocation of each job. I ask members to go back to local authorities and to urge them to submit applications. If allocation of \$10 000 is made to each authority, a large number of allocations can be made throughout the State.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. TRAINER: Has the Premier decided yet whether he will table in the House the Allert Report on the Bank of Adelaide, which was commissioned by the previous Government, particularly in view of the strong sentiments expressed by staff members at last night's meeting concerning the A.N.Z. merger.

Is the Premier aware of this meeting last night of the staff of the Bank of Adelaide, held at the instigation of senior levels of management of the bank, at which a suggestion was put to the staff that they should act against their own interests by placing an advertisement in the press calling upon members of this Parliament to refrain from carrying out any examination of the fate of this major South Australian economic institution and also calling upon unnamed businessmen (presumably including Mr. A. A. Scott of Mount Gambier) to withdraw their proposal to save the bank and its employees?

Further, is the Premier aware that the motion concerning this proposed advertisement to support the A.N.Z. merger was soundly defeated by a majority of over 90 per cent when put to the bank's staff at last night's meeting?

On 16 October, the Premier, when asked by the member for Hartley to table the Allert Report, said that he would consider the request. On 17 October, when asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whether he had decided, the Premier replied that the matter was still under consideration. In this morning's *Advertiser*, a report of a staff meeting of about 300 staff members, convened by senior management staff, stated:

South Australia Bank of Adelaide staff yesterday rejected a proposal to insert an advertisement in the *Advertiser* supporting a merger with the A.N.Z. banking group. The decision was made at a meeting of about 300 staff to discuss the merger and the staff provident fund.

The proposal was that the advertisement costing about \$700 should be put in the *Advertiser* tomorrow. It is believed that only between 20 and 30 of the estimated 300 at the meeting in the bank's head office voted in favor . . .

Several of the staff who attended the meeting told the *Advertiser* they were surprised by the proposal and claimed the meeting had been called only to discuss the merger and matters relating to the provident fund . . .

In view of the appearance that something untoward may have happened with respect to the staff being pressured to support a merger that does not seem to be in their interests, and in view of the staff's concern with "matters relating to the provident fund", will the Premier now table the Allert Report, because he has had over a week to consider its tabling?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not aware of any of the details of the meeting of bank officers that was held last night. Although I was aware of the report in the press, I do not know any other details. I have examined the situation regarding the so-called Allert Report. The report is technical; it was one of the papers which was prepared for Treasury and on which I have based my decision to make a statement to this House on the Thursday before the meeting of shareholders, in which I outlined the possibilities that were open to shareholders at that meeting. Those possibilities included two proposals, one of which honourable members would be aware, put forward by Mr. Holmes a Court; the other was a fallback position put forward by friends of the bank, the business men to whom the honourable member has alluded.

In putting forward those fallback positions as they were before the meeting of shareholders, I did so knowing that the propositions were possible and viable. The Allert

Report, among other things, made it possible for me to put them forward as viable fallback positions. I have examined the report, which, as I have said, is a technical one. The conclusions that were reached by way of advice to Treasury in answering a number of questions on the bank's financial situation and feasibility led me to put forward the fallback positions, thus permitting the Government to support those fallback positions where it was indicated. I do not see why the report should be released to this House and I do not intend to do so.

SURS

Mr. RUSSACK: In light of the personal explanation made yesterday in this House by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (the former Minister of Labour and Industry) concerning the allocation of SURS funds for political purposes, can the Minister of Industrial Affairs present facts to substantiate his own claims?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes; I have taken out some figures. The former Minister of Labour and Industry made claims in this House yesterday that funds had not been allocated under the SURS scheme on a political basis. As an example, I refer to figures for approvals granted by the former Labor Government on 27 August 1979, about 2½ weeks before the election. Of that total allocation of \$744 000, I have worked out what allocation went to Labor districts and Liberal districts. The figures are as follows:—

Mr. Keneally: Where do you think the unemployed are—in the Liberal electorates? Don't be so stupid!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I suggest that the honourable member listen to what I have to say. First, his Deputy Leader and his former Leader both claimed yesterday that funds had not been allocated on a political basis. Before the honourable member makes any statement, I suggest that he listen to the figures. In Labor districts, \$595 000 was allocated. In Liberal districts, \$124 000 was allocated. An additional \$25 000 was allocated on the border of Liberal and Labor districts. I also point out that, in two districts in which Liberal applications were made and approvals granted, \$74 000 was allocated in the marginal seat of Eyre and \$50 000 in the so-called marginal seat of Mt. Gambier. There was no allocation whatsoever to what one would call safe Liberal seats. That clearly substantiates the point I made to the House yesterday. It is interesting to note the embarrassment that this causes members opposite.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The funds were clearly allocated on a political basis. It is interesting to note that such substantial funds were allocated just before an election.

As I said in answer to a previous question from the member for Brighton, other additional funds were announced only two weeks before the election. I suggest that the former Minister of Labour and Industry should be ashamed of making such an unsubstantiated personal explanation as that he made to the House yesterday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FESTIVAL CENTRE CAR PARK

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to

maintain the requirement that he should make only a personal explanation.

Mr. DUNCAN: Indeed I will. During Question Time today, the member for Todd asked a question of the Minister of Public Works concerning an accident in which I was involved in the outlet to the car park at the rear of Parliament House. For the record, I want to place before the House the facts of the matter. It was not a case of my vehicle being driven through the boom gate. The boom gate was up, and lowered itself automatically on to the top of my car. There was no person in authority in the car park at the time, and it was not possible to report the matter then to any individual. Therefore, of course, I was unable to do so.

I was under the impression, which I still believe to be correct, that the car park is under the authority of the Festival Centre Trust. I have sent a letter, through my electorate office, to the General Manager of the Festival Centre Trust, advising him of the facts. I believed that that was the proper and appropriate step in the circumstances and that has been done. I think, quite frankly, that raising such a trivial matter in this House is about the dirtiest thing I have seen since I have been here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

GIFT DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Gift Duty Act, 1968-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill forms part of the Government's programme of legislative and administrative measures designed to promote economic development by reducing the incidence of State taxation. It is consequential upon the decision to abolish succession duty, for it is the Government's belief that a substantial portion of gift duty is incurred through persons dispossessing themselves of property, by gift, in order to avoid succession duty on their estates. The object of the Bill is to exempt from gift duty all gifts made on or after the first day of January 1980. Its effect will be to enhance still further the attraction and retention of private capital funds in South Australia.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal, and clause 2 exempts gifts made on or after the first day of January 1980 from gift duty, and provides that no such gift shall be taken into account in assessing the duty on a gift made before that date.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give a much-needed stimulus to the housing industry in this State and to assist those who are

faced with the expense of acquiring and furnishing their first home. With respect to the urgent need for recovery in the housing industry, let me illustrate the current position, and the events leading to it, by reference to the official figures.

Throughout 1975 and 1976, the growth in new dwelling commencements in South Australia was dramatic. In the former year, annual growth was 8.7 per cent and in the latter it was an extraordinary 19.1 per cent. In the next year, 1977, construction fell by 29 per cent to 11 340 new homes. In 1978, a further fall of 29 per cent was recorded, and the number of new homes commenced was only 8 048.

This decline has continued well into 1979, with the number of commencements in the first half of the year being 15.7 per cent lower than for the corresponding period last year and 54 per cent lower than the corresponding period just three years ago. Admittedly, there has been a decline in housing construction throughout Australia, but the intensity of this decline has been far greater and more prolonged in this State than elsewhere.

In 1977, when new dwelling commencements throughout Australia fell by only 10.3 per cent, the same index in South Australia fell by 29 per cent or nearly three times as much. In the next year, 1978, commencements throughout Australia fell by only 11.6 per cent, but in South Australia they dropped by another 29 per cent. In the first half of calendar year 1979, commencements in South Australia have fallen by a further 15.7 per cent and yet have shown a positive growth throughout the nation of over 7 per cent.

Moreover, since 1976, when South Australia's share of new dwelling commencements was 11.1 per cent of the national total, our relative position has fallen sharply. This State's share of new dwellings, declined to 8.8 per cent in 1977, to 7.1 per cent in 1978, and to a critically low 5.7 per cent in the first half of this year.

So, on the evidence presented by those official figures from the Bureau of Statistics, it is unmistakably clear that the South Australian housing construction industry has fallen on hard times. Its predicament is urgent and, accordingly, the steps taken to restore its levels of activity must be both substantial and immediate. This Bill meets those criteria. I ask leave to have the remainder of the explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The associated problem that is of major concern to the Government, the effects of which will be relieved to a considerable extent by this Bill, is the matter of rising house building costs. Regrettably, the new Government has inherited a situation in which rising costs in this area are outstripping the increases in most other commodities. Since June 1978, the rate of price increase of materials used in house building in Adelaide has been 38 per cent greater than the national average, and 25 per cent greater than Sydney, which recorded the second highest increase in this period. To add to this problem, South Australians in the same period received a rise in average weekly earnings that was 17 per cent lower than the national average.

Clearly, therefore, the combined effect of having the fastest rising house building costs, and a lower than average rise in purchasing power, has compounded the problems of the building industry, and added to the difficulties of the intending home buyer. This Bill will not solve the problem of price rises. That is not its object. But

it will offset the effect of a substantial portion of building price increases by relieving the first home buyer of a considerable tax burden.

The Bill provides for a complete exemption from duty where the consideration is \$30 000 or less; where the consideration exceeds that amount, there will be a reduction of \$580 in the amount of duty payable. The concessions proposed in the Bill extend also to a conveyance of shares in a home-unit company.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments will come into operation on the first day of November 1979. Clause 3 removes redundant provisions from section 71 of the principal Act. Clause 4 enacts the new stamp duty concessions in respect of the purchase of a new home. New subsection (1) of the proposed section 71c sets out the criteria that must be satisfied if applicants are to qualify for the concession. These are as follows:

- (a) The applicants must be natural persons;
- (b) They must have entered into the contract for purchase of the land or shares to which the conveyance relates on or after 15 September 1979;
- (c) They must be the sole purchasers of the land or shares;
- (d) They must have entered into a contract for the construction of a dwellinghouse as their principal place of residence within three months of its completion, or, where there is already a dwellinghouse on the land, they must intend to occupy it as their principal place of residence within three months of the date of the conveyance;
- (e) None of the applicants may have had any previous possessory interest in a dwellinghouse;
- (f) None of the applicants is permitted to have previously received the benefit of the new provision.

The concession does not apply to a dwellinghouse that forms part of industrial or commercial premises. It will, however, apply to the conveyance of a perpetual lease.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is central to the Government's strategy for stimulating employment in South Australia. It is designed to provide a legal framework under which pay-roll tax concessions can be directed towards employers who expand employment opportunities. In broad outline, the Bill contains three exemption provisions.

The first of these will raise the general exemption from pay-roll tax from \$66 000 to \$72 000 as from 1 January 1980. A corresponding increase is made in the minimum deduction, raising it from \$29 700 to \$32 400. The second provision proposes exemption from pay-roll tax in respect of the wages of employees aged less than 20 years who are engaged after 30 September 1979. The third provision proposes a system of rebating a portion of pay-roll tax to those firms that increase their total employment after 30 September 1979, by engaging either one or two additional employees aged less than 20 years.

The effect of raising the general exemption from \$66 000 to \$72 000, and increasing all pay-rolls within the

tapering range by a corresponding proportion, will be to "index" tax liability against the continuing increase in wages and salaries. It will mean that, on any fixed pay-roll within the tapering scale (and they, it should be remembered, are the pay-rolls of small enterprises which are especially vulnerable to economic fluctuations), pay-roll tax liability will be reduced by \$500. For larger firms, which are eligible for the flat exemption, pay-roll tax liability on a fixed amount will be reduced by \$135.

The fact is, of course, that in those enterprises where employment numbers remain constant, the size of pay-rolls is continually increasing, due to wage and salary rises. The effect of "indexing" pay-roll tax liability in these circumstances is to cushion the total impact of wage rise and so reduce the level of unemployment that is caused solely by them. On an annual pay-roll, for example, of \$100 000, existing pay-roll tax is \$2 833, but by increasing the maximum exemption level as proposed this amount will reduce to \$2 133. The saving of \$500 can thus be used to offset a substantial portion of the extra \$750 that any employer, with a business this size, could reasonably expect to pay over the course of this year in increased pay-roll tax as a result of escalating wages and salaries.

The special youth employment exemptions proposed in this Bill are a new concept—indeed, I venture to say they are the most imaginative and ambitious contribution yet made by any State Government to tackle the problem of youth unemployment. They are based upon the view that permanent job creation will be achieved only by increasing the levels of economic activity and profitability within our community, that is, by increasing the capacity of employers to engage more staff.

That view is, of course, rejected by the Opposition, which both now and in Government was intent upon reducing economic activity and reducing business profitability. As a consequence, South Australia now has the highest rate of unemployment, the highest rate of youth unemployment, and the highest rate of emigration amongst all the States. That record of performance is absolutely unacceptable to the new Government and, accordingly, every action will be taken to generate permanent job opportunities for the youth of the State.

The first step, as outlined in this Bill, will be to exempt from pay-roll tax the wages of all persons aged less than 20 who are employed after 30 September 1979, who are employed in a full-time capacity, and whose employment constitutes an addition to the total work force of their establishment. This measure is designed to provide an immediate stimulus to the employment of young people, and, judging by the response already received in my office, it will do just that.

One large firm based in Adelaide has indicated a willingness to employ a further 50 junior staff promptly, because this policy represents a saving on additional pay-roll tax of approximately \$15 000 in a full year. Another medium-to-large firm has indicated that an additional 24 young people will be employed over three successive weeks at a total annual saving of approximately \$7 200.

Numerous smaller firms have also indicated they are willing to employ just one or two additional youths, and so qualify for the exemption from additional pay-roll tax of approximately \$300 per employee.

The Government will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this scheme and, at a later date and within the context of its overall budgetary considerations, will consider an extension and possible expansion of the scheme beyond 30 September 1981. For this reason the Bill therefore allows for some details to be worked out by regulation. This will allow flexibility of administration and enable the Government to deal efficiently with any future extensions that may be decided.

As I have said, the exemption from tax of additional wages has been designed as a stimulus to further job creation. The Government is of the view, however, that youth unemployment is so chronically high that special inducements are also needed if the problem is to be tackled swiftly. Accordingly, the Bill also provides for a system of rebating pay-roll tax by means of refund.

Over a full year, any firm whose total employment is increased by engaging one full-time employee aged less than 20 will qualify for a special exemption of \$12 000 from the total pay-roll on which tax is payable. Similarly, any firm which increases total employment by engaging two full-time employees, each of whom is aged less than 20, will qualify for a special exemption of \$36 000.

Over a full year, any firm employing one additional youth will receive a rebate of \$600 and any firm employing two will receive a rebate of \$1 800. The combined saving of exempting additional wages from the imposition of pay-roll tax and the special rebates I have described, amounts to approximately \$900 in the case of a firm that puts on one additional young person, and to approximately \$2 400 in the case of any firm that engages two additional young people. Thereafter, the saving is equal to the sum of \$2 400 plus \$300 for every additional employee.

In practical terms, and on the basis of an average income per junior of \$6 000 a year, this Bill offers to every employer willing to engage two more young people a subsidy in a full year that is equivalent to the payment of the first 10 weeks of employment for both employees. Moreover, the Government has decided that the exemptions proposed in the Bill shall be available to employers who are already in receipt of Commonwealth assistance, especially under the Special Youth Employment Training Programme (SYETP) and the Commonwealth Rebate for Apprentices Full-time Training Scheme (CRAFT).

For the information of members, I have prepared two tables showing the weekly cash benefits to employers, one relating to the additional employment of apprentices and the other to non-apprentices. Both tables distinguish between subsidised youth employment under Commonwealth Government schemes and unsubsidised youth employment. As the tables are purely statistical I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED PAY-ROLL TAX EXEMPTIONS ON WEEKLY PAYMENT UNDER SEVERAL AWARDS
(NON-APPRENTICES)

	Award rate of pay p.w.	Cost to employer of one additional employee at annual exemption of \$12 000 (\$11.54 p.w.)	Cost to employer of one additional employee with added SYETP benefit	Unit cost to employer of two additional employees at annual exemption of \$36 000 (\$17.31 each p.w.)	Unit cost to employer of two additional employees with added SYETP benefit	Pay-roll tax saving on additional wages (maximum p.w.)
<i>Clerks (S.A.)</i>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Under 16	81.00	69.46	24.46	63.69	18.69	6.75
At 17	97.20	85.66	40.66	79.89	34.89	8.10
At 18	113.40	101.86	56.86	96.09	51.09	9.45
At 19	129.60	118.06	73.06	112.29	67.29	10.80
<i>Shop Assistants</i>						
Under 17	79.10	67.56	22.56	61.79	16.79	6.59
At 17	94.90	83.36	38.36	77.59	32.59	7.91
At 18	110.70	99.16	54.16	93.39	48.39	9.23
At 19	126.50	114.96	69.96	109.19	64.19	10.54
<i>Hairdressers (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 16	36.00	24.46	(11.54)*†	18.69	(17.31)*†	3.00
At 16	49.10	37.56	(7.44)†	31.79	(13.21)	4.09
At 17	61.70	50.16	5.16	44.39	(0.61)	5.14
At 18	74.50	62.96	17.96	57.19	12.19	6.21
At 19	87.30	75.76	30.46	69.99	24.99	7.28
<i>Hotels (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 18	84.80	73.26	28.26	67.49	22.49	7.07
At 18	98.90	87.36	42.36	81.59	36.59	8.24
At 19	120.70	109.16	64.16	103.39	58.39	10.06
<i>Delicatessens</i>						
Under 17	72.10	60.56	15.56	54.79	9.79	6.01
At 17	86.50	74.96	29.99	69.19	24.19	7.21
At 18	100.90	89.36	44.36	83.59	38.59	8.41
At 19	122.50	110.96	65.96	105.19	60.19	10.21
<i>Metal Industry (unapprenticed)</i>						
Under 16	46.40	34.86	(10.14)†	29.09	(15.91)†	3.87
At 16	59.70	48.16	3.16	42.39	(2.61)†	4.98
At 17	73.00	61.46	16.46	55.69	10.69	6.08
At 18	86.30	74.76	29.76	68.99	23.99	7.19
At 19	104.20	92.66	47.66	86.89	41.89	8.68
<i>Vehicle Industry</i>						
At 17	66.60	55.06	10.06	49.29	4.29	5.55
At 18	83.30	71.76	26.76	65.99	20.99	6.94
At 19	99.90	88.36	43.36	82.59	37.59	8.33
<i>Furnishing Trades (Fed.)</i>						
Under 17	60.10	48.56	3.56	42.79	(2.21)†	5.01
At 17	73.45	61.91	16.91	56.14	11.14	6.12
At 18	86.80	75.26	30.26	69.49	24.49	7.23
At 19	104.80	93.26	48.26	87.49	42.49	8.73
<i>Bricklayers</i>						
At 17	82.90	71.36	26.36	65.59	20.59	6.91
At 18	98.80	87.26	42.26	81.49	36.49	8.24
At 19	130.70	119.16	74.16	113.39	68.39	10.89
<i>Pastoral</i>						
At 15	62.10	50.56	5.56	44.79	(0.21)†	5.18
At 16	69.00	57.46	12.46	51.69	6.69	5.75
At 17	75.00	63.46	18.46	57.69	12.69	6.25
At 18	89.70	78.16	33.16	72.39	27.39	7.48
At 19	103.50	91.96	46.96	86.19	41.19	8.63

* SYETP subsidy in this case would be \$36.00 per week

† Exemption and additional SYETP benefits exceed the award wage by that amount

EFFECT OF PROPOSED PAY-ROLL TAX EXEMPTIONS ON WEEKLY PAYMENT UNDER SEVERAL AWARDS (APPRENTICES)

	Award rate of pay P.W.	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice at annual exemption of \$12 000 (\$11.54 P.W.)	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice with added craft benefit (Stages I and II)	Cost to employer of one additional apprentice with added craft benefit (Stage III)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices at annual exemption of \$36 000 (\$17.31 each P.W.)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices with added craft benefit (Stages I and II)	Unit cost to employer of two additional apprentices with added craft benefit (Stage III)	Pay-roll tax savings on additional wages after discontinuation of existing pay-roll tax rebate for first year apprentices who commenced indentures in 1979 (max. P.W.)
<i>Hairdressers</i>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
1st year	68.30	56.76	46.57	—	50.99	40.80	—	5.69
2nd year	87.30	75.76	65.57	—	69.99	59.80	—	7.28
3rd year	108.00	96.46	—	89.92	90.69	—	84.15	9.00
4th year	136.00	124.36	—	—	118.69	—	—	11.33
<i>Hotels (Cooks)</i>								
Under 18	87.70	76.16	66.97	—	70.39	60.20	—	7.31
At 18	102.30	90.76	80.57	—	84.99	74.80	—	8.53
At 19	124.20	112.66	—	106.12	106.89	—	100.35	10.35
<i>Metal Industry</i>								
1st year	66.10	54.56	44.37	—	48.79	38.60	—	5.51
2nd year	86.50	74.96	64.77	—	69.19	59.00	—	7.21
3rd year	118.00	106.46	—	99.92	100.69	—	94.15	9.83
4th year	138.40	126.86	—	—	120.09	—	—	11.53
<i>Vehicle Industry</i>								
1st year	66.10	54.56	44.37	—	48.79	38.60	—	5.51
2nd year	86.50	74.96	64.77	—	69.19	59.00	—	7.21
3rd year	118.00	106.46	—	99.92	100.69	—	94.15	9.83
4th year	138.40	126.86	—	—	121.09	—	—	11.53
<i>Furnishing Trades (Fed)</i>								
1st year	65.80	54.25	44.07	—	48.49	38.30	—	5.48
2nd year	86.20	74.66	64.47	—	68.89	58.70	—	7.18
3rd year	117.55	101.01	—	99.47	100.24	—	93.70	9.80
4th year	137.90	126.36	—	—	120.59	—	—	11.49
<i>Construction</i>								
1st year	82.90	71.36	61.17	—	65.59	55.40	—	6.91
2nd year	98.80	87.26	77.07	—	81.49	71.30	—	8.23
3rd year	130.70	119.16	—	112.62	113.39	—	106.85	10.89
4th year	154.60	143.06	—	—	137.29	—	—	12.88

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One final point that I wish to cover is the matter of the cost to the Government of introducing the proposals in this Bill. It has been alleged that the budgetary provision of \$2 000 000 for the total package of pay-roll tax promises is considerably less than the Government's pre-election promise of \$6 450 000. Let me assure the House that this is not so. There is no inconsistency whatsoever between the proposals in this Bill and the policies announced by the Government during the election campaign. There has not been and there will not be any dilution of the Government's commitment to the success of this vital policy.

The fact is that any allegation of discrepancy between the amount estimated before the election and the amount included in the Budget fails to take several important factors into account. I believe they require explanation now so that no misunderstanding exists as to the exact cost of the proposals in this Bill. It is true that the Government's pre-election costing document did quantify the maximum possible cost of the total pay-roll tax policies at \$6 450 000 in a full year. However, the costing document also stated that in this first year of operation, 1979-80, the maximum possible cost would be only three-quarters of this amount, or \$4 800 000. This is because the increase in the maximum exemption level will operate for only half the year, and the special youth policies will operate for only three-quarters of the year.

In addition, the costing document was at pains to avoid under-estimation. Accordingly, the figures it contained were based on an average annual salary for juniors of \$8 000, which under most awards is over-generous by at least \$1 000. Furthermore, the total cost of the rebate scheme was based on the particular combination of jobs and firms that would produce the greatest possible exemption, that is, 3 500 firms each employing an additional two young people and so qualifying for the maximum exemption of \$36 000 in each case.

All of this was clearly stated in the costing document and the prime reason for over-estimation was stated with equal clarity. As a result, even though the costing document anticipated a maximum possible cost of the total pay-roll tax package of \$6 350 000, it also stated that the more probable cost would be \$3 050 000 in a full year. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

These figures have been checked by Treasury and been found to be accurate within the limits of toleration that apply to any such prediction. The final point in regard to the cost of the scheme relates to the specific allocation of \$2 000 000 that is provided in the Budget. Lest it be inferred from what I have said that there is still an inconsistency between this amount and the total probable cost of \$3 000 000 in a full year, I believe it is necessary to explain two further matters.

The first is simply to remind members that the Budget Estimates are based not on a full year's operation of the scheme, but on six months in respect of the maximum exemption, and on nine months in respect of the youth employment initiatives. The second point is that the exemption of additional wages from pay-roll tax represents revenue forgone to the Government.

It is not, therefore, reflected in either increased pay-roll tax receipts or in a payment from Revenue Account. As far as the special youth employment scheme is concerned, the Budget appropriation of \$2 000 000 applies only to

estimated rebate payments under the sections of this Bill that relate to special youth exemptions.

There is no question whatsoever, as has been implied in statements already made, that the Government has compromised its pre-election assurances by the faintest degree, nor is there any chance that the Government will resile from them in the future.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the new Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on 1 October 1979. Clauses 3, 5 and 7 provide for the increases in the general exemption and the minimum deduction that I have outlined. Clause 6 makes a corresponding increase in the amount paid by way of wages which determines whether an employer must be registered under the Act.

Clauses 4 and 8 are the provisions directed specifically at the problems of youth unemployment. They are designed to provide exemptions from pay-roll tax in respect of young employees taken on after 1 October 1979 and to establish a more general administrative scheme under which pay-roll tax concessions can be directed to employers who can demonstrate that they have a positive contribution towards solving the problems of youth unemployment.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It gives me extraordinary pleasure to be able to stand in the House and move the second reading of this Bill. This Bill implements an explicit promise given by the Government at the recent general election. It is one of several measures proposed by the Government which are designed to stimulate the economic development of the State by reducing the incidence of State taxation. The object of the Bill is to exempt completely from succession duty the estates of person who die on or after the first day of January 1980.

The effects of the Bill will contribute significantly to the Government's overall plan for renewed economic activity and confidence. It will remove completely the inequities so often caused by the imposition of succession duty, and so often ignored by the previous Government.

In particular, it will put an end to a continuation of the many genuine cases of hardship that have become commonplace in these days of inflation, cases in which the value of deceased estates, and consequently the amount of duty payable on estates, bears no realistic relation to income levels or a family's capacity to pay an inheritance tax.

In one stroke this Bill will also transform South Australia from being the least attractive State for the investment of retirement capital to being equal best. It will bring South Australia into line with Queensland and the Commonwealth, both of which have abolished death duties and probate, and will put us ahead of the other States, every one of which is still phasing out death duties progressively.

The importance of this transformation cannot be overstated, for in recent years South Australia has failed to retain or to attract considerable sums of capital that were destined to be subject to succession duty. In this respect, I refer members to the Blackwood Report, prepared by a former President of the Australian Taxation

Institute, and laid on the table of the Tasmanian Parliament as Paper No. 62 of 1978.

At page 6 of that report, which examined the abolition of probate and death duties in Queensland, Mr. Blackwood stated, and I quote:

Quite massive funds were flowing (into Queensland) from all States and particularly Victoria and South Australia. The effect of this Bill will be to halt that massive flow of funds to Queensland, or anywhere else outside the State. Indeed, the package of tax relief and business incentive measures proposed by the Government, of which this Bill is only one item, will actively encourage the migration of interstate retirement capital back into South Australia.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act is not to affect the estates of persons dying on or after the first day of January 1980. The administrator of the estate of such a person is relieved from the obligation of filing a return with the Commissioner in respect of the estate of that person. Clause 3 relieves the Treasurer from the obligation to publish indexation factors in respect of the general statutory amount. These indexation factors will have no further relevance after this year.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936-1977. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for exemption of residential properties from land tax where the owners of those properties occupy them as their principal place of residence. The Government had hoped to introduce this concession in relation to the taxing of land for the present financial year. Unfortunately, for administrative reasons, this has proved to be impossible.

Mr. Payne: That's just not true. You could still do it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On that matter, I point out that this is in no way a reflection on the officers of the State Taxation Office or the Lands Title Office. They are working most efficiently and indeed the source of their efficiency, which is the use of the computer, shows that it is impossible in respect of the present listing of properties to identify which is the principal place of residence. Because of that difficulty it will not be possible to introduce this measure until 30 June 1980.

The Bill will ensure, so far as it is practicable to do so, that there will be no increase in land tax for the present financial year on a property that may subsequently qualify for total exemption from land tax. I seek leave to insert the explanation of the clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amending Act shall operate retrospectively from 30 June 1979. This is to ensure that the concessions applicable to the present financial year will apply to the assessment of tax for this financial year.

Clause 3 amends section 10 of the principal Act. This section deals with liability to taxation. A new provision is inserted to take account of the exemptions to be granted under the proposed section 10a. New subsection (3) stipulates a specific time as at which land tax is to be

calculated. This is particularly important for the purpose of determining whether land is to be treated as exempt or non-exempt in the light of changing circumstances for a particular financial year.

Clause 4 enacts new section 10a of the principal Act. This new section introduces the new exemption of the principal place of residence. The Commissioner is empowered to grant the exemption either upon application or otherwise. He will notify the owner of exempted land of the ground of exemption and, if it appears that he has acted on a mistaken assumption of fact, the owner must notify him accordingly. The owner must also notify the Commissioner where proper grounds for the exemption cease to exist. In order to qualify for exemption, the land must be owned by a natural person who occupies it as his principal place of residence, or by a home-unit company. The new section envisages the fixing of additional criteria by regulation. For example, it is not intended that property, which is predominantly used for industrial or commercial purposes but which incidentally includes a residence, should qualify for the exemption. Matters of this kind will be dealt with by regulation.

Clause 5 introduces an amendment consequential on the proposed section 10 (3) and the proposed amendments to section 11a. Clause 6 introduces amendments which are designed to ensure, as far as possible, that there will be no increase in tax for the present financial year on residential property that may subsequently qualify for total exemption from land tax. Clause 7 corrects an anomaly in the rates of tax applying to land that is partially exempt from land tax.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 406.)

Schedule.

Mines and energy \$8 300 000.

Mr. BANNON: The spokesman with responsibility for this matter is the member for Mitchell but I would simply like to look at the lines, which are relatively straightforward as they appear before us. Large amounts are contained in single lines. Why are the various lines categorised as they are? There is really no indication of functions in the actual titles of the lines. It seems to me that these have been set out to consolidate a whole series of administrative divisions without really making clear what positions are involved and what functions are involved in the various sections.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would have thought that by looking at the headings of each of these sections it would be fairly apparent to the Leader what it is all about. The first section is administration; the second refers to the technical section of the department; and the third is the mining section in particular.

Mr. Keneally: This is the best answer you've given for 1½ days.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We had some complaints early this morning from some wise men opposite about the brevity of the answers we were giving at the Committee stage to some of their queries. For the record, the spokesman for mines and energy on the other side of the House is the member for Mitchell. These are some of the answers we got from the member for Mitchell on 6 October 1976 when he was a Minister. He said, "I shall be—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me see how this can possibly be relevant to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition which was on the lines of this item. Apparently the Minister is going on to something else, which is not related to questions or comments made by members. The Minister, if only for his Government's sake, to get the Bill through, should stick to the point and answer the questions which are put to him.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Mitcham had been here until 4 o'clock this morning, and not gone home to bed at 8.30 last night—

Mr. BANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you failed to uphold the point of order raised by the member for Mitcham and I would question that. In fact, as part of the questioning, I point to the remarks made by the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you disagreeing with my ruling?

Mr. BANNON: I am submitting to you that the remarks the Minister made when he resumed speaking in fact transgressed completely from the discussion of the line and spoke about the member for Mitcham, and his interjection, in terms of his personal abuse. I am submitting that is totally out of order and wasting the time of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The honourable member has the discretion of replying as he sees fit. I do ask the honourable Minister to link up his remarks.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly the query from the Leader was not in fact in reference to a specific line; it was a general comment. The fact is that in the early hours of this morning at about 3 o'clock a complaint was made by several members opposite about the brevity of the replies given during the obvious filibuster.

Mr. BANNON: I am sorry to have to raise another point of order but I submit that the Minister, in talking about the question of length or breadth of answers in Committee, is in fact straying from the questions which are before the Committee, namely, the explanation of the lines, and that in so doing he is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not uphold the point or order. As I understand what has happened the honourable Deputy Premier was replying to an interjection which came across the Chamber.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would just point out by way of comparison the answers given by the member for Mitchell when he was a Minister. His next answers, in sequence, were "I will get a report", "As that is a Commonwealth department I will try to obtain the information for the honourable member", "I will try to obtain the information for the honourable member", "I will try to obtain that information".

Mr. Keneally: And you complained about that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, you complained this morning. His next answers were "I will obtain the information for the honourable member", "I shall be delighted"—he was getting a lot of pleasure at this stage—to obtain a voluminous report on the matters raised by the honourable member, "I will obtain information on the remainder of the questions raised by the honourable member", "As this is an important matter I will not give an off the cuff answer but will obtain a detailed reply for the honourable member".

Let us put in context the replies that have been given by the Government up until 4 o'clock this morning during the filibuster organised by members opposite. In fact, we have given full answers. I understood that the ground rules were that in Committee questions were to be asked in relation

to a specific line. We have now got from the newly-fledged Leader of the Opposition a general question that cannot be related to a specific line. He talks about headings generally. I consider that the way in which the Mines Department has set out these Estimates of Revenue is completely logical, and it would be a nincompoop who could not understand it.

Mr. BANNON: I refer to the length of replies. It is interesting to hear the Minister talk about a filibuster. He implies that time is being wasted in the course of this Committee debate because of the questions that are being asked by Opposition members and the way in which replies are framed by Ministers. In evidence of that he has read rather tediously from previous *Hansard* debates, illustrating the sort of replies that were given on a totally different subject by a totally different Minister and at totally different times, somehow to make a point in relation to these Estimates. I should have thought that was out of order, but I accept your ruling, Sir. I am not questioning it; in fact, I am taking advantage of it by talking about this matter, which should be aired before the House.

Members are here to get information from the Minister, and we ask questions with a view to getting that information. Instead, we are subjected on every occasion to long rambling discourses, with the Minister usually making side-long swipes at individual members, about their contributions and what happened in the past. The time has come in this Committee where we can get down to an actual debate of the lines, where we can talk about, in this case, the Department of Mines and Energy and the financial allocation that is being made to it.

I hope that the Minister, in making his contributions, does not take advantage of your ruling, as he appears to simply ignore questions on the line and quote from *Hansard* reports of previous debates and simply obscure and fudge the issue before us. I could talk in this vein for another hour or so, but I do not wish to waste the Committee's time in the way that the Minister has. Can the Minister point to any amount which provides for departmental officers to go overseas to study the use of nuclear energy for electricity generation, which is obviously a matter of prime importance. Will he indicate which division would be engaged in this important work and whether it is taking place at present?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought the onus was on the Opposition members who are seeking information to point to a line and seek information in relation to that line. If the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to point to a line, I shall be only too pleased to make a comment in relation to that line. Last evening, the complaints were that the answers were too brief and today the complaint is that they are too long.

Mr. BANNON: The Minister is inviting us to go through an extraordinarily tedious process of taking the matter line by line and asking whether that is the point from where certain moneys will be coming and where certain activities will be taking place. I could commence that by looking at the line "Director-General" and ask whether the sum of \$36 901 contains any sum for travel overseas in the course of studying the use of nuclear energy for electricity generation. Clearly, if I asked that question and proceeded down the other lines, it would make a farce of the deliberations of this Committee. We are asking the Minister for information. If he knows his subject, what his department does, and where it is done there will be no problem at all in his answering questions. However, if the Minister wants to do it by a process of exhaustion and elimination, we are only too happy to oblige him. But, that would be a complete waste of time. I ask again whether

the Minister can tell us if he has any officers overseas studying the use of nuclear energy for electricity generation, under which division in the lines that occurs, and whether he will point to the financial allocation that has been so made.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is my view that the Leader of the Opposition is seeking to change the ground rules in relation to the study of the Revenue Account. In my 10 years in this place, which is about eight years longer than the Leader's experience here, there has always been a request for information in relation to a specific line in these Revenue Estimates. I am only too happy to oblige if he can find the appropriate line. That was the attitude adopted by the Leader of the Opposition until four o'clock this morning. He now seeks to use these Revenue Estimates to open up general topics without any reference at all to anything specific in these lines. If he knows the lines, I will give him the answers.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: And to abuse the practices of the House.

Mr. BANNON: I caught the interjection made by the Minister of Agriculture, which was to add to the remarks made by the Minister, that that would be abusing the practices of the House. I agree with him; it would indeed do so, if we were to do what the Minister is inviting us to do, namely, go by tedious repetition through each line to try to uncover the information we want. I do not think we should do that.

I defer to the Minister's greater length of time in this House, although I am beginning seriously to question whether he has learned much in that great length of time. The Minister seems to be battling, as he is taking as long to pick up the procedures of the House as he apparently is taking to pick up the details of the Mines and Energy portfolio, which involves an extremely complicated and technical field. We do not hold that against him, but simply say that he is here in this House and he ought to know his portfolio. I note that the Minister has taken the precaution of ensuring that he can be properly briefed at short notice on these matters. He was not able to do that earlier this morning, so it is a good move that the Minister has a ready source of advice to him, as that will aid the Committee.

If the Minister takes the attitude that he has said he will take, he will not get anywhere. If occasionally a specific line is not clearly evident, the Minister could short-circuit proceedings by pointing this out and answering the question. I simply repeat my question, which I do not think is out of order or outside of ordinary procedure.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I seek your ruling on this matter. My understanding has been that members may seek information in relation to the Revenue Estimates that are placed before them.

Mr. Millhouse: I have a few questions I want to ask.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is all right. To my knowledge it has not been permissible for members to raise topics in a general fashion unless they are related specifically to the lines under consideration. I seek your ruling in relation to this matter. It is my view that it has been past practice that, if members are seeking information, they must do so in terms of the lines of the Revenue Budget. I do not believe it is competent for the Leader of the Opposition to ask any question on any topic and then ask to have it justified in some vague way in relation to the Revenue Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: The Deputy Premier seeks guidance in relation to the procedure. Members are entitled to seek information about an individual line. They are also entitled to seek general information about a certain vote. Whether the Minister wishes to answer is entirely a matter

for his discretion.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was aware that some investigations were to proceed. Because of complaints last evening that answers were too brief (as I pointed out they were even briefer when given by someone else on this side of the House), I decided to do what members of the Labor Administration did when in Committee, namely, to have advisers at hand to answer questions asked in Committee.

To try to cover all the eventualities as they change from time to time, I have taken the opportunity (as was the habit of the Labor Government) of bringing two of my senior officers to Parliament House to enable members to be given information, without our having to resort to the tactics of the previous Administration of saying, time after time, "I will get a report."

Regarding the honourable member's question, an overseas visit was mooted for the Director-General of Mines and Energy before the recent State election. I became aware of that on the first day I was in the department. The Director-General told me that it was his intention, because there had been a change in Government, to delay that trip, which had been approved. Part of that trip authorised by the former Minister and his Government was to investigate uranium development, particularly in Saskatchewan, Canada. That was authorised by the previous Labor Government, which would not have a bar of uranium mining. The Director-General was to make that trip a week after the election, and part of it involved a study of developments in relation to uranium mining, with particular reference to Saskatchewan, Canada.

Mr. McRae: Why didn't you tell us that at the beginning?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought it necessary to establish the ground rules, which change from hour to hour, according to the whims of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest to the Deputy Premier that the Chair does not change the ground rules.

Mr. BANNON: In response to the Minister, we are concerned not about the brevity or length of answers but about their accuracy and relevance to the question asked. The Minister said that the Committee had wasted 20 minutes because an answer was supplied to him by that assistance which he had made available to himself, and about which the Opposition congratulates him. This whole business could have been completely done away with if the Minister had presented that information in the way he eventually did.

I turn now to the services provided to the mining industry by the department. Should not the department charge more for its services? It provides major services to the private sector from the public purse. Does not the department make a large subsidy to the private mining sector and private mining interests in South Australia? Although some degree of Government subsidy through the Mines and Energy Department may be appropriate, is it not the Minister's view that the charges for those services could be increased, thus saving money in terms of Government expenditure?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is my knowledge that, in fact, charges are levied in South Australia for the services of the Department of Mines and Energy in a way in which they are not levied in some other States. It came to my notice only this week that drilling work is done by the department in South Australia for which a charge is made. In this respect, litigation is involved in one case. It was put to me that no such charge is levied in other States. Regarding the level of charges, if the member opposite has some particular point of view and has some information

that would lead to the conclusion that we should charge more for what is done, I would be pleased if he would pass that information on to me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now that the Minister's anti-filibuster is over, I would like to follow your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and make some general comments about the way in which the Minister has been running the department since he took office. I invite the Minister's reply to what I say. I take it that that is in line with your ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member's comments must relate either to a certain line or to the department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. I link my remarks to the line "Energy Division", to which \$188 000 is allocated. I have a copy of the Liberal Party's mines and energy policy, which the Minister put out before the election and page 3 of which states:

Energy development and use: The Liberal Party believes that the co-ordination of the research, development and use of existing and new energy sources is vital to the State.

That is a good purple passage, and no-one would disagree with that. I am sure that we all have that sort of thing in our policies. It continues:

The establishment of an energy authority and the Liberal Party's proposals for research and conservation will facilitate those objectives.

The policy refers to the establishment of a State energy authority, as follows:

... responsible for the co-ordination and utilisation of the State's energy supplies.

I will not read all the things that are supposed to be done. I do not think there is any mention of uranium under that heading. In another part of its policy the Liberal Party states that it will:

... approve the processing of uranium and continue to promote the establishment of an enrichment plant to process uranium oxide from mines in South Australia.

That part of the policy will receive no help whatever from the Australian Democrats in this Parliament. The sooner the Minister and his friends and supporters on the Government side know that the better. If there is any way that we as Australian Democrats can block that part of the policy's being put into effect, we will take it. Let the Minister be under no misapprehension whatever about that. Let him do his counting of numbers in another place.

I will come to this more positive part of the Liberal Party's policy. This is my third attempt in 24 hours to see whether the Government will honour promises made before the election. On the first two I have failed to get an unequivocal undertaking that it will, but, on this one, because this is good, as indeed were the others about which I asked, namely, the Public Accounts Committee and West Lakes lighting—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must relate his remarks to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do so immediately. If you had not interrupted me, I would have been on to it there. What is the Government going to do about the establishment of this energy authority to advise the Minister of Mines and Energy on the matters of energy use, conservation and development, including utilising solar energy facilities in large Government and other buildings? There is more than a doubling of the amount given for the line, but I suspect that that was done by the previous Government and not by this Government. What is being done under this line to set up a State energy authority?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Moves are already afoot to establish what will be an energy authority. The honourable member may know that there is already a State Energy Council and that separate from that council

is an energy research body (SENRAC), to which funds are directed for research into alternative—

Mr. Millhouse: Not nearly enough.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps not, but we have increased the funds over and above those made available by the previous Administration. Moves are now afoot to restructure the relationship between the energy council and SENRAC, and their connection with the Government through the Minister, which in effect will constitute an energy authority. However, this will not be a major restructuring.

Also, the Government intends to set up two consultative committees, which will have important functions to perform. One of these councils will advise the Government on setting priorities for the use of liquid fuels, which is one energy source the world is running short of. South Australia is fast running into trouble in relation to the short-term supply of liquid fuel. The other committee is an important and new initiative, and it will investigate and advise the Government on the saving of energy in building and home construction.

Mr. Millhouse: In insulation and hot water services?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, that type of thing. It will have a wide-ranging charter, part of which will be to look into energy conservation in home building as well as major building constructions.

Mr. Millhouse: Who will you put on those committees?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As I have said, Rome was not built in a day. We have been in Government for about a month and with the assistance of some very competent officers, we have taken many positive initiatives in a relatively short time. So the member for Mitcham should not be too impatient.

Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, there is a sizable increase in the allocation for the Energy Division to which he referred. All members should acknowledge the fact that the provision of energy is of prime importance to South Australia. We have problems in relation to the Cooper Basin; we must prove up what is there. A lot of questions must be answered about the coal deposits that we have discovered, although their viability is far from assured yet. An escalating amount of work has to be done in relation to the Energy Division, which is a relatively new division.

The Government cannot say simply that it will not increase staff numbers in every area of government. However, there is a demonstrable need to reduce staff numbers in some areas. In relation to energy supplies, which are of vital importance to the future of this State, I say quite unashamedly that there is a demonstrable need for more work to be done. In fact, provision in this line is made for salaries of existing staff members as at 30 June, and for 10 new positions that will be filled during the financial year. These new positions are necessary to cope with expanded requirements for research, development and management of energy resources.

I make no apology for the fact that each one of those provisions will be vetted by me personally and the justification for those positions will be made to me personally; that situation will devolve on every Minister of this Government. There is a demonstrable need for a reduction in the overall size of the bureaucracy of the Public Service in some Government departments, but not in the Energy Division.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I rise to comment and seek information on the Energy Division line. This is a particularly important line that should be carefully and thoroughly examined to determine exactly the Government's position. What type of staff will be hired for this division? I hope that details printed in the Estimates of

Expenditure are not the total sum of the staff for this division. I also want to know what type of emphasis that department will have. Also, what interpretation will be put on this State's energy needs, and what interpretation will be put on priorities for researching avenues for solving the energy crisis? Also, how will the funds that are being allocated to that department be tied and how will they be spent? What type of priorities will be set?

It is certainly heartening to see that an increase in funds has been provided but, if the priorities are not of the right order, and if the allocation is not of the right order, that money could be wasted. Not only could it be wasted but also it could be used to the detriment of the people of this State and to the community in general. I must mention the aspect of research in relation to this line. It would be a total waste of money if the \$188 000 allocated was, for example, spent on duplicating research and advances that have been made overseas. What benefit could that be to the community? It would just be a waste of the taxpayers' money.

In the speeches I have made in this House so far I have touched upon the international research into non-conventional energy sources. That is an indication of the vast possibilities and opportunities that exist. I hope that the research work that is proceeding overseas will be an important part of this division. However, the word "research" does not appear in this vote. The words that do appear imply that the division is totally local in its vision and concept and is not particularly interested in what is going on overseas.

The point should be made that not enough research into energy resources is going on overseas that could be relevant to this State. I will not take up the time of this House by going through all the avenues of which I am personally aware of overseas, but I will mention four examples that could be rather enlightening and could help us to reach a new direction on how this money should be spent.

It was reported in the *Australian Financial Review* of 17 October that a Canadian study costing \$250 000 undertaken in Winnipeg found that a massive switch to alcohol fuels in Canada would generate 50 000 permanent post-construction jobs. The implications of that study for this State, given the number of people here who say that alternative fuels could be made available through alcohol production, would be most enlightening and most interesting. We could save a lot of time and effort in research by taking the advances that have already been made overseas and starting from that point. That is one area where research could vitally and usefully be conducted.

Another example where we need some information for our Energy Division concerns the nuclear area. I was concerned to read that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission is proposing that the safety recommendations in that country need to be raised. The commission into the Three Mile Island accident has voted to recommend a halt in the construction of new nuclear reactors until its recommendations for improving safety have been adopted. We need to know in greater detail the findings of the commission. People in this State who are charged with the responsibility of developing the energy future of this State and its energy requirements need to be fully aware of that information. It is not adequate merely to rely on newspaper reports and expect the staff, for whom we are voting money, to go from there. This information must be made available to them and research staff must be provided to analyse all the implications of these reports.

Another example concerns the work of the United

Nations Centre for International Environmental Information. This is a think tank or store house of information on energy issues from all over the world. If the Government did not link in with that centre, it would be a gross example of negligence and a gross waste of money by the Energy Division. That agency has contacts throughout the world that are second to none. For example, I have read of the work being undertaken in South Korea to construct three solar-powered towns.

They have commented on the proposals by the Federal Republic of Germany to construct solar villages in Indonesia, and also commented on the contracts between Japan and the People's Republic of China to undertake joint research and development of solar and terrestrial heat in the People's Republic of China. We need to know more about those types of project that are going on overseas, if they are to be applied in this country. It has been mentioned that building standards will be investigated in this country to see in what ways energy can be saved and in what ways non-conventional energy can be used in public buildings in this country. We can save ourselves those starting points if we see what is happening overseas, and that cannot be done until the research staff is available.

Regarding the nuclear field, the Minister should examine a report from the Soviet Union. We know that the Government there has determined that nuclear energy is a useful power source. Although I certainly do not agree with that decision, it is interesting to note an article that appeared in a journal called *Kommunist*, the Party's theoretical journal. It appears, from this article, written by Nikolai Dollezhal and Yuri Koryakin, that the Russians are gravely concerned about the safety of the nuclear industry. They are also gravely concerned about the implications for the citizens of European Russia, in particular, where most of the power plants are being sited. The translation of the article states:

"It cannot be said that there exist guaranteed, safe, economic and time-tested technologies for all products of the external fuel cycle," they said.

The concentration of nuclear power plants in European Russia could lead to environmental exhaustion.

It was said that uranium mining could lead to environmental exhaustion. That vital aspect should be examined. It has been mooted in some quarters that a uranium enrichment plant may be the best thing for this State. If people in other countries look at the possible effects of environmental exhaustion, we need to know what issues are being examined. It is remiss that the word "research" does not appear in that line. The Minister owes it to the House and to the people of South Australia to elaborate on how that money will be spent, what priorities will be established for the energy authority, and what proposals will be put regarding directing funds to non-conventional energy sources as opposed to nuclear or traditional energy sources. We need to know those facts and clarify them in our own minds. We need explicit answers.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not in disagreement with a lot of what the honourable member has said. I agree that there is certainly a necessity to ascertain what is going on overseas. However, the line to which the honourable member has referred relates to salaries of the staff in the division. Other allocations of funds relate to research. I pointed out earlier to the member for Mitcham that \$299 808 has been allocated this year purely for research of projects. This sum represents an increase of about \$50 000 over the sum allocated by the previous Government.

Some of the functions of the Energy Division are energy

conservation, alternative sources of energy, the saving of liquid fuels and lubrication, as well as petrol, and utilisation of South Australian coal. Members of the division are liaising with the Federal Government, and making submissions to the Senate inquiry. The department is, of course, interested in this State's future energy requirements and the impact this has on the South Australian industry study, because energy is vital to industry. My department is vitally involved in those consultations.

The department is interested in the future energy requirements of industry, in particular industries that are electricity intensive. That is another point that is of vital importance to the future of South Australia. Can abundant electrical energy be supplied to sustain energy-intensive industry? Fortunately, as the member for Mitcham said, we can satisfy ourselves that the Urenco-Centec uranium enrichment plant is not electricity intensive. That is just a passing comment.

Regarding the point made by the member regarding co-ordination, I could not agree more. That is one of the reasons why the Director-General is going overseas. One of his functions is to travel overseas to examine the uranium situations in other countries, particularly in Saskatchewan. In many regards, people liken Australia to Canada, and it has had a nuclear industry operating for many years. Canadian contracts to India were modified because the Canadian Government was not happy with the safeguards.

The other area examined by the Director-General was that of energy. I share the view of the recently-elected member. I went overseas at my own expense to examine some of the questions involved. The general public is not well informed in relation to details. One of the prime functions of this Government is to give the public the facts. The Government is not interested in giving the public a load of garbage or putting before the public a tissue of lies (as was promulgated by a member of another place a week ago) and asking for comment. The way to find out the facts is, if possible, to have a look at the real world by going overseas and finding out.

I went overseas privately. The present Premier also went overseas to study the international scene, and former Premier Dunstan also went overseas. He took with him consultants engaged by the former Government, who studied the scene. Reports were commissioned and made available to the previous Labor Administration. All in all, I do not find that I disagree with some of the broad points made, although some of the emphases might be slightly different. Certainly, there is a need for energy resource and co-ordination. There is no point in South Australia's embarking, in a minor way, into energy research when billions of dollars are being spent in the United States in the same field. There is no use in South Australia's researching wave power when the British are leading in that field. There is a necessity to view the global scene. I could not agree more.

Money is made available for research by this Government, and the sum is somewhat larger than that provided by the previous Government. Provision has been made for an expansion of staff, which will have to be justified to me before actual appointments are made. Provision is also made in the Budget, for which I make no apology, for expansion of staff in the Energy Division, because this is a vital field in relation to the economic future of South Australia.

The whole future of South Australia's population is intimately bound up, in my view, with assured supplies of energy. I point out to the House that supplies of energy to the developed and developing world are bound up with the

provision of welfare. If one looks at the economy of an energy starved country, one sees that, if energy is not accessible to a developed or developing country, there is a tremendous impact because of the loss of energy, particularly if energy has previously been available. All sorts of ramifications apply regarding the provision of welfare and the general standard of living.

So, to sum up my remarks in reply to the general discourse from the member opposite, I could not agree more that there is a necessity for a view of the international scene. We have set out to inform ourselves in relation to that scene, and that was to have been the purpose of the visit of the Director-General. I dare say that, in due course, his visit will take place, but I think members would appreciate that he felt some obligation to the new Government not to leave the day after the election. That was quite reasonable. I agree that there is a necessity for co-ordination and for providing facts.

Mr. McRAE: I resent the Minister's remarks, which were directed at the member for Mitchell and me. Last night we asked one simple question of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and it took an hour and a half to get an answer. Subsequently, when I asked the Deputy Premier a simple question about the Chemistry Division, it took another hour to get an answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks.

Mr. McRAE: Certainly, Sir. I quite agree that there needs to be an establishment to provide information for the public, and also an advisory centre, but what sense does that make when the Minister and his colleague, the Premier, went to the people of South Australia on the specific basis that, by opening up a uranium energy resource at Roxby Downs, they would make South Australia great again and provide jobs? What is the sense of having an information service or a research service if the Minister and his Government are already committed to the development of Roxby Downs? That was the proposition which was put to the people of South Australia and on which the Government now claims to have a mandate. How can the Minister reconcile those factors?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is some convoluted thinking in that statement. At 2 a.m. today, the honourable member was trying to put words into my mouth in relation to the Chemistry Division.

Mr. McRAE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I take exception to that remark. I was not seeking to put any words into the Minister's mouth. Time and time again, I asked for a simple answer to a simple question in relation to the Chemistry Division. It is a quite unparliamentary to suggest that I was doing what the Minister alleged.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order, but I ask the honourable Minister to stick to the matters under discussion, and perhaps it would be better if we deferred any mention of last night's debate.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will desist from replying to those snide remarks. I know what I said about the Chemistry Division, and there was no question of winding it down. The honourable member was trying his damndest to scare the Public Service.

I see no conflict involving the provision of an information advisory centre, and the development of Roxby Downs. The centre would provide information to the public. People want to know how to insulate their ceilings, and how to minimise heat loss or to maximise heat gain through a solar hot water system, and so on. There is a demonstrable need for such information. I understand that it is not available in the State Information Centre. A whole range of other matters could be

incorporated in such a centre, and would be of value to the general public.

I cannot see any connection between the provision of information to the public on a whole range of energy questions and the development of Roxby Downs. The Liberal Party did not back away from the matter at the State election. We believe we must develop the mineral resources of the State, and that would be a tangible way of improving the economic outlook for the future of South Australia. I have made clear, every time I have heard the scaremongering tactics of the Opposition, that we would not proceed until we were satisfied that safety precautions were provided every step of the way.

The Leader of the Opposition seems to have adopted a strange stance on Roxby Downs. I heard him yesterday morning on 5DN radio. The sentiments he expressed were along the lines, "Of course, we are not against Roxby Downs." It was the best bit of double talk I have heard lately, but the Leader is getting very adept at double talk.

I was surprised at the tone of his remarks, after having heard the range of questions Opposition members have asked in the House and what members opposite have been saying publicly. I was quite refreshed at that early hour of the morning to hear that the Leader was not knocking Roxby Downs.

There is no specific connection between Roxby Downs and the provision of an information centre to provide data in relation to energy conservation, particularly in relation to homes. There seems to be a continual stream of requests for information in that area, which I believe is a significant area for conservation. There is no facility in Adelaide at present, and certainly not at the State Administration Centre, for the dissemination of the information sought by the public. The Government intends to look at this and to see what provision can be made. Roxby Downs is a separate issue, and we have made no secret of our belief that it will be in the best interests of the State to develop the vast gold, copper and uranium deposits.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had a fairly discursive statement from the member opposite, and I have attempted to cover the points he has raised.

Mr. PAYNE: I appreciate the trouble the Minister has taken to listen to the member for Salisbury and to reply as he did. He gave quite a deal of information which we did not have previously. It is possible that there may be some misinformation in what the Minister gave us, perhaps because his Government has not been in office very long.

It is my understanding that a good deal of work is being done concerning energy conservation, both in housing and building, by the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs. If the Minister checks with his colleagues about this matter, I am sure his colleague will be able to bring him up to date about this. This has been done having particular emphasis to the South Australian scene, both in the arid areas and metropolitan areas of the State. I would think that some information would be available that the Minister is not aware of at the moment. I am not being critical about that; I am simply drawing to the Minister's attention the fact that there might be some possibility of eliminating the overlap and getting matters co-ordinated something the Minister stressed in his remarks.

The member for Salisbury put research forward as an important topic. The Minister said that there would be no point in carrying out research in some areas when billions (I think he said billions) of dollars are being spent on research elsewhere. I was surprised to hear him say that

because we were both at a lecture given by Professor Ringwood (I think last Thursday or Friday night) at which some interesting matters were raised. It is my understanding that Professor Ringwood's budget to carry out the research he did at the Australian National University into safer storage methods for highly radioactive waste would pale into insignificance alongside the vast sums spent overseas, on the same research. It appeared to me, as a semi-skilled person in the field with regard to geology and crystallography and the other matters discussed, and it must have seemed to the large number of people there who were scientifically qualified, that the proposition which he put forward and which he outlined in the publication he issued in 1978 would, if I am using the right term, scoop the pool. I do not know the amount of money available to the Australian National University in its budget for that research, but I would think, based on Australian expenditures, and compared to overseas expenditure, that it would have been a small amount.

I noticed in the publication I am referring to, *The Safe Handling of Radioactive Waste* by Professor Ringwood, that the professor referred to his team, as is often done in these publications, and the great help they had been to him. My recollection is that it consisted of four or five people, including the technical officers who worked with him on that project, so I suggest that the premise that one ought not engage in research if much money is being spent in that area is not a good premise to adopt. I would think that a better principle to operate on would be to continue, in concert with the department, with the kind of policy instituted by the previous Minister.

I think that the setting up of the Energy Research Advisory Council and the Energy Council was the best way for a State with the limited resources of South Australia to operate. It crosses both the Government and private sectors, if one likes to put it that way. We are able to tap into scientific expertise available in the State through such bodies as Amdel and the Australian Mineral Foundation. I would think that, if the Minister were putting that suggestion forward as a premise, there would be no quarrel from this side of the House—we would be applauding him. I think there is some point in making the remarks that, in general, we are not in opposition (no pun intended) to many of the things discussed so far.

I return to the line concerned, which covers salaries of the Director, and engineering and scientific staff. There has been a handsome increase in that line. I am not going to explore how the increase came about, but I could postulate that it was mooted before the change of Government, because these matters are usually some time in the offing. I will let that go. The time for political point scoring disappeared on 15 September—for the time being. I would think that most members would agree with that. I would like to know about a matter, recollection of which was triggered in my mind by the Minister's remarks, that I had intended to raise and seek information about. The Minister was kind enough to inform members for the first time today that some 10 positions are involved. That suggestion appears to roughly match the amount of the increase listed. The Minister was also kind enough to tell us that he is going to personally (and I will be careful how I phrase this, because I do not want to put any words into the Minister's mouth after the member for Playford's objecting to what was said about that) investigate those appointments. He also paid us the courtesy of explaining that he would have to justify those appointments (I take it to Cabinet and the Premier), because of the overall no-growth policy of the Government. I have no quarrel with that.

I think that the Minister would be the first to agree that

in the area we are talking about (since we all agree about the importance of energy and the fact that an energy division exists) the quality, calibre and actual salary ranges involved in those positions will have an important bearing on whether the money we are presently asked to vote for, the \$188 000, is going to be of benefit to this State. Does he envisage contract appointments for all or some of the persons involved? Are they all to be of roughly the same level in terms of salary and qualifications? Details such as these will be of benefit to all members of the House and will enable them to feel confident, when passing the vote for this amount, that they are doing the best they can for the people of this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was difficult to cover the whole field in my previous answer. I am aware that there were a couple of experimental houses built by the Housing Trust in relation to energy saving, and that work has been done by Government departments other than mine in this field. The fact is that there is some co-ordination and the Energy Division is well aware of what is happening in this field. For instance, there is the electric car at the Flinders University this year and an amount of \$300 000 has been funded for SENRAC projects. The sort of projects being supported by State funds include the electric vehicle and wind energy research. I was at the Institute of Technology soon after the election and saw the windmill that has been funded for research into wind energy.

If the honourable member has looked at the JENRAC report, as I did before the election, he will realise the scope of activities related to energy research that are going on at the moment.

When I referred to billions of dollars, I was speaking of the international scene. I was not for a moment suggesting that that sort of money is being spent in Australia. I think members opposite, including the member for Mitchell, would realise that President Carter announced a programme in relation to energy research which ran into a large sum of money. I repeat (and I thought I had made this point clear) that there is no point in duplication. Professor Ringwood's comments were, of course, in relation to the local scene.

I read his book some time ago on the early development of the Synroc process, and I was very interested in the idea of the absorption of nuclear waste into the crystalline structure—an incorporation into the crystalline structure of the Synroc. I read the book in the very early stages of its publication and thought that it had some very considerable possibilities. My understanding is that the Americans, particularly, are interested in Ringwood's work.

Mr. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what the budget was but I was not for a moment suggesting that it ran into millions. I was saying that on the international scene it involves very large sums of money. I cannot be precise on the amount of money that Carter announced would be directed to research but it was a large sum of money in anyone's terms. I agree that a very pleasant note has entered the debate, which has not been prevalent thus far in the discussion of the lines. We have reached a measure of agreement which has been absent from our deliberations in the past. What we are seeking to do in the Department of Mines and Energy is to facilitate, by making some change, (and I acknowledge that some of the initiatives of the former Government have been continued), work in some areas. Some changes have been made to the Redcliff steering committee; the fact is that the carriage of the Redcliff project was vested in the Department of Economic Development, and the carriage of that project is now vested in the Department of Mines

and Energy. It so happens that the former Minister had two hats. There has been a separation of those hats in this Government, and it is now my function to continue development of that project.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Chairman of the Redcliff steering committee happened to be the Director of the Department of Mines and Energy; he was appointed during the life of the previous administration. I have brought in some private enterprise expertise at the head of that committee, and I believe that, appointment of Mr. Schroder to that committee will be invaluable and this was welcomed by officers of my department.

Mr. Payne: We've no quarrel.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be surprised if members opposite were so churlish as to make complaints about this. All I am saying is that some changes have been made in the structure of the department to facilitate the sort of work which we are trying to achieve. We are also to make some changes to the State energy committee concerning its relationship to SENRAC and our overall concepts of constituting what we call a energy authority. We are building on some of the initiatives at least of the previous Administration.

In relation to the last point raised by the member for Mitchell I have no details at hand but it is my understanding that these appointments would be permanent; however, I will check this out. This is going to be an increasing function of government, one that is vital. I believe that the remarks made by the member for Salisbury were responsible as he saw them, and I agree with some of what he said. I understand that these appointments will be permanent because of the permanent and increasing function of the Energy Division in the department. As to the salary range, we are hoping to attract the best people we can in Australia, and we have been very fortunate in having officers in the department who are acknowledged as being leaders in their field in Australia. This is a statement of fact, and the Labor Government had the common sense to appoint in several of our major Government departments first-rate officers.

Mr. Keneally: Which ones did we not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not going into details but as I say, in some Government departments, the Labor Government made some very good appointments. Some officers were there long before the Labor Government came into office. I shall obtain the details for the member who has asked this question in good faith as to the level of these officers and what their duties will be. They will not be contract officers. The point I made, as members opposite are well aware, was that the Government has a policy of containing the growth of the public sector. There is a clear distinction between the opposite sides of this House in relation to the relative functions of government in some areas. I think every member in this place acknowledges that. There is a clear policy direction in which this Government wishes to go in relation to that matter, and it will be incumbent on the Ministers to justify appointments within their departments. That may have been the same with the previous Government. I will be requiring justification for each of the appointments made in the department.

Mr. McRAE: I acknowledge the force of the remarks that the Minister made with regard to the Energy Division so far as the very valid general functions of that division are concerned of providing information to the public. What I was striving to put to the honourable gentleman was this: if a concerned citizen goes to an officer of that division, who is bound by the Government's policy, which

we have been told is the development of uranium resources at Roxby Downs (which the Minister himself said in the course of the last election campaign and subsequently was now able to proceed safely), how can that ordinary citizen expect to get anything else but a load of information based on Government policy? If the Minister adopts the attitude that he had in Opposition, which was that it was a relevant function of public officials to draw a line and not to go against policy of the Government of the day, I do not see how anything else can follow; in fact, the whole thing seems to me a total charade.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I just cannot swallow that lot. If members of the public come to any member of this Government seeking information they will be given the facts in relation to Roxby Downs or any other development. It is the firm intention of this Government to provide the public with facts.

Mr. McRAE: Will you permit officers to supply the facts, even if they are against your policy?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There is no conflict existing between the policy of our Government and the facts. We have made it clear that we will not proceed with any stage of this cycle until we are convinced of its safety. We will give the facts. There is clear evidence though that under the previous Administration there was on top of the professional advice available some sort of screen (I do not know whether they called it a policy division) that filtered out the facts. When in Opposition, we were told that we could not be given certain information because it ran counter to Government policy, whether it was fact or not. This Government will not be vetting material given to the public just because the facts conflict with Government policy. I have clear evidence that the facts did conflict with previous Government policy and for that reason the facts were not made known. Let me reassure the honourable member that, if members of the public come to this Government and want facts, they will get facts.

Mr. McRAE: And the officers?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It has not been the practice of any previous Administration simply to tell the general public that it could walk into any Government department at any time of the day and seek out information it wants.

Mr. McRAE: That is what they are there for; you have said so.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: What on earth is the honourable member talking about?

Mr. McRAE: You said it in your speech on 18 October.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Quote me the relevant passage.

Mr. McRAE: Page 194.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I call the member for Albert Park.

Mr. McRAE: That is unfair. With respect, Sir, the Minister has asked me specifically to supply him with information. I am the last person to reflect upon the Chair. I am attempting to supply the information.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It has been my policy since I have been in the Chair to be as even as I can with people wanting to ask questions. The member for Albert Park has not asked a question since I have been in the Chair, and it is my intention to call him. I call the member for Albert Park, and the next call could well be for the member for Playford.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Playford.

Mr. McRAE: I am pleased that I am able to follow up this matter. The Minister asked me to refer to the relevant passage. It was in *Hansard* on 18 October at page 194. The relevant part states:

In addition to participation in this national campaign, the South Australian Government has under consideration the establishment of an energy information and advisory centre, to provide advice to the public on the use and conservation of energy.

As I said before, I was not being critical of all the things to which he referred. In fact, I strongly support them. I cannot understand how, if a public servant is at an information service and, as a member of the Public Service, is properly bound by the policy of the Government of the day (we would not say anything else), he could, if he held a contrary opinion, hold a meaningful discussion with a concerned citizen? That is all I ask. It is a simple matter.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand now what the hang-up is. The information centre provides publications that give factual information to the public.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I refer to the line "Director, engineering and scientific staff". In directing a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy, I take into account previous answers to questions from this side of the House regarding the increased allocation in the 1979-80 Budget. We were told that there will be 13 permanent staff, with gradings to be determined later.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You didn't listen. I read out "10".

Mr. HEMMINGS: All right, 10. The Liberal Party's policy speech regarding mines and energy states:

The emphasis here is on the immediate development of South Australia's known mineral wealth, encouragement of further exploration, research into alternative energy sources, partly paid for by royalties on existing minerals, and a number of minor energy conservation measures. No time span is specified for any particular development or when mining royalties are expected to commence.

Research and Development: An energy authority will be set up to advise on all matters of energy use including allocation of grants for researchers in energy conservation. Scholarships will be established to enable individuals to study new energy sources. A percentage of mining royalties and revenues from uranium, l.p.g., etc., will go to research into alternative energy sources.

The key words are "immediate development". The only line to which I can connect this is that under "Energy Division", in which the Minister has already stated there will be increased personnel. Yet, in answer to all the questions from this side, the Minister has not mentioned the energy authority that will be set up.

An energy authority will cost money. I know I cannot stray into miscellaneous lines because I know I will be pulled up immediately. Therefore, I do not intend to do so. However, a salary allocation has been provided under "Miscellaneous" for energy research, which the Minister mentioned earlier in relation to an increase of \$50 000. If one was talking about the immediate development of South Australia's mineral wealth and the setting up of an energy authority, one would think that in this particular line, or in any other line, there would be provision to set up this authority and the scholarship. However, there is no provision.

Are we to get an answer from the Minister? I hope the Minister will say that I am wrong and that the 10 people will set up the authority. Are we to have the same answer

that has been supplied by the Premier? Will we be told, "It cannot be set up; you cannot expect us to carry out our promises within eight months or straight away."

We are talking about immediate development. The Minister stated publicly, just after the election (I think on the following Sunday or Monday), that they would immediately mine uranium at Roxby Downs. Will the Minister say whether the increase in relation to the Energy Division from actual expenditure of \$75 272 to a proposed vote of \$188 000 will take in the setting up of the Energy Authority and the machinery to provide for the establishment of scholarships to enable individuals to study new energy sources?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Salisbury has been out of the Chamber or he has been asleep.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I take exception to those comments. I have not been out of the Chamber, nor have I been asleep.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I have not left the Chamber since 2 p.m. and I would like the Minister to withdraw his comment.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have explained, in answer to the member for Salisbury, that some changes are being made to the State Energy Committee, and that, by those changes, we will make what will constitute an Energy Authority, with little or no expense to the State. We are simply restructuring. I did not say that we would be mining uranium immediately at Roxby Downs.

Mr. Whitten: What about Honeymoon?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am replying to the honourable member opposite, so that we can get the facts straight. We know that Western Mining Corporation and B.P. are spending \$50 000 000 over three years to prove up the deposits, to do further work, and to undertake feasibility studies in relation to the final development. It is nonsense to suggest that I said we would be mining uranium in the short term. Shortly after coming to Government, we announced an immediate and greatly expanded exploration programme in the Cooper Basin.

Mr. Payne: What about the previous Minister's efforts on that?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I saw no evidence of the way in which he intended to fund it.

Mr. Payne: You will find the docket with the stamp on it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not find that. Certainly, the way in which the exploration would be funded would be somewhat different, I would hope, from any of the previous Government's proposals. The details of the financing of the scheme are as follows: from the established exploration levy charged by PASA on the sale of natural gas and made available to SAOGC for exploration purposes, in 1980, \$3 100 000; in 1981, \$3 500 000; and in 1982, \$3 900 000, giving a total of \$10 500 000, and from additional borrowings within SAOGC's capacity to finance its operations, including the cost of interest and to meet its commitments to repay existing and proposed additional borrowings by 31 December 1987 (the net accumulated positive cash flow), \$5 700 000.

That is a total of \$21 600 000. There is a short fall there of \$9 700 000. We do not propose to fund that from general revenue but from borrowings from liquidity of funds available to PASA. That is the detail relating to funding. That adds up to \$31 000 000. Let me refer to the other points raised by the honourable member. Another immediate pressing priority of this Government is finding the answer relating to the massive coal deposits in the

Balaklava region. It is of vital importance to South Australia in the long term to know how we are going to generate electricity.

An honourable member: Wind power.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a possibility, but at the moment it would require a forest of windmills stretching from here to Victor Harbor to generate enough electricity for metropolitan Adelaide. I forget the size of the area concerned, but it would create some environmental difficulties. It would be an expensive option at present.

Dr. HOPGOOD: It's a decentralised opportunity for a particular area?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Definitely. They are doing it in New South Wales, I understand in one small rural town, but to suggest that that is an option for supplying power for metropolitan Adelaide at the present time I think is something that members opposite would admit is not within the realms of reality. There are immediate vital requirements for the welfare of South Australia where immediate action is needed. The experimentation, which runs into millions of dollars, for the Port Wakefield and Balaklava coal deposits is a vital priority.

There are two priorities relating to power; one is to find out what is in the Cooper Basin. Some members opposite would know that our guaranteed supplies of gas go only to 1987. Sydney has a guarantee of its supply of gas to the year 2006. That was negotiated by the previous Labor Government and Premier Dunstan—that is a fact of life. Some of the gas that we find will have to go to meet the Sydney guarantee.

It is vital that we know what resources are available in the Cooper Basin, because that is one of our energy options.

Another of our immediate energy options is coal. Oil has become prohibitive in price, as members well know. If we are going to remain on any sort of a competitive footing with the Eastern States in our whole range of manufacturing industry, or any industry that requires power, then we have a vested interest in knowing what electricity will cost and where fuel is going to come from to provide electricity in the future.

Mr. Keneally: I thought cheap wages were going to cover that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is an oversimplification, even by the member for Stuart. These are immediate priorities, if the member for Napier is looking for immediate priorities. A quite exciting coal deposit has been discovered in the South-East, but the problem is that it is in a wet region and it has not been proved up. We believe that there is some urgency to find out what is the position in relation to Lock. Of course, geography has a lot to do with the exploitation of coal. There are vast coal deposits in New South Wales, but the cost of shipping that coal to South Australia is prohibitive when one thinks in terms of getting power on a competitive basis to the Eastern States.

Mr. Payne: It won't be when we get a grid, but that's beyond your time and mine.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We probably will get a gas grid before we get any sort of transportation. Transportation will become more expensive as time goes on, but in relation to gas and its exploitation, some of the matters are national questions. Some information sought by the honourable member has been given, and some information was inaccurate.

Mr. Hemmings: Your information was inaccurate?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, your information is inaccurate.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I remind the Minister that I am

the member for Salisbury, not the member for Napier or Elizabeth, or the Minister of Water Resources.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister has given much information that is of great value. The aims of the energy authority that he has read will provide useful information for the board, members here, and the community generally. I look forward to seeing them in *Hansard* so that I can give them further attention. In general, they are sound, reasonable and good. What concerns me is that, as with a recipe, what we get out depends on the proportion in which we put the ingredients in. In what proportion will these aims receive attention and emphasis?

I fear, given the obvious inclination of the Government to favour uranium mining and the general nuclear processing industry, that people on overseas study tours will spend much time researching and analysing what is going on in the overseas uranium industry and, at the end of a report containing many pages, we will see two paragraphs stating that they also saw a windmill, went down to the beach and saw waves, or sunbaked and saw the sun. That may be the entire attention given to the other aims mentioned. It is important that we understand clearly that the Minister does anticipate that the Energy Division will give equal attention to all areas of energy development, that we can be sure that non-conventional energy, traditional energy sources, and the nuclear energy area all receive the rigorous and close attention we believe they deserve. If we cannot get that, that will make a mockery of what the board is all about.

We have touched briefly on public access. I think it is praiseworthy that public access will be available and will be developed, but it does not seem that we have a clear undertaking about where an individual will go to get information concerning, for example, uranium as a general area, nuclear reprocessing, or aspects involving nuclear enrichment. I hope that the Minister can give a clear indication of the person to whom an inquirer should go and where the person should go to find out whether the Government has information. Is it expected that he will go to the Minister and the Minister will provide it?

Further, is it expected that the Energy Division will also study questions of the marketing of energy in this State, and in the international arena? Obviously, if we are developing energy sources, it has been put many times that our relationship with international demands is growing more critical for our own internal development in the State. At present, in Brussels, the Australian negotiators are meeting the Euratom negotiators to discuss the way we will sell uranium to the European Common Market. All sorts of problems are developing. The question of marketing is turning out to be a potentially more important and explosive area than we give credit for. A report in the *Australian Financial Review* of 12 October mentions this and states:

The Europeans know that in the two years since the Fraser Government formally decided to export uranium it has been able to conclude a safeguards agreement—a precondition to uranium exports—with any country which can be considered a major market.

The Euratom countries also have a negotiating advantage in knowing that Australian uranium production will come on stream within about 18 months of the start of the Brussels talks.

Furthermore, the talks will be held at a time when the world demand for uranium is bearish. European utilities companies are well supplied to the mid-1980s, and some beyond. Australian uranium is now seen in a more marginal light than it was two years ago. It is seen as useful in stabilising prices and for securing supplies through

diversification of sources.

These considerations will undoubtedly be used to press Australia to modify its stringent safeguards requirements. The willingness of Canberra to ease safeguards to gain markets is already evident in the modifications announced earlier this year enabling miners to begin supply negotiation prior to safeguards being determined.

We have already been told that the Energy Division will be looking at such things as safeguards, and we are told in that report that the safeguards question is inexplicably tied up with the marketing question. I would appreciate any comment from the Minister about whether this department will handle that aspect or whether it may be another department or whether it is any Government department. These are things that in future years will be vitally important to the State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had a diffuse discourse and I will try to cover most of the points raised. Some officers went overseas with a specific purpose in mind. Dealing with the second point first, it can be clearly understood that the officers of the department are concerned with a whole range of energy options and with keeping up to date with a whole range of information in relation to this whole spectrum. We should acknowledge that people do go overseas to study specific aspects of energy development; indeed, just as Premier Dunstan did. He went overseas specifically to study uranium development and took two consultants with him who were paid by the former Administration to study this question.

If the honourable member or anyone else is looking for authoritative information on the most recent developments of uranium, I would have thought it common sense for the previous Administration to honour its undertaking to make those reports available. If the honourable member wants to be steered towards the most recent expert opinion on this question, those would be the reports that should be sought. The former Administration gave a clear undertaking that those reports would be made available. I refer to the former Government's experts who were commissioned to examine this matter.

The honourable member asked where he could find information. The information centres would not be set up with any specific purpose in mind. My officers can give greater detail if the honourable member is not satisfied with what I can tell him, because our discussions have not yet reached any depth, but I visualise that the centres would provide information to the public in relation to energy conservation and other areas, where the public can come to inquire about house insulation, how they can cut down on heating bills and the like. The centre would provide such information. If the Opposition seeks expert advice on uranium, I would steer it to the paid experts of the previous Administration and the studies that they provided. If people could afford it, I would advise them to go overseas and look for themselves, as was suggested, although that is not practical in the case of the majority of people. The marketing arrangements as I perceive them are basically concerned with the companies that mine uranium and the provisions put on those arrangements by the respective Governments, in the case of Australia, the State Government and the Federal Government.

Over the last day or two it has been suggested that it is senseless to mine uranium, because it cannot be sold. For the life of me I cannot see why companies such as W.M.C. and B.P. would spend \$15 000 000 proving up something to provide a commodity that they could not sell. In the real world of business, commerce and industry, things just do not happen that way. These companies do not mine commodities that they cannot sell. For example, at one stage gold mining was not profitable and many marginal

gold mines closed down. When gold mining became profitable again, those mines were reopened.

In relation to marketing arrangements, the onus is on the producer to be involved. In relation to the marketing of uranium, Governments are heavily involved because of the stringent safeguard policies which are imposed by the Federal Government and which would also be imposed by the State Government. One of the articles in the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty imposes an obligation on signatories of that treaty to be part of the uranium scene. That article can be provided for members opposite. Companies do not dig up minerals if the companies believe they cannot sell them. The sale of these minerals will certainly be vetted in accordance with the safeguard policies of the Federal and State Governments.

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister explain the \$991 000 under the line "Drilling and Mechanical Engineering". That sum has been charged to other accounts. What is the nature of these charges and to which accounts do they apply?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That information is not available. However, provision for the total cost of salaries of existing staff as at 30 June 1979 is the estimated payment of wages to weekly-paid employees of the drilling and mechanical engineering branch. The salaries item includes payments to the chief drilling and mechanical engineer, engineers, draftsmen, technical, drilling, supply, clerical and other staff. A tremendous amount of work is done in this area by the Mines Department. That provision covers the total cost of salaries in the areas I have mentioned, including weekly-paid employees of the drilling and mechanical engineering branch.

Mr. DUNCAN: All members would appreciate it if the Minister would obtain for them the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty articles that he said places some civil obligation on signatory countries in connection with the supply of uranium. Secondly, in relation to the line "Mining Branch" what was the cost of recent drilling at Maralinga, undertaken by the Mines Department for the Commonwealth or State Government? Who were the persons who undertook that drilling and what were the results of that drilling?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As I have no information that would satisfy the honourable member, I will have to obtain it for him.

Mr. HAMILTON: I was interested to hear what the Minister said when he referred to the comments made by the member for Salisbury. He said that he was going overseas to see for himself, and he said that quite advisedly. I had the opportunity in 1977 of visiting Japan and, whilst there, the opportunity, among other things, to hear expert advice on problems in the nuclear industry. In particular, I visited a nuclear power plant installation at Kakegawa. I was concerned with the type of propaganda put out by the industry itself, whose members were expert in the field of selling their nuclear industry to the Japanese, particularly to the people in the surrounding area. Fortunately enough, a number of concerned people were involved in an interesting experiment called the spiderwort experiment, which has been going on for a number of years in Japan. Plants are located around nuclear power installations to determine the amount of radiation given off by the nuclear power plants. Part of that experiment states:

Increased somatic mutation frequencies were found in the atamon hairs of *Tradescantia*, spiderwort, planted close to a nuclear power plant under its test operation. A long-term scoring of the somatic mutations revealed that the increase occurred only during the test operation period and mostly at the places located to the leeward of the power plant.

The experiment was conducted by Sadao Ichikawa, radiation geneticist of the Laboratory of Genetics, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyoto University, Kyoto; Motoyuki Nagata, biology teacher of Sagara High School, Sagara, Shizuoka; and Shizuo Oki, science teacher of Kakegawa-Nishi Middle School, Kakegawa, Shizuoka. I refer to what I consider to be the most important part of the experiment, as follows:

While so-called peaceful uses of nuclear energy have been promoted on a huge scale in the last two decades, the long-term effects of low-level radiations have remained unsolved although the uses of nuclear energy inevitably increase environmental radiation level. In the 1950's and even in early 1960's, it was still a persuasive opinion that some effects could be observed when an experimental animal or a human body was exposed to higher than 25 rem radiation doses, and this opinion was often misread, sometimes intentionally, as that the radiation doses lower than 25 rem are harmless.

The truth was that enough and clear evidences were not available at that time. However, the carcinogenic effect on infants of at most a few rem of prenatal diagnostic X-ray exposures during pregnancy was statistically demonstrated in England and in United States of America. The long-term statistical data on the survivors of atomic bombs exploded above Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 also showed an almost linear relationship between the incidence of leukemia and estimated dose of radiation, suggesting strongly that leukemia must be induced even with a small dose but at a rate proportional to the dose without any threshold.

I now refer to the spiderwort experiment as follows:

Studies with the stamen hairs of *Tradescantia*, spiderwort, in recent years have proved that increase of somatic mutations is proportional to radiation dose even in extremely low-dose ranges; for example, as down to some fractions of 1 rem. In fact, the genetic effects of relatively high natural radiation background in Colorado, United States of America, and in Kerala, India, could be detected with this stamenhair system of *Tradescantia*. This system is therefore regarded as one of the most excellent test systems for low-level radiations

I will not describe the plant itself because it may take up too much time. However, I request that this experiment be investigated, as I understand that it is also being used in parts of Europe.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What is?

Mr. HAMILTON: This plant. I was informed, whilst in Japan, by a number of overseas delegates of the problems surrounding nuclear power plants and the problems of radiation emanating from those plants. When the Minister speaks in terms of the public not being well informed of the facts, I suggest that this experiment be investigated and that he seek out this information.

One would hope that there would be no vetting of this material (to use the Minister's words) and that the public of South Australia be given the opportunity to peruse not only the document itself but also the results of the experiments and the results of this experiment since 1977.

My observations, during my visit to this nuclear power plant, were such that it left many doubts in my mind because, while visiting the model of this plant which is about half a mile from the installation itself, people were not allowed to go through the nuclear power plant on a conducted tour or even get close to it. In this building where they displayed the so-called safety of the plant they had soft-sell music, rubber stamps, etc.

We were not allowed to go through the plant. Surely people who were concerned about the problems of radiation from the nuclear power plant, especially overseas visitors who were being conducted around by a

couple of eminent scientists, should have been given the opportunity to go through the plant, but that opportunity was not forthcoming. I ask the Minister to investigate this, so that the people of South Australia have the opportunity to study this information.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Before replying directly to the member for Albert Park, I have available information in connection with Maralinga drilling, which was requested earlier by an Opposition member. The information is to the effect that the drilling was undertaken 12 months ago. The cost is unknown, and the results were assessed by officers of the Commonwealth and of the Premier's Department.

Turning now to the comments of the member for Albert Park, let me say that, although I take his comments quite seriously, the findings there do not line up with the findings of which I was informed when I visited England last year. However, I am not saying that one brushes aside such evidence. I am sure that some scientific assessment will be carried out by eminent scientists, and that there will be genuine scientific evaluation of the results of the experiments, because of the intense interest in the subject. When an evaluation has been made, information will be exchanged. It is unrealistic to suggest that people in this House can draw the necessary conclusions from a multiplicity of individual happenings around the globe. If the experiments were on the scale mentioned by the honourable member, I am sure some eminent scientific body will assess the results.

I visited England last year to look at the nuclear industry and I visited two nuclear reactors at Hinkley Point, near Bristol. One reactor had been in operation for, I think, 20 years and a newer reactor had been commissioned recently. The public and schoolchildren were conducted in parties over these nuclear reactors in this locality. During my inspection, I saw inside the reactor, where they put the core to cool it down in water baths, and so on. Nothing was hidden, and any questions I wished to ask were answered. I was told there was regular monitoring of radiation levels in the surrounding pasture lands.

The British have lived with nuclear energy for 20 years. The Japanese have no alternative available at the moment and, if there was any radiation hazard, the Japanese would be the most sensitive race on earth, having suffered the devastation of the first nuclear bomb.

I also point out that the energy options available to the Japanese are limited. I think 70 per cent of energy needs in Japan are in the form of imported oil. I am not sure about the figure. The Japanese will be more dependent, if they are to satisfy their energy needs (in the judgment of people more expert than I in the energy field), on oil. There is also evidence that there is a degree of radiation that no-one has worried about in the past from the emissions of coal-fired stations. I recently read *The Hazards of Not Going Nuclear* by Beckman which asserted, having regard to the actual radiatory content, that mostly the emissions to the atmosphere from a coal-fired powerhouse are 400 times greater than those from a nuclear power station.

One can take all sorts of perspectives in relation to the provision of nuclear power. It is a fact of life, and must be acknowledged, that the French have no available option but nuclear energy. They have no viable coal deposits; their economy would collapse if they could not obtain oil.

There is no option open to the French but the increasing nuclear option. There appears to be no other option open to the British. Margaret Thatcher has just announced the establishment of 20 more power stations. The Japanese have no other options; they are intensely interested in this matter. It is not often that I find myself in agreement with Bob Hawke or most of the Federal body of the Australian Workers Union. I have great respect for trade unions, although members opposite, on occasion, might not think that that is true. I do have a great respect for moderates in the trade union movement. I have respect for the views of Bob Hawke regarding the uranium question because he has been overseas extensively and informed himself as to world problems. Problems do not occur only in Adelaide, but are world wide.

A considerable number of other people in the trade union movement have informed themselves as to the problem. Even my predecessor, the previous Minister of Mines and Energy, knew the problems, although he could not admit them publicly. Sir Mark Oliphant has gone full circle from being anti-nuclear to believing that nuclear energy is the only option. Sir MacFarlane Burnet has also gone full circle, from a "leave it in the ground" philosophy to believing that there is no alternative available but nuclear energy. I could list many people who have taken the trouble to inform themselves that we live in a real world and that energy is inextricably tied to welfare in the developed and developing countries. Other options are not available. I believe that, in the fullness of time, members opposite will come to that view, as many of their leaders have done. The Government is not trying to put anything over the public; we are not interested in mining uranium if people will be put at risk.

We are not interested in uranium mining if we think the uranium is going to be deployed to make weapons. We are not interested in uranium mining unless we believe that uranium is essential as a fuel for countries that have no other option. I believe that the Liberal Party is a little further along the road than some members of the Labor Party in relation to this question. All I am saying in answer to the honourable member is that his experience would reinforce my view that one must become aware of the facts. Those sorts of experiments will be assessed by experts and we will take due cognizance of any information supplied, as I guess the world scene will. I believe that we live in the real world and that there is no other option for an increasing number of nations than a nuclear option—it is the only one open to them at present. I could go on and talk at length about this.

Mr. Keneally: You are.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: This has been a fairly discursive afternoon; I think this has been a useful discussion. We have heard much discussion, and points of view expressed by members from both sides of the House, which may help to clarify a few issues. I think the debate has been conducted in better spirit than it was at 4 o'clock this morning.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 30 October at 2 p.m.