

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 20 February 1980

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

QUESTION

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

FISHING LICENCES

In reply to **Mr. GLAZBROOK** (19 February).

The **Hon. W. A. RODDA**: Since data covering the whole of the period since the introduction of the freeze is not readily available, licensing officers advise an additional 15 man hours have been estimated to extract the information sought by the honourable member. The incomplete information available may be summarised as follows:

	June 77 to March 78	April 78 to January 80
1. Applications for fishing licences since June 1977 freeze announcement	N/A	309
	June 77 to January 80	
2. Requests for review sought (approximately 20 more could eventuate from above 309 applications)	195	
3. Analysis of appeals sought		
Granted—Class A	8	
Granted—Class B	9	
Granted—Licence to employ	5	
Withdrawn	5	
Adjourned	17	
Refused	131	
Hearings pending	20	
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	195	

(Hearings pending could increase by approximately 20.)

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 301 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 were presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton, Mr. Ashenden, and Mr. Whitten.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SOCIAL WELFARE

Petitions signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to implement recommendations 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 49 and 53 of the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare were presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton and Mr. Evans.

Petitions received.

PETITION: BURDETT WATER

A petition signed by 18 residents of the hundreds of Burdett and Ettrick praying that the House would urge the Government to provide a satisfactory water supply to the

hundreds of Burdett was presented by the Hon. D. C. Wotton.

Petition received.

PETITION: WOMEN'S RIGHTS

A petition signed by 102 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not alter the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to restrict a woman's right to choose was presented by Mr. Langley.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DEEP CREEK FIRE

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: I wish to bring members up to date with the situation regarding the fire at the Deep Creek Conservation Park. This morning my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, as the local member, and as the Minister representing the Country Fire Service, and I visited the fire. I can now report that when we left earlier this afternoon the fire was contained. Extensive damage has been done to the park, with about 4 000 hectares burned out. The damage has been contained within the park. It has been contained mainly through magnificent co-ordination between members of the community, the C.F.S., and officers of my department and the National Parks and Wildlife Service. I commend all those who in the last 24 hours have worked to contain this fire.

We have been fairly lucky this fire season which, because of the late summer, has been potentially the most dangerous for many years. The Deep Creek fire was the first major fire in a national park this summer.

While we hope that it will be the last, the danger period for this summer is far from over. As Minister responsible, with officers of my department I have been looking at the need for changes in our fire policy, and at the possibility of setting up guidelines for controlled burning in some of our national and conservation parks.

I have arranged today for the Cleland Conservation Park and the Mount Lofty Botanical Gardens to be closed because of the extreme danger in the area. I apologise to any members of the public who have been disadvantaged because of this. We notified the public this morning through the media, and it is likely that this will continue to happen in future on days of extreme fire danger. In such circumstances, the public will be informed through the media on the morning on which the parks will be closed.

QUESTION TIME

NORWOOD BY-ELECTION

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say when the Government first decided to consider the option of a Royal Commission into allegations concerning the electoral roll in the district of Norwood and what evidence it had for that decision? Further, when did the Government reject this option, and why? When asked by a reporter from the *Sunday Mail* on Saturday evening if the Norwood result might go to a Court of Disputed Returns, the Premier agreed that this was a possibility, and then volunteered the information that "It could even go to a Royal Commission." In a further interview shown on the channel 7 network, he said that in this matter of possible

inquiries, and again I quote, "I am speaking now as head of the Government, as head of this State." Leaving aside his confusion of his role with that of His Excellency the Governor, it would seem that the Government on Saturday had made a decision. Yesterday, however, the Attorney-General, when answering a series of questions on this subject in another place, said, quoting from *Hansard*, "The fact is that a Royal Commission is not within our contemplation."

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition has got a great deal to learn. Although he may be in Opposition, he has a very grave responsibility to the people of this State and to the democratic process which we all, I hope, uphold in this Parliament. I am most concerned at the allegations put forward, and they are being investigated. The way in which they should be dealt with, if in fact there is some substance in them, is a matter for the Government to consider, and it will do that. Whether it will be by way of prosecution under the Electoral Act, by way of changes to the Electoral Act, or whether it could be, if it were sufficiently serious, a matter for a Royal Commission in my view is not a joking matter.

I was also disappointed to hear last Sunday that the Leader of the Opposition had said that the Government must be desperate to be raising matters of electoral misconduct. If the Leader of the Opposition is reflecting the views of the Labor Party in this matter, it does him and his Party little credit. I sincerely trust that there will be no substance found in the allegations made. I hope that consideration of what steps must be taken will be made with full knowledge of the facts and that, if it does become necessary to have a detailed inquiry, if the facts warrant it, we will have the full support of the members of the Opposition as well as the more responsible members in this House.

STATE FINANCES

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Premier say whether there is any truth in the claims regarding the finances of this State which have been made repeatedly during the last several weeks by the Leader of the Opposition?

On a number of occasions in recent weeks the Opposition Leader has repeatedly claimed that South Australia faces a \$40 000 000 deficit next financial year. He has followed this up by saying that a mini Budget will be brought down in South Australia soon after the Norwood by-election. I know that there are many people in the community who are concerned to know whether any of these claims are true, or simply political posturing by Mr. Bannon.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would think that the comment made by the member for Newland, that this was "simply political posturing", was exceedingly kind to the Leader. I have called his remarks untruths on a number of occasions, and I will continue to do so. The Leader has, on a number of occasions (and I think he tried the dose again last night—I did not hear him, but I understand he did), said that the Government is facing a \$40 000 000 deficit this year. He started off by saying "this year". He suddenly saw the error of his ways in this particular matter, that that was taking things just a little bit too far, and he rapidly moved around and made it "next financial year". This, of course, was compounded by some media anxiety to get in on a bad story against the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The *Advertiser* of 17 January also mistakenly gave the impression (one of them was

wrong—it was either the Leader or the *Advertiser*) that we were facing a \$40 000 000 deficit this financial year. The Leader then switched to saying it was "next financial year". He made the comment that this was because we had miscalculated the cost of our tax concessions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The constant firing of interjections across the Chamber by members from both sides is not enhancing Question Time. I ask honourable members to give the Premier due regard so that he can answer the question put to him.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was surprised that the Leader made such an elementary mistake. He apparently handed documents from which he quoted to the media—that is the report that appeared in the *Australian*. I find that quite fascinating.

The Government costed its tax concessions after it came to office. It had the benefit of the Treasury advice. Treasury costed the full year's concession at about \$25 000 000, certainly no more. That ties in with the fact that we heard no rebuttal of our own costing that was made before the election when we said it would cost about \$20 000 000. To say that the State faces a \$40 000 000 deficit on revenue and Loan Budgets—

Mr. Bannon: As you did.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sorry, but the Leader is incorrect. It simply exposes the Leader's total and abysmal ignorance of the accounting of this State. All honourable members would know that, in leading up to the Budget session, in moving up to the period when we prepare the Budget, memos go out to all departments that set out the requirements quite clearly. There was no doubt at all that if we had continued with the rate of excessive spending engaged in by the previous Government we would have been looking at a shortfall of some \$40 000 000 in the next financial year.

That was a situation we were not prepared to put up with and which we would not tolerate. That was one of the reasons why the Labor Government was thrown so soundly out of office in September. There will not be a deficit of that kind. If there is any deficit at all it will be a very minor one. We will be very close to a balanced Budget. I am happy to say that the co-operation we have received from all departments so far has been excellent. The thing that makes the Leader's repeated statements, his repetitions of these untruths, even more reprehensible is that the figures that came out at the end of December showed an excess of receipts over payments on the combined accounts of \$10 300 000.

Unfortunately, the Leader is not interested in anything that shows up the truth. I make just one small point. Although the Leader obviously sees some merit in trying to give South Australia a bad name interstate and overseas, he should, I think, listen to a word of advice from one who sat in that same seat for some little time. I hope that he will take my advice kindly and in the spirit it is intended. It is important for the Leader of the Opposition in this State, whoever he may be, to establish some degree of credibility. The media does not like claims repeatedly made which are then continually proved to be false. I would advise the Leader to trust more to his own judgment and rather less to that of his advisers.

SALES TAX

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the Minister of Industrial Affairs persist in his proposal announced on Monday last week that the vehicle manufacturing industry

in South Australia will be helped by a substantial cut in sales tax on motor vehicles? The Minister revealed plans at a press conference on 11 February to seek a cut in sales tax from the Australian Government. He said that he thought this was one way in which to boost flagging car sales. At the same time his Federal colleague, the member for Kingston, has gone on record complaining bitterly that an A.L.P. proposal to cut sales tax on cars is merely political expediency. Mr. Chapman is reported today as saying that encouragement of speculation about a possible reduction in sales tax will have an extremely detrimental effect on motor vehicle sales. Can the Minister assure us that either he or Mr. Chapman will withdraw and reconsider their opinions so that they can present a united front either for or against a sales tax on cars.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, I point out that I made my statement on Tuesday last week. The statement I made was in relation to a letter I wrote to the Federal Minister for Industry and Commerce, Mr. Phillip Lynch. In that letter I pointed out the long-term change that had occurred in the allocation of the consumer dollar spent by the motorist in purchasing motor vehicles and fuel. I pointed out to the Federal Minister that, because of the world parity price of oil, which I fully support, the motorist had spent far more money in buying petrol and the Federal Government had raised significant additional finance. I pointed out also that I thought there should be a readjustment so that the Federal Government made an appropriate adjustment in sales tax to take account of the increased revenue it had raised through the world parity price of oil.

In that letter to Mr. Lynch, I urged a substantial, significant and permanent reduction in sales tax on motor vehicles. I think that, if the honourable member reads what Mr. Chapman has said very carefully, he will see that he has raised, first, the problem that, if there is constant speculation that there might be an immediate short-term change in sales tax on motor vehicles, consumers might stop purchasing motor vehicles and wait for that reduction in sales tax hopefully to occur. A great deal of damage can be done to the motor vehicle retail industry and manufacturing industry if that sort of uncertainty develops in the market place. That certainly occurred on a previous occasion when the matter was raised, I think, by Mr. Chris Hurford.

In my submission to the Minister I said that there needed to be, in the long term, a restructuring of the finance collected by the Commonwealth Government, especially as it was now collecting additional finance through the world parity price of oil. That is different from what was advocated, I think, by Mick Young and some of his Federal colleagues, namely, a very short-term adjustment in sales tax on motor vehicles simply to boost immediate sales. I think what Mr. Chapman was quite rightly trying to do was to make sure that short-term speculation was put to rest immediately so that that immediate demand for motor vehicles was not upset; if it was upset, the present slump in motor vehicle sales might go even deeper, and we might see a major recession within the industry. I know that the Deputy Leader would not like that to occur.

HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr. ASHENDEN: As the housing industry is one of the bigger employers in this State and it is particularly important to the outer suburbs, has the Premier any evidence to show that the serious decline in this industry in

South Australia in recent years has been arrested?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure that the honourable member has seen the rather more optimistic reports that have occurred in the press lately of restored confidence in the housing and building industries, and I must say I was pleased indeed during a recent visit to the Iron Triangle to find that the housing industry in that area was also much more buoyant. The houses that have been developed by a private developer in Whyalla were moving well, and there is now a waiting list for accommodation in those areas that was not there before. I am sure that the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart will be equally as pleased as I am at those tendencies.

There is telling evidence that the Government's policies of economic reconstruction are beginning to have some effect. I think it is important to realise, as we do with other problems that face us, that the state of the building and construction industries is not satisfactory at present, and we do not pretend that it is. A great deal has to be done, but there are definite signs of recovery, and what is more to the point, recovery of confidence.

In last week's *Sunday Mail*, Mr. Bernie Lewis, President of the Association of Permanent Building Societies, is quoted as saying "We've bottomed out and we are starting to climb again." His remarks were supported by Mr. Brian Martin, General Manager of the Hindmarsh Building Society, who said, "It's been accelerating in the past couple of weeks and is a sign of recovery in confidence." Mr. Don Cummings, Chief Executive of the South Australian Housing Industry Association, was also reported as saying, "Confidence is gradually being restored and this has been evidenced through the change in Government." The reasons for this consensus of confidence are not hard to find, and I shall briefly relate the present situation to the House, in case members need reminding of it. As a result of remitting all stamp duty on first home purchases up to the value of \$30 000, 2 263 purchasers have, as at the close of business last week, saved \$1 115 000 in non-payment of this tax.

Furthermore, a completely new range of housing initiatives and benefits has been introduced by the Government for State Bank loans. The maximum loan ceiling has been increased by 22 per cent from \$27 000 to \$33 000, and all loans are now to be contained in a single mortgage at concessional rates. Moreover, changes have been made to increased income limits for families with dependent children, the discrimination in granting loans to new or established houses has been abolished, and a new mortgage system has been introduced to help established home buyers with approved additions and reconstructions. In the non-housing sector of the construction industry, a considerable lift has also been given to builders by the Government's policy of letting all projects to open tender.

The reasons for optimism and confidence are further evident in the forecast figures provided by the Bureau of Statistics. For the three months ended December 1979, the value of approvals for all building work in South Australia was 18.6 per cent higher than in the corresponding period the previous year. Furthermore, each sector of building approval values showed a positive increase, and most encouragingly new business premises approvals were up a massive 91.2 per cent.

In the month of November alone, \$56 700 000 of building approvals was recorded, which was 22 per cent higher than the monthly average for the first 10 months of 1979 and much better than the equivalent monthly average for 1978. In summary, there is still a long way to go, but I am cheered by the signs of restored confidence that are beginning to appear in the housing and construction industry.

RADIOACTIVE WASTES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Health tell the House what advances have been made by the South Australian Government with the Commonwealth to further proposals for a national repository for radioactive wastes produced by hospital, medical and industrial establishments, and will the Minister arrange for environmental impact reports to be made on the environmental effects of the large body of low level radioactive wastes currently being sent to the Wingfield dump, and on future sites before they are licensed?

The Minister would be aware that hospital radioactive waste is currently being disposed of at the Wingfield site, and it has been put to me that other sites are presently under consideration, including the St. Kilda site in the City of Salisbury. Disposals under the supervision of officers of the South Australian Health Commission are buried to a depth of one metre under other waste. Detailed figures are available as to the amount of material that is dumped each month, but I will not go into that detail now. I have been informed that accidents have occurred in disposing of wastes, and I am told that there was one occasion when liquid wastes were emptied from containers at Wingfield, rather than buried in those containers. It has further been put to me that Health Commission officers concerned have reported to the Minister that current South Australian waste disposal methods are inadequate for certain kinds of waste.

Mr. Becker: What did you do when you were in Government?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: As the interjection implies, this practice had been going on for many years—in fact, throughout the duration of the previous Government's term of office. The questions posed were quite specific; as I would like to answer them specifically, I will consequently obtain a report and make a statement to the House.

MOORE'S BUILDING

Mr. BECKER: Is the Premier aware of allegations to the effect that the Government stepped in and prevented a sale of Moore's building to an Adelaide businessman and, if he is, can he say what basis of fact exists for these claims?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no basis in fact for those claims; the Government did not step in and stop the sale of Moore's building. The Leader of the Opposition once again has been doing the best he can to peddle around untruths. I refer him to my advice of a little while ago. I find his sudden concern expressed previously quite remarkable when I consider that the Government of which he was a member was about to buy the property and demolish it; it is totally unreal.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not true.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: You were going to sell it to someone to demolish, and you know perfectly well that that is so. The docket says clearly that it was going to be sold and given to someone to build a hotel on.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is not true.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was the first docket that came across my desk.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That might have been—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The position, basically, is that Moore's building was on the market from mid-October until December, when the Superannuation Investment Trust decided to buy it and made an offer.

Claims that the Government stepped in to stop the negotiations, which were continuing at that time, are false. Indeed, I have a letter from the agent that makes it clear. At that time, it is clearly said that no offer better than that accepted was ever made or appeared in prospect at that time. Parties who complain that they never had a fair opportunity are incorrect.

In other words, negotiations were going forward with a private developer. The prices being negotiated were not acceptable to the vendors, and the agent accepted the firm offer made by the Investment Trust at the time. A great deal of capital has been made out of this situation to the effect that the Government stepped in in some way to overcome the free market situation: that is not true. The Government did not stop the sale. The Superannuation Investment Trust made an offer, which was accepted. Anyone who had been continuing on with negotiations in the hope of getting a very keen price was ultimately disappointed.

GUERIN COMMITTEE

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Will the Minister of Health say whether she agrees with all the principal recommendations of the Guerin committee for the better management of the South Australian Health Commission and, if she does not, will she state what recommendations she considers are inappropriate?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I have no disagreement with the recommendations of the Guerin Report. I fail to see the purpose of the question. When I say that I agree with the recommendations of that report it is in the knowledge that they have all been either implemented or set in train, and they were clearly endorsed by other members of the committee which was set up by the former Premier for the purpose of examining the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say how many mining and exploration companies he has had discussions with since he has been in office? What evidence is available that indicates an increasing interest in mineral exploration and investment in mining in South Australia? My question arises from the continued attack on this Government by the Opposition about our policies in relation to mineral exploration. I am sure that the minister will be able to demonstrate that we as a Government are getting the State going again.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, I draw the attention of honourable members on both sides to the matter of commenting. On this occasion I refer particularly to the members for Newland and Henley Beach, who both made comments which were not truly part of the question. I would ask members on both sides to desist from this practice.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suppose the question is logical because the Leader of the Opposition, in a rambling speech yesterday, made some unkind references to me, to the Minister of Health and to the Mines Department, in that case reflecting on the competence of its officers. I think it would well behove the Leader of the Opposition to heed the advice given to him by the Premier, who suggested that the Leader would be well advised to desist from personal abuse and shady practice.

The fact is that there is an unprecedented level of exploration in South Australia in the area of mining since this Government has been in office. The mining companies now appreciate that we have a stable and responsible Government in South Australia and they can deal with it, safe in the knowledge that they will not be prohibited or inhibited by the whims and the faction fighting which is so obvious within the Labor Party. Expenditure commitments over the next 12 months are likely to be more than \$10 000 000, excluding the accelerated programme at Roxby Downs.

There are 185 exploration licences now under tenure and 85 applications are being processed. The minerals under search are copper, uranium, oil shale, coal, evaporites, and diamonds in particular. Since coming into office it has been my business to talk to many companies, including Western Mining, Oilmin, Mount Isa Mines, Dow Chemical, Santos, Delhi Petroleum, Marathon Oil, Western Nuclear Australia, B.H.P., Urenco-Centec, British Nuclear Fuels and dozens of others. They have all shown renewed interest in the policies and future of this State.

I think that the public of South Australia is getting heartily sick of the misrepresentations which are being churned out by the Leader of the Opposition, probably goaded by his advisers. Again last night we had that misrepresentation. Let me remind the House of some of the statements, completely false, which the Leader has promulgated. He said that Radium Hill was going to be a dump for international waste—with no basis whatever in fact.

Mr. Bannon: I think you raised that issue.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I certainly did not. It was raised in the Upper House by the former Minister of Environment, and it was completely false.

Mr. Bannon: I thought you said it was raised by me.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was raised by the Leader in this House. There was then the deceit promulgated as a result of the overseas trip of the former Premier, when the unanimous findings of the study group were that we should proceed. There has been a complete misrepresentation by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues in relation to that matter.

Mr. Keneally: Surely you haven't got all that written down. Have you lost your place?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, but the list is so long that one could hardly be expected to remember all the details. I shall pick out a few of the highlights. My statement in relation to the establishment of an enrichment plant has been completely misrepresented. The speaker said that I said the thing could be built in 1980, which is complete nonsense, as everyone knows, and I did not say that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible comment and unnecessary questioning from Opposition benches. I ask honourable members to desist, and I ask the honourable Minister to continue with his answer.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That was a complete misrepresentation, but they continue with it. I hope that the Leader will heed the Premier's advice and will not attach any significance to the adage that, if you tell a lie often enough, someone will believe you. He is certainly telling them often enough.

Mr. BANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the Deputy Premier' reading this catalogue if he will stick to the text, but I resent the implication that I have been lying, and I think it is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. It has been the opinion of this House over a long period that the use of

the word "lie" is unnecessary and unparliamentary. I did give a qualification to that use during the earlier part of the session, but I ask the honourable Deputy Premier to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw the use of the word "lie", because I realise that it is mentioned in Erskine May as not being acceptable, but the complete fabrications of the Leader of the Opposition have been repeated. Let me sum up with a couple more recent instances. A long list of reports has been leaked to the press by the Opposition, leaked from the Leader's office, as the Premier has pointed out, in an orchestrated fashion. The most recent so-called leak was a document which emanated from the Parliamentary Library in Canberra but which is also available in our Parliamentary Library. It has been freely available, and Mr. Payne, the member for Mitchell, mentioned it in this House. It was fed to the media, I understand from the Leader's office. On the front it was marked "confidential" and the back page was missing. The document purports to claim that it is possible to mine copper at Roxby Downs without mining uranium. This was leaked to the media, and one paper had to stop the run when it was pointed out that this page was conveniently missing. The missing page said, inter alia, this:

The proportion by weight of uranium is small. The uranium occurrence is only about 5 per cent of the copper. The uranium mineral occurs in very fine particles within the body of the copper minerals. The particles are so fine that they cannot be detected by the naked eye, even with the use of ordinary microscopes. They were first identified by Western Mining using the C.S.I.R.O. electron probe in Perth. The probe is a sophisticated microscope capable of very high magnification. It is quite impossible to mine the copper without the uranium.

This document was fed to the press to prove that copper could be mined without uranium.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That's credibility!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is credibility for you. The document was stamped "confidential" on the front, the back page was torn off, and it was handed to the media.

Then, of course, there was the case of the stolen report (that is what it amounts to) which came from the Leader's office and which was a completely discredited report relating to uranium.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Who says it was stolen?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: My understanding is that, if somebody in the employ of the Government has access to Government documents and takes them out of an office, they are stolen documents. That was a completely discredited report that was handed to the media to support a case against uranium mining.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I ask what is the relevance of all this material to the question asked, which was to do with how many companies have got mining leases since the election. The Minister's remarks seem quite irrelevant to that question.

The SPEAKER: It has always been held that the Minister, when answering a question, has a degree of latitude far greater than that allowed in the question or in the explanation of the question. In the early part of this session I gave an indication of my ruling on that matter, and it is on record. I would say, however, and I believe it is pertinent to the point, that Question Time is meant to be Question Time, and Ministerial statements are meant to be given in special leave circumstances. I am looking at the matter closely, but I cannot uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have almost completed part of the chronicle—it is endless. I am illustrating the point that the Leader cannot rise above personal abuse and downright misrepresentation. There was the break-in in the name of the Labor Party and the boorish behaviour when the Urenco-Centec representatives were here and somebody purporting to speak for the Labor Party broke into that press conference.

There were also the Leader's attempts to inspire fear and confusion quite unnecessarily over the siting of an enrichment plant. Then there was the tissue of fabrication from the member for Elizabeth relating to the supposed cartage of plutonium into metropolitan Adelaide—a complete fabrication. I will say this: we do agree with the member for Elizabeth on one point, that is, that his Leader is as weak as orange flower water. I hope that, when we have effusions from the Leader in this House such as that to which we were subjected yesterday, he will try to stick to the facts, get out of the gutter and rise above personal abuse.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: That opportunity is available at the end of Question Time.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government intends that a South Australian uranium enrichment consortium, to be named Urenco Australia, should be established to enrich uranium for package sales contracts and will Urenco Australia include shareholdings from the South Australian Government, Urenco International, and the Commonwealth Government (through the medium of the Australian Atomic Energy Authority), as well as financial support from Japan? Also, does the South Australian Government support the establishment of a Government uranium export authority to sell uranium directly overseas?

I have been informed that yellow cake produced in South Australia will be sold to Urenco Australia, the builders of an enrichment plant in this State, and that enriched uranium from the plant will then be sold overseas through Urenco International. I have also been informed that an enrichment plant will be largely self-financing through customer loans and deposits on its enrichment services. Is this the case?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I have indicated to the House that I intend to make a statement relating to the uranium policy of the Government, and I shall be saying something about that, I hope, later today. I think it is far too early, as the honourable member should appreciate, to be talking about the fine detail involved in these negotiations. Before the honourable member came near this place, his Party was involved in proceeding with uranium enrichment negotiations: it was talking to the same company as that to which the Government is talking. We believe there is some benefit, if and when the plant is developed, in the Government's having some equity in that plant.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Agriculture report to the House the results of findings he has made about future Government assistance for the Rural Youth Movement? On 31 October last I asked a question of the Minister about what plans the Government had to upgrade

the Rural Youth Movement. In his reply the Minister concluded by saying that he would bring back a report showing precise details of the identified needs, and showing what the Government would be able to do for that worthy organisation.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The honourable member would be aware that over the years the Rural Youth Movement's emphasis on agricultural training has been superseded by activities relating more to personal and social development—leadership, self-expression, and recreation. It is on that note that I have prepared some material for the honourable member, as I am aware of his interest in this area.

It is fair to say that it has also become obvious that servicing of rural youth clubs from Adelaide had its disadvantages both from the point of view of advisers having to travel long distances and remote clubs receiving poor services. Subsequently, under departmental regionalisation, a senior extension officer has been appointed in the South-East region. He spends 15 per cent of his time servicing rural youth clubs in that region, and this has been a great help to those clubs. Similarly, officers are needed in other regions to assist rural youth clubs, but I cannot predict when appointments will be made throughout the State regions in South Australia. In August 1979 the State Council of Rural Youth requested the establishment of a working party to examine the funding, staffing and central office needs of the movement. I understand that the council subsequently accepted the recommendation by the working party that the council itself should assume a number of duties which are non-agricultural in nature. The purpose of that move was to allow the rural youth clerk to devote full attention to the immediate needs of the clubs.

I believe that revised arrangements in that direction are working satisfactorily. Also, an examination was made of funding arrangements for the Rural Youth Movement, particularly in the areas of printing and travel subsidies for members of State council. I am told that as of 30 December 1979 some \$700 out of the total allocation of \$5 500 had been spent on those items and a further \$1 200 may be required for printing during this financial year. In these circumstances, there is nothing in the findings to date to suggest that funds will be inadequate; nor do I believe that there is a pressing need to improve the existing departmental advisory and extension services to rural youth in South Australia.

LIVESTOCK FACILITIES

Mr. PETERSON: Can the Minister of Marine say whether there will be provision for the yarding of live sheep in either the \$497 000 upgrading of No. 3 berth at Outer Harbor or in the projected extension of the land reclamation scheme at Outer Harbor? In the financial year 1978-79, 1 232 825 live sheep were exported from Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor. The ships used in this trade are becoming larger and larger, and there are ships now such as the *Al Yasrah*, which carries 92 000 sheep, the *Danny F*, which carries 60 000 sheep, the *Aries Chief*, which carries 50 000 sheep; and the *Persia*, which carries 48 000 sheep, which have to use Outer Harbor exclusively. There have been many problems in keeping up with the continual flow of sheep. Obviously, with a flow of sheep of thousands per hour, there must be good organisation. There has been provision of yarding through No. 1 berth Outer Harbor on a trial basis. Is there any scheme to extend this yarding?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I understand that the honourable member's question is whether provision will be made to yard live sheep; I take it that he is referring to substantial numbers of live sheep in the proximity of the berth. I am not aware that this is so, but I will have discussions with the department about the matter the honourable member has raised. However, his question poses certain difficulties. If there are to be permanent sheep yards, there will be some encroachment on other freights that must use the berth. When the decision was taken to upgrade No. 3 berth, it was apparent that certain equipment in the construction had to be readily removable to facilitate the movement of shipping.

I do not know where these yards would be sited. If there are to be sheep yards, I know from past experience that they take up a large area, and they have no other use. From my knowledge of the sheep industry, I know that it is not a big problem to construct temporary yards, which can give the same effect as that given by permanent yards. The honourable member poses an interesting question on a matter that is part and parcel of an expanding industry. I will have discussions with the Director-General of Marine and Harbors about the matter.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Minister of Health say what health services the Health Commission is considering with a view to transferring them to the voluntary or private sector? On 7 February an article appeared in the *Advertiser* under the headline "Some Government health services may go to the private sector". The Minister was quoted as saying that she was reviewing all services. She went on to say that the criteria in each instance would be based on the need to maintain, and if possible improve, quality and efficiency, while cutting costs. Will the Minister explain the content of that article?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The key words in that statement are "to improve quality and efficiency"; a review is now being conducted with a view to assisting the Health Commission to meet the requirement to reduce the overall budget by 3 per cent. I emphasize that those cuts in the interests of economy and efficiency will not be made across the board but will be made selectively in those areas where we believe services can be provided more efficiently and more appropriately by either the voluntary or the private sector. That review will take some time and will be a continuing review.

It is too early at this stage to say what services will be transferred. However, one in particular that stands out as being a good candidate for such transfer is the Central Flammable Liquids Decanting facility at Dudley Park. Having looked at the documentation and the background to this, I feel sure that, had the previous Government continued in office, we would have had a mini Frozen Food Factory on our hands, as the previous Labor Government was obviously committed to a proposal that provided grossly excess capacity for the needs of the State hospitals for decanting flammable liquids.

Looking at the documentation, which is quite long, I see that following considerable delays after a suggestion in 1973 from the Department of Labour and Industry that a central decanting facility for flammable liquids should be established because some of the hospitals were not conforming to D.L.I. safety requirements, Cabinet approved proposals, in 1976, to convert a site at Dudley Park for use as a decanting facility. The sum of \$180 000 was approved in 1976. That sum has grown over the years to \$203 354 and it appears now, on examining the current demands for flammable liquids and solutions for

Government hospitals, that the plant has a capacity grossly in excess of any known or foreseen needs of hospitals and, indeed, of any other Government institutions that may be expected to require such liquids.

So, the Health Commission is examining the possibility of transferring that facility to private enterprise, and discussions have been entered into with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I emphasise that, if such a transfer were made, obviously, as part of the terms of the transfer, contracts would have to be negotiated which ensured that the needs of the hospitals were fully met and given priority, and that any other needs that the capacity of that plant might meet from private enterprise would be served in a secondary capacity to the principal role of servicing hospitals.

I emphasise that the documentation relating to that project shows a complete lack of proper managerial control over taxpayers' money—indeed, over Cabinet decisions that were obviously taken without full information. How a joint committee from the Hospitals, the Public Buildings and the State Supply Departments could have come up with a proposal that the then Government approved for a plant which would have a capacity grossly in excess of the State's requirements is hard to determine. One of the decisions this Government has made is that such things will not occur again. We are examining the chickens that are flying out from the roost; some of them are not pleasant, and this is one of them. This is why this plant at Dudley Park is a candidate for transfer to the private sector once the review has been completed.

GUERIN COMMITTEE

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I seek your guidance. My question arises from an answer given by the Minister of Health to the member for Hartley, wherein she said that she failed to understand the reasons behind the question. Mr. Speaker, is it a prerequisite that Ministers understand the reasons behind questions before they answer them?

The SPEAKER: That is the question the honourable member has posed. Does he wish to give any explanation?

Mr. O'NEILL: No, Sir. I am asking you whether there is a requirement on Ministers that they understand questions or the reasons behind them before answering them. I seek your guidance, Sir.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is rising on a point of order, I make the point that it has always been the understanding that Ministers have a responsibility to the House, to the State and to their commission, and that they may, within those responsibilities, determine the answer they give on any subject according to the way they see it or read it.

Mr. O'NEILL: Can the Minister of Health say what action has been taken to put into effect the major recommendation of the Guerin Committee that a small review committee be established as a matter of priority to resolve the remaining criticisms of the Auditor-General, including those affecting—

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL:—budget control, staff establishment—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: That particular question was asked by the member for Hartley, and the explanation was given by the Minister.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. While the basis of the question is related to one asked earlier today by the member for Hartley, the preface to

the question is different. In due course, I will give the Minister the opportunity of dealing with the question in whichever way she desires.

Mr. O'NEILL:—and wage controls, the rights of private practice for doctors in the hospitals, and food costs?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I think that any Minister is perhaps entitled to make a gratuitous comment (and we all do from time to time, as did members of the previous Cabinet). In answer to the specific question, the honourable member will find that the replies to Questions on Notice published yesterday included a detailed explanation of all the questions he has asked.

FLUKE ENTERPRISES

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs read the lead article in last week's *Guardian*, which is a local newspaper circulated in the Marion, Brighton and Glenelg districts, headed "Luke's making his last stand. Battler who is sick of Government promises"? The article claims that the Minister has said that a company called Fluke Enterprises, a food processing enterprise, which employs 30 people at Somerton Park, is not viable and cannot be helped with a State grant of \$90 000. Is this claim correct? If it is not, how is the Government going to assist Mr. Drieman and his company?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I have seen the article in which Mr. Drieman has made a number of statements and allegations. I believe that some of the allegations are grossly incorrect, particularly when he made the accusation that the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, promised him financial assistance. As all members know, such financial assistance can be given only by the South Australian Development Corporation, which is an independent statutory authority. The Government has no means of giving assistance to industry unless it is either approved by this Parliament in the Budget or approved by that committee. Of course, the allegation that the Premier has given such an undertaking is quite false.

I also point out that it is claimed that 30 people were employed. I understand that at this stage only two people, or a small number similar to two, are currently working in this enterprise.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What is a small number similar to two?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: To answer the honourable member, I am not sure whether some of them are employees or proprietors of the company. Two or three people were working physically in trying to produce this product.

I understand and support the principle that Mr. Drieman is trying to achieve, that is, to achieve work for those unfortunate people who are handicapped, and I applaud his object there. I also applaud the fact that he is trying to manufacture a food product and to export it from South Australia. The people to whom I have spoken who have tasted his cuisine say that it is of a high quality. I must emphasise that Mr. Drieman is in a position where he has existing debts. The South Australian Development Corporation has an obligation to make sure that it does not give financial assistance to any enterprise that is not likely to be viable. Until those existing debts are met, hopefully by increased equity by Mr. Drieman and his friends, it will be impossible for the South Australian Government legally to give him any financial assistance. However, I have asked Mr. Drieman to come to see me. An appointment has been made for next week, when we will discuss the problem, but until Mr. Drieman can rearrange his existing debts, no assistance can be given.

GUERIN COMMITTEE

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: If, as the Minister of Health has just informed the House today in answer to a question from the member for Hartley, she is in full agreement with the recommendation of the Guerin Committee, does she agree that the dismissal of Mr. Guerin from his post represented a serious loss of talent and expertise to the South Australian Health Commission?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I think that the Opposition should understand by now, if it has not already grasped the point, that moves made by the Health Commission in respect of that position were directed at the position itself and not at the incumbent of that position.

STATE TAXES

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier state what charges the Government has increased since coming to office last September? Also, does the Government intend to institute a sales tax, as claimed by the Leader of the Opposition? In the House yesterday the Leader accused the Premier of heavy-handed use of charges to solve his revenue problems. In the continuation of the gross mismanagement claims during the recent Norwood by-election campaign the Opposition Leader referred, among other things, to steeper electricity and water bills and to a sales tax.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Once again, the problems of economic management to which the Leader referred seem to have been problems which have arisen only in the imagination of the Leader of the Opposition. Once again, to say that the Government has been heavy-handed in its increases in charges seems to me to be straining credulity to its utmost extent, because, if one looks at the record to see what charges have been increased since this Government has been in office, one sees that there have been some increase in charges in respect of the lodgment of documents at the Lands Titles Office, which charges do not come into effect until next month.

I find it extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition should find anything wrong with measures being taken to correct a situation which was not accurate at the time. I only wish that the Leader would take action to correct his own misconceptions and his own misstatements. It would do him a tremendous amount of good and his standing in the community might increase just a little. That might not suit the member for Elizabeth, but it would possibly help the Leader. Not only is there a problem there with the question of heavy-handed increases in charges about which the Leader has to provide evidence, but there is another question, and that is the quite blatant misrepresentation during the course of a recent election campaign when he said that a mini Budget would be introduced and that the Government intended to impose a sales tax on the people of South Australia.

Mr. Bannon: Those were your own words.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader is quoting my own words, I would like to know the source of his information—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Your mouth.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:—because that obviously has been a misrepresentation. I am absolutely amazed that the Leader, backed up by the contender from Elizabeth, should continue to advertise his abysmal ignorance of the revenue structure of this State. I would think everyone in this Chamber understands that it is not possible

constitutionally for the State to introduce a sales tax—that is, everyone with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition. I can appreciate people in the community being disturbed by such extravagant misrepresentation as that made by the Leader of the Opposition. They are not as well aware of the Constitution as are members of Parliament, but I would say that the Leader would be the only person in this Chamber who did not know the true facts and the fact that we could not introduce a sales tax even if we had considered it. Once again, let me renew my advice to the Leader to stick to the truth, stick to the possible and retain his credibility, if he can.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MISREPRESENTATION

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member claim to have been misrepresented?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Leave is granted. I ask the honourable member to make his remarks relevant to a personal explanation in accordance with Standing Order 137.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, I have no intention of making a speech this afternoon. During his answer to a question this afternoon, the Deputy Premier referred to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of 10 February 1980 wherein I was reported in the column of Peter Ward as having made derogatory and disloyal comments about the Leader of the Opposition. I was reported as having said that he was as weak as orange flower water, or something of that sort.

I want to place on record that at no stage have I made that comment. I am sure members of the House would know that, if I had made any comment, it would not have been in those terms. I want to make clear—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! A personal explanation is recognised as a serious business, and I ask all honourable members to recognise that and to come to order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As a result of that, I have issued a writ against the publishers and the printers, and Mr. Ward and the Editor. If the Deputy Premier wants to repeat his allegations outside of this House, I shall be happy to join him in the action.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: MINISTER'S REMARKS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member claim to have been misrepresented?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not know that I could actually claim that I have been misrepresented, but I believe that, in the remarks of the Deputy Premier, there was a suggestion that I was concerned in some action which he regarded as disreputable. I should like to put the record straight.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In answering a question earlier, the Deputy Premier referred to a document which he said had been released to the press, and he said that it had been first mentioned in this House by me. He had some difficulty in working out who I was, although I have been here for nine years, but subsequently he realised that it was I and he said, subsequent to those remarks, having associated me with the document, that all one had to do was to put a stamp "confidential" on something, tear off

the last page, and hand it to the press. The document I used on that occasion (that was the part of his answer that was correct) I obtained from the Parliamentary Library. I still have it, it is not marked "confidential", and it has no pages missing.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Has the honourable Minister been misrepresented?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not suggest for a moment that the member for Mitchell had given this document to the press. Obviously, he did not hear what I said. I said that a member of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition had handed the document to the press, with "confidential" stamped on the front, the information from Western Mining being torn off the back. The document was first referred to by the member for Mitchell but there was no suggestion by me that he was implicated in any of the underhanded tactics to which I was referring.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who was?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader of the Opposition and his staff.

At 3.13 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Substances Act, 1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill proposes amendments to the principal Act, the Dangerous Substances Act, 1979, authorizing the making of regulations controlling the manufacture, installation, maintenance and repair of machines, equipment, containers or devices in or in connection with which dangerous substances are kept or used. The principal Act includes provisions designed to control the storage, handling, conveyance and use of dangerous substances in the interests of safety. However, recently when the need arose to regulate the installation of liquefied petroleum gas conversion apparatus in motor vehicles, it was found that the Act does not include provisions authorizing the making of the necessary regulations. As a result regulations to deal with this matter were made under the Road Traffic Act. The Government, however, considers that the ambit of this general Act dealing with the safety aspects of dangerous substances should be enlarged so that regulations may be made under it regulating the installation of liquefied petroleum gas conversion apparatus and any similar matter as the need arises.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure may be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the amendment of section 30 of the principal Act which empowers the making of regulations. The

amendment inserts new paragraphs authorizing regulations requiring persons manufacturing, installing, repairing or maintaining machines, equipment, containers or devices in or in connection with which dangerous substances are kept or used to have received training and to hold permits to be issued by the Chief Inspector.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT MARKETING BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the marketing of wheat, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is complementary to legislation of the Commonwealth and other States. It will allow the Australian Wheat Board to continue to exercise sole authority for the export and domestic marketing of wheat. The previous five-year plan for wheat stabilisation expired in 1979 and the new scheme will extend for five years until 1 October 1984. At the present time, certain basic elements of the new scheme are operating in South Australia by regulations made under the outgoing legislation. This transitional arrangement will cease to operate when the legislation proposed in this Bill becomes law. By far the most significant change proposed is the new guaranteed minimum delivery price that takes the place of the traditional first advance payment. This will be set at 95 per cent of the average of the pool returns for three years—for the past year, and the expected returns for the present year and the year ahead.

It is expected that the guaranteed minimum delivery price will provide relative income stability while providing the necessary price signals from the market place. Annual movements from one season to the next will be subject to a limit of 15 per cent. Any deficiency between the net pool return and the guaranteed minimum price will be met by the Commonwealth Government. The price of wheat for human consumption will be fixed by legislation for the year commencing 1 December 1979, at \$127.78 a tonne. In subsequent years it will be varied annually according to a formula. Movements in the price from year to year will be subject to a limit of 20 per cent.

The pricing formula is based on three principles. First, a degree of short term isolation from sudden, large cost increases is provided. Second, price stability is incorporated by using a portion of the previous year's domestic and export prices in the formula. Third, the formula is designed to give a price that will, over time, generally parallel longer-term prices trends on international markets at a level approximating 20 per cent above export prices.

Production of wheat in Tasmania is insufficient to meet local requirements and the deficiency is made up with supplies from the mainland. In 1977-78 this amounted to 89 000 tonnes. The cost of the freight to Tasmania has been met by a levy on all human consumption wheat, and this has been a regular feature of wheat stabilization arrangements. The domestic market price for wheat for stockfeed and industrial purposes will be determined by

the Australian Wheat Board and shall be the same throughout the Commonwealth at any one time. To assist the board in setting a price for stockfeed and industrial wheat, a consultative group will be established that will consist of producers and users of such wheat. The prices set will not be subject to a ceiling, but a safeguard will be provided against inappropriate decisions by reviews of such decisions, if necessary, by Ministers at meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council. In the new five-year plan growers will be able to engage in grower to buyer transactions provided they pay a share of the cost of handling facilities by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. They will be required to pay, also, other charges such as the research levy and the grower fund deductions.

Clauses 1 to 4 are formal and clause 5 defines certain expressions used in the proposed Act. Clause 6 provides that the proposed Act is to operate subject to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act. Clause 7 will confer certain powers on the Australian Wheat Board, including power to receive and sell wheat delivered to it. Clause 8 provides that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is an authorized receiver and may enter into agreements with the Australian Wheat Board. Clause 9 provides that the Wheat Board is subject to the direction of the Commonwealth Minister in the exercise of its functions. Clause 10 provides that the board may acquire wheat by delivery or by a notice demanding delivery. A notice cannot require a person to deliver wheat if it is retained on the farm for the growers' own use. Once delivered to the board, the wheat becomes the property of the board.

Clause 11 deals with the delivery of wheat to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. Clause 12 provides that the proposed legislation is not to apply to seed wheat or inferior wheat which would not be acceptable to the board. Clause 13 will enable a person to obtain a permit to move wheat from one farm to another or to a mill for gristing. Clause 14 is a new provision in the legislative scheme. Growers will be able to engage in grower to buyer transactions provided they pay a share of the cost of handling facilities by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. That cost will be determined by the board after consultation with the industry. Also the growers will pay other relevant charges such as the research levy and the grower fund deductions.

Clause 15 will prohibit the selling of wheat without the written consent of the board. The old provision also prohibited the movement of wheat from the farm where it was grown. The new clause will allow the movement between farms owned by the same person by introducing a permit system for the movement. Clause 15 also introduces a new concept in prohibiting the use of wheat for purposes other than those which may be specified in the contract of sale. Clause 16 provides that the advance payment made by the board shall be the guaranteed minimum price modified by allowances for quality, variety, locality, cost of transport, charges, and charges under the Wheat Tax Acts and the Wheat Levy Acts. If wheat is delivered after the final delivery day, an additional charge will be made based on additional administrative costs.

Clause 17 provides for the final payment. Both clauses 16 and 17 are concerned with the seasons covered by the proposed legislation other than the last two, that is, the seasons for 1984 and 1985. A modified scheme for payment in those seasons is provided for in clause 18. Clause 19 sets out ancillary provisions relevant to all payments. Clause 20 provides for the furnishing of declarations in relation to old season's wheat. Clause 21

fixes the price of wheat for human consumption for the year commencing 1 December 1979 at \$127.78 and provides a formula for the following years. There will be added to the price a charge to enable the board to meet the costs of shipment of wheat to Tasmania. This clause will also allow the board to determine the price of wheat for stockfeed and industrial use. Clause 22 provides for the keeping of special accounts by the board relating to dealings concerning Tasmania.

Clause 23 provides for a quota season if it is necessary to declare such a season. Clause 24 deals with the appointment of authorized persons for the purposes of the proposed legislation. Clause 25 empowers the board to require the furnishing of information relating to wheat and allied matters. Clause 26 requires persons in possession of wheat owned by the board to take proper care of it. Clause 27 provides that South Australian Cooperative Bulk Handling Ltd. shall notify the Australian Wheat Board of the proportion of the remuneration that is referable to capital expenditure after consultation with Grain Section of United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated. Clause 28 will empower an authorized person to enter premises for the purposes of searching for wheat and any documents in connection with wheat. They will not be allowed to enter any premises used for residential purposes without the consent of the occupier or a warrant from a justice of the peace. Also, authorized persons will be able to stop and detain any motor vehicle that contains wheat and demand the production of documents. They will also be able to seize wheat that they reasonably suspect is the property of the board or which has been lawfully demanded by the board.

Clause 29 ensures that the board may apply its funds for the purposes of the joint Commonwealth-State scheme of which this proposed legislation forms a part. Clause 30 provides a general penalty section in relation to offences created under the proposed Act. Clause 31 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the proposed Act. Schedule 1 sets out the details by which the price of wheat for human consumption will be fixed. The formula for ascertaining the price of wheat for human consumption contains three groups of factors. The first allows the effects of sharp rises in wheat growing costs to be reflected in the price. The second includes last year's price and last year's export returns and provides both a degree of year-to-year stability and a direct association with world prices. The third part of the formula is a somewhat complex arrangement which, together with earlier parts, will ensure that the human consumption price will average over the longer run, although not necessarily in any one year, some 20 per cent over export parity.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.
Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This short Bill is designed to deal with a question that

has been raised in relation to the marketing of oats. Section 14aa of the principal Act makes it obligatory for growers to sell their oats to the board, subject however to the exceptions outlined in subsection (2) of that section. Subsection (2)(f) permits a direct sale between a grower and a purchaser "where the oats are not resold . . . otherwise than in a manufactured or processed form." The board has interpreted this provision as meaning that a grower can sell directly to a purchaser either where the purchaser processes the oats and resells them in the processed form or where the purchaser does not resell the oats at all, but simply purchases for his own consumption. Some doubts have been expressed about the correctness of this latter interpretation and the purpose of the present Bill is to put the matter beyond doubt. The Bill inserts a new paragraph in section 14aa(2) making it clear that a grower can sell oats directly to a purchaser where the purchaser buys the oats for his own consumption and not for resale.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes obsolete material from section 14 of the principal Act. Clause 3 amends section 14aa of the principal Act. The material amendment is the inclusion of new paragraph (g) which permits a grower to sell oats directly to a purchaser where the purchaser buys the oats for his own use and not for resale.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CANNED FRUITS MARKETING BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the marketing of certain canned fruit, and for related purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.
Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is complementary to legislation introduced into the Commonwealth, Victorian, New South Wales and Queensland Parliaments for the purpose of setting up a marketing scheme for canned apricots, peaches and pears produced in Australia.

The canned fruits industry is an important horticultural undertaking. It provides the basic economic and social foundation of the population in many areas of the country, including the Riverland region of this State. However, the industry has been experiencing serious difficulties for a number of years, resulting from a variety of factors, principally excess capacity, increasing costs and depressed international marketing conditions. It is now convinced that a statutory marketing scheme is necessary and the arrangements of which this proposed legislation forms a part have the support of the growing and canning sectors of the industry in the principal growing areas of the country.

The Commonwealth legislation establishes the Australian Canned Fruits Corporation which will replace the Australian Canned Fruits Board and which will manage the marketing of the canned fruits. The scheme operates with the corporation estimating the amount of canned fruits which may be sold during the next year in the most

profitable world markets, which the scheme terms "the equalization market". Quotas are allocated to the canners and the canned fruits produced to fulfil the quotas become the property of the corporation. The canned fruits are sold in the equalization market and the proceeds are distributed equally to the canners subject to premiums being allowed for certain kinds of canned fruits. It is a major objective of the scheme that, with better marketing arrangements and funding, payments by canners to growers for their fruit will show a considerable improvement, both in respect to earlier payments and increased returns.

A Commonwealth levy on all canned fruits will finance the administrative costs of the corporation. The object of this Bill is to provide for the scheme to operate in relation to canned fruits produced in South Australia. Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 defines certain expressions employed in the proposed Act. Clause 5 provides that the Act is to apply subject to the Constitution Act of the Commonwealth. Clause 6 enumerates the powers of the corporation, limits the power of the corporation to purchase property for an amount exceeding \$100 000 and requires the corporation to insure canned fruits acquired by it.

Clause 7 requires the corporation to comply with any directions which may be given to it by the Commonwealth Minister who is administering the complementary Commonwealth legislation. Clause 8 permits the corporation to market the canned fruits through agents. Clause 9 provides that the corporation acquires canned fruits when a canner sets canned fruits aside for that purpose, whether or not the canner has been required to do so by the corporation, and that the canner is required to notify the corporation that he has so set aside the canned fruits.

Clause 10 allows the corporation, when canned fruits become or are unfit for human consumption, to serve on a canner a notice to that effect. Clause 11 prohibits a canner dealing with canned fruits without the consent of the corporation. Clause 12 provides for the fixing by the corporation of an insurance reimbursement rate to cover the cost of insurance of the canned fruits. Clause 13 requires the proceeds of the disposal of canned fruits in the equalization market to be paid into a special account known as an equalization pool, and specifies the procedure for determining the amount of the payments that may be made from that account in respect of the canned fruits.

Clause 14 provides for payment by the corporation of proceeds of the disposal of canned fruits other than in the equalization market. Clause 15 deals with the person entitled to payment for canned fruits acquired by the corporation other than by purchase and clause 16 deals with the person entitled to payment for canned fruits purchased by the corporation. Clause 17 makes provision as to when the corporation must pay for canned fruits acquired by it and permits the corporation to make advance payments to a canner until that time.

Clause 18 empowers the corporation to require a person to supply information relating to canned fruits and imposes a penalty for the supply of false or misleading information. Clause 19 permits the corporation to delegate its powers and clause 20 provides that a member of the corporation is indemnified for acts of the corporation. Clause 21 enables the Australian Canned Fruits Industry Advisory Committee established under the complementary Commonwealth legislation to give advice to the corporation, and clause 22 requires a person to exercise proper care in relation to canned fruits which are the property of the corporation.

Clause 23 provides for the authorization by the

corporation or its Chairman of a person who may enter premises, by permission of the occupier or by warrant, for the purpose of inspecting or taking away canned fruits or books, documents or papers relating to those canned fruits. Clause 24 provides that offences constituted under the new Act are to be dealt with summarily. Clause 25 allows the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the proposed Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1941-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Legislation establishing statutory authorities of various kinds usually contains provisions exempting the members from civil liability that may arise in the course of carrying out their statutory functions. A provision of this kind does not, however, exist in the Marketing of Eggs Act, and the members of the South Australian Egg Board have expressed some anxiety about its absence from their legislation. The present Bill therefore exempts the members of the board from personal liability that may arise in the course of carrying out their official functions and provides that any liability that would, but for the exemption, lie against a member shall lie instead against the Crown. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 confers an immunity from liability upon members of the South Australian Egg Board in the terms outlined above.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, 1973-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal purpose of this amending Bill is to make provision for the variation of hen quotas for poultry farmers during the year, in accordance with fluctuations in the demand for eggs. At the present time the Act provides for one twelve-month season, for which each licensed farmer has a hen quota. This cannot be varied within the season. There are clearly recognized fluctuations in the demand for eggs during these seasons; in spring to early summer there tends to be an over supply of eggs, while in

winter there is a corresponding shortage. The existing legislation gives the South Australian Egg Board no flexibility to accommodate these market conditions.

These amendments will overcome this problem by allowing the Minister to fix licensing seasons for any period; thus seasons of less than 12 months may be set, each with appropriate hen quotas. The effect of these proposals are in line with interstate practice, and would enable the board to pursue vigorous and imaginative policies which it has developed for the marketing of eggs. In addition to the main amendments necessary for this proposal, the Bill effects several consequential changes to the principal Act, and removes or modifies provisions of the Act which have become wholly or partially obsolete.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act, which defines certain expressions used therein. The amendment removes the definition of "first licensing season", which is no longer needed, and substitutes for the existing definition of "hen quota" a new definition of that term which is more simple and more appropriate in view of the central amendments proposed in this Bill. The definition of "licensing season" is also recast to fit the new scheme and the definition of "the appointed day", which related to the first licensing season and which is therefore unnecessary at the present time, is removed.

This clause also deletes subsection (5) of section 4 which also related to the first licensing season, and substitutes a new subsection (5) which comprises the central provision of these amendments. The proposed subsection (5) empowers the Minister to fix any period as a licensing season by notice published in the *Gazette*, and to vary or revoke any such notice. Clause 4 amends section 15 of the principal Act, which is concerned with the issuing of seasonal licences to poultry farmers. The amendment substitutes reference to "the prescribed fee" in relation to licences for the existing reference to "the prescribed annual fee . . ." and inserts a new subsection (1a) which, in effect, will enable the Board to issue licences for two or more seasons in a year, while only requiring applications and fees on one occasion during that year. Clause 5 effects a minor consequential amendment to section 17 of the principal Act.

Clause 6 repeals section 23 of the principal Act, which deals with the calculation of hen quotas, and substitutes a new and less complex provision which is now appropriate in view of the removal of reference to the first licensing season from the principal Act. The new section provides that, unless it is varied, the hen quota for a poultry farmer in any licensing season shall be the same as for the last preceding season. Clause 7 provides for a corresponding modification of section 24 of the principal Act which is concerned with the variation of hen quotas for poultry farmers. Clause 8 amends section 42 of the principal Act, which is concerned with the Licensing Committee's annual report. The amendment ensures that only one report will be required each year, notwithstanding that there may now be more than one licensing season in that period.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill is designed to contain development of shops outside zoned shopping centres. It is an interim measure, intended to preserve the status quo while detailed policies governing retail development in metropolitan Adelaide are formulated and brought into effect.

The legislation will operate by withdrawing from councils and the State Planning Authority power to consent to the establishment, in non-shopping zones, of shopping complexes with a floor area exceeding 450 square metres. Thus the unfair advantage that some developers have sought to gain by breaking into residential and industrial zones will be curtailed.

The new controls will not affect the development of shops within designated shopping zones where legitimate competition to provide goods and services to the public should be encouraged. The Bill also allows scope for the development of small convenience shops in residential areas.

The Bill will give greater certainty to councils, prospective developers and the public generally. It will mean that where there are to be large-scale shopping developments they will have to be properly planned and located, with the land rezoned for shopping before development proceeds. This will place the matter on a more satisfactory basis and will allow a fuller opportunity for consideration of proposals of this kind and their complex effects upon the surrounding community.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Bill is to operate retrospectively from the 15th day of February, 1980. This is the day on which notice of the proposed legislation was given publicly.

Clause 3 is the major operative provision of the Bill. New subsection (1) contains definitions required for the purposes of the Bill. New subsection (2) prevents the making of applications for consent to the carrying out of major shopping development projects in non-shopping zones. New subsection (3) renders void any purported consent given upon such an application. New subsection (4) provides for the expiry of the new provisions on 31 December, 1980.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COUNCIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Council Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for the establishment of a new Environmental Protection Council with changes to the

structure and Chairmanship of the council to enable it to operate more efficiently as an independent source of advice on environmental matters. The current legislation provides for eight members of the council with one, the Director-General of the Department for the Environment as Chairman, three other public servants and four other members appointed by the Governor.

The functions of the council as outlined in the Act are to report to the Minister on environmental matters referred to it or raised of its own initiative; to conduct inquiries as requested; and to recommend or promote research on environmental matters. It is not proposed to make any legislative change to the role and functions of the council. As presently defined in the legislation the role and functions are adequate and appropriate.

However, this Bill proposes that changes be made to the structure and Chairmanship of the council. At present, with the Chairman being the Director-General of the Department for the Environment there has been a conflict of interest, as one of the functions of the council is to advise critically on the character of the Government's policies and activities. It is therefore proposed that an independent Chairman be appointed.

At present there are four ex-officio public servants on the council. This has tended to limit the scope and nature of discussion on some subjects by the council and it is therefore proposed that no ex-officio public servants be appointed. Instead, two public servants will be appointed to the council on the basis of their particular expertise in the environment and health areas respectively.

The Government recognizes that the nature of environmental problems is becoming more complex. In the next few years the balance between economic and environmental matters will change in accordance with fundamental social changes. The more vision and wisdom which can be brought to bear on these matters the better. This Bill provides for additional expertise to be provided to the Environmental Protection Council and will ensure that its operations are independent of the Department for the Environment, enabling it to fulfil a "watchdog" function while still being required to advise and report to the Minister.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 provides for the amendment of section 4 of the principal Act which provides for the constitution of the Environmental Protection Council. The clause amends that section by providing that the offices of the existing membership of the council shall be vacated and that the council shall consist of nine members, instead of the present eight, reflecting interest groups and areas of expertise that differ from those provided for by the present provision. The membership proposed is to be made up of a person having expertise in biological conservation; an academic having expertise relevant to environmental protection; a representative of the Conservation Council of South Australia; a person having a special interest in environmental protection; persons representative of mining or manufacturing interests, rural industry interests and local government interests, respectively; and two public servants, one with expertise in environmental protection and the other with expertise in public health. The clause provides that no more than three members of the council shall be public servants and that one member, not being a public servant, shall be appointed to be the Chairman of the council.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill sets out a series of amendments to the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1979, the most significant of which provides for the compulsory use of restraints for children under the age of eight years in moving motor vehicles. At its meeting in February 1979, the Australian Transport Advisory Council acknowledged the vulnerability of children in the event of motor vehicle accidents, and endorsed proposals making it compulsory for them to wear suitable restraints. The advisory council's recommendations place the onus on the driver of the motor vehicle to ensure that any child under the age of eight years who is in a moving motor vehicle is wearing a suitable and properly adjusted restraint, or that if no restraint is available, the child is occupying a rear seating position. New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania have enacted legislation in accordance with the advisory council's recommendations, and the Government is of the view that similar provisions ought to be introduced in this State.

The Bill also deals with several other matters. A court decision handed down last year in a case arising out of an alleged contravention of the speed restrictions enforced in the vicinity of schools has made it necessary to ensure that the portion of road subject to the restriction is clearly defined by signs facing the driver both at the beginning and end of the restriction. This Bill contains provisions which will achieve this. There are also amendments which will enable public authorities placing signs indicating the maximum permissible speed where roadworks are in progress to set any speed limit, rather than the 25 kilometres per hour which is presently set down in the Act, and which has proved impracticable in rural areas where the open road speed limit of 110 kilometres per hour applies.

Finally there is an amendment in this Bill to provide that traffic lights shall not be regarded as operating if they are merely displaying a flashing yellow light, and consequently, the normal give way rule shall apply. The present position here is ambiguous; if a traffic light displaying a flashing yellow light is considered to be not operating, as in the case of a malfunction, the give way rule applies; if it is considered to be operating, the rule does not apply.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 20 of the principal Act, which is concerned with signs indicating that works are in progress on a road. Subsection (2) is recast to permit speed limits to be specified on those signs. The amendment also inserts a new subsection (4), providing that a person shall not drive at a speed greater than that indicated by the signs when travelling on a portion of road to which the signs apply. Clause 4 amends section 49 of the principal Act, which deals with speed limits. The amendment substitutes a new subparagraph (c) in subsection (1) for the existing provision, providing for a speed limit of 25 kilometres per hour on portions of road between "School" and "End School Limit" signs. This amendment also strikes out paragraph (e) of subsection (1), which provides for a speed limit of 25 kilometres per

hour on portions of road between signs indicating that roadworks are in progress. This is consequential on the amendments in clause 3.

Clause 5 inserts a new subsection (6) in section 63 of the principal Act, which is concerned with giving way at intersections and junctions. The new provision makes it clear that traffic lights which are merely displaying a flashing yellow light shall not be regarded as operating. Clause 6 inserts a new section 162ac in the principal Act setting out the requirements for child restraints. The section provides that a person shall not drive a motor vehicle unless the requirements of the section are complied with. These are that if a child is travelling in a motor vehicle fitted with a child restraint of a prescribed kind it shall occupy the position fitted with the restraint, unless that position is occupied by another child. If there is no child restraint in the vehicle, or if there is one which is occupied by another child, the child must be accommodated in the back seat, if there is one. It is a defence to a charge against these provisions if the defendant can prove special reasons justifying non-compliance.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this small amending Bill is to raise the percentage allocation from the Highways Fund under section 32 (1) (m) (i) of the Highways Act, 1926-1979, in respect of road safety services provided by the Police Department. At present a contribution equal to six per cent of the fees received by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles by way of motor vehicle registration fees is applied for this purpose.

The reduction in registration fees, following upon the recent introduction of an *ad valorem* licence fee in relation to the sale of motor spirit and diesel fuel, will result in the income from registration fees being reduced by some \$10 000 000 per year. In order to maintain the contribution at approximately the existing level, the percentage levy will have to be increased to 7.5 per cent.

The reduction in registration fees came into effect early in October of last year; consequently it will be necessary for this amendment to have retrospective effect to that time.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the proposed Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on the first day of October 1979. Clause 3 amends subparagraph (i) of paragraph (m) of subsection (1) of section 32 of the principal Act by substituting reference to seven and one-half per cent for the existing reference to six per cent.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 19 February. Page 1080.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): An article in a publication of the Amalgamated Metalworkers and Shipwrights Union, titled "Australia Being Ripped Off", goes into further explanation as to the Labor Party's attitude in regard to a wealth tax. In that publication of the national council of that body the following is stated:

We call for the collection of thousands of millions of dollars for the public purse. We have published only the most conservative of available estimates . . .

What they are trying to do there is spell out the system of collecting taxes from the so-called wealthy by using a wealth tax. It continues:

No-one owning wealth to the value of less than \$100 000 would have it taxed. This would exempt 95 per cent of Australians. The tax would fall only on 4.5 per cent of our population—nine in every 200. From \$100 000 to \$120 000, the tax would be half a per cent, rising to a tax of 5.625 per cent between \$325 000 and \$500 000, and over \$500 000 it would be 6.75 per cent.

The people who prepared this document for the union estimate:

Such a wealth tax would not only raise \$3 500 000 000 per annum for public revenue, it would also force the wealthy to invest productively to pay the tax—invest instead of buying gold, antiques, famous paintings, etc. as a hedge against inflation.

I doubt the wisdom of those who subscribe to that argument, as they believe that basically only a certain section of the community purchase those types of goods. I heard on the radio this morning that people in a certain profession have houses full of very fine antiques presented to them from those who obtain their favours. That of course would be subject to another debate. However, the Labor Party, when it was in Government in the State, was looking at a wealth tax. I wrote to the Premier on 9 November asking what information was available in the Premier's Department in regard to this matter. I was informed by the Premier as follows:

Inquiries have revealed that a working party set up by the previous Government looked at the possibility of a wealth tax as an alternative to succession and gift duty. It envisages the base of that tax embracing all forms of assets, both real, such as buildings, land, etc., and personal, such as cash at bank, shares, life assurance policies, etc., and the net of outstandings on those assets.

In other words, the previous Labor Government in this State undertook an investigation as to how it could best tax people or bring in an alternative tax, or another taxing system, to obtain revenue by taxing people's assets. I was reliably informed before the election that that was the type of taxation that they were investigating. The Labor Party was intending to charge 0.2 per cent per annum for all tangible assets up to \$50 000, or equity of part thereof; 0.5 per cent per annum on all assets from \$50 001 up to and including \$200 000; 1 per cent per annum from \$200 001 upwards, inclusive of any moneys in family trusts or interest-bearing deposits. Low-income earners (for example, people receiving the minimum wage or under) were to be exempt. Also, persons who had a mortgage on a housing trust home were exempt until the first mortgage was discharged. Multi-national enterprises were to be assessed according to assets in South Australia and profits after tax. Union funds and real estate were to be exempt. Inquiries were made from countries such as Sweden and Denmark. The matter was considered in the United

Kingdom also, and the legislation has been studied.

The example I was given was that, if a house was valued at \$65 000 and there was a \$22 000 mortgage, that mortgage would be deducted, leaving an equity of \$43 000. If one had \$1 000 worth of shares, debentures of \$1 000 and, say, one's furniture was reasonable and worth \$6 000, and one had a motor vehicle worth \$5 000, then one's total assets would be worth \$56 000. Under the proposal of the previous Labor Government in this State, such a person would be charged \$280 per annum on those assets. This wealth tax was a real issue, and it is still a live issue for the Labor Party. It is that Party's alternative method of replacing the short-fall due to their extravagant expenditure over the years.

As I have said previously in this debate, the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that his Party wants pay-roll tax to be abolished. The Leader believes that pay-roll tax should be abolished, but how is he going to replace it? If one is looking at something in the vicinity of \$160 000 000 per annum, and if one takes the bases of the recommendations in "Australia Being Ripped Off", one finds that the Labor Party in this State would expect to receive about \$300 000 000 per annum in South Australia alone. That is the way the Labor Party treats the people in this State. That shows the respect it has for the people who show initiative and enterprise, whether they be working class, middle class or anybody else. The Labor Party in this State has failed to represent the average worker. That is why it is on the Opposition benches at the present moment, because the average workers in this State were the ones that put Labor on the Opposition benches. No doubt my colleague the member for Glenelg will make a contribution to this debate to prove that very point.

The average worker, living in a Housing Trust house in my electorate or in the electorate of Morphett which was acquired some 10 or 15 years ago, would have a property valued at about \$65 000.

Mr. Hemmings: A Housing Trust home?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member wants to look around. There are some magnificent Housing Trust houses built at Henley Beach South. What was formerly called White Park is now Lockleys.

Mr. Hemmings: You are exaggerating.

Mr. BECKER: I could take you down to Novar Gardens where the Housing Trust built houses on land and actually lost. The trust subdivided a park and also took land from the Education Department.

Mr. Hemmings: You're wrong.

Mr. BECKER: I can assure the honourable member that I am not wrong. Some people in the Novar Gardens area who purchased houses three years ago for \$28 000 had to sign a contract that they would not sell the house on the open market for 15 years. They had to sell them back to the Housing Trust at the price they paid, so that they could not benefit from capital gain. Those houses were undervalued by thousands of dollars. Before I left that electorate, they were worth about \$45 000, and they would be worth more than that today. There are many trust houses in my electorate which were purchased by average working people, tradespeople, semi-skilled people who developed beautiful gardens, put additions on to the houses, and many put in swimming pools.

Mr. Keneally: Average workers?

Mr. BECKER: Don't you believe the worker in this State has any initiative or any pride in his own house? If you do not believe in that—

Mr. Keneally: If I—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER:—you will be in Opposition for the rest of your life. You have misunderstood the situation of the

average citizens in this community. They have pride in ownership of their own houses and take pride in developing and improving their own properties. The Labor Party, backed by the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, wants to rip off at least \$280 per annum in relation to the average house in this State. That is not on.

Mr. Trainer: How many rented Housing Trust houses cost \$60 000?

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member is so stupid, I assure him that he will carry on in the Opposition benches for a long time. If he carries on as he has been, he will be lucky to be re-elected to this House. He should get out and examine his constituents' attitude towards this type of taxation.

Mr. Trainer: How many of my tenant constituents have \$60 000 worth of assets?

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

Mr. BECKER: Obviously, it is Labor Party policy that the average worker should not own a house. We know that. It is the policy of the Labor Party that the average citizen should continually be kicked and pushed down. You will not give him any credit for his own initiative, so do not be so stupid. There are plenty of properties in my area the value of which has escalated considerably. Why do you think there have been complaints and protest meetings about land tax and water rates that people have to pay?

Mr. Keneally: Do you realise that Housing Trust tenants do not own the house? If a person is a tenant he does not own the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections across the Chamber. I cannot hear the member for Hanson. I point out to the member for Hanson that he must not invite interjections.

Mr. BECKER: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker; I did not hear your last comment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest to the honourable member that it is not appropriate for him to invite interjections.

Mr. BECKER: People who are residing in Housing Trust houses have purchased them from the trust.

Mr. Keneally: They are a minority.

Mr. BECKER: Heaven forbid! The honourable member must know the annual sales of the South Australian Housing Trust and the number of houses that the trust has sold over the years. If he does not know, I suggest he go to the Parliamentary Library to check. He will be amazed at the number of people who have purchased houses built by the trust on land that was bought and subdivided by the trust. Make no mistake, those houses were the best value housing ever produced in the State, and they still are.

Mr. Keneally: We agree; there is no question about that.

Mr. Trainer: We do not know how much longer it will continue, but that is right.

Mr. BECKER: I believe that it will continue.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that, if the honourable member does not stop interjecting, he may not continue in the Chamber for much longer.

Mr. BECKER: A publication which is called the McCabe Letter and which is produced in Sydney is an exclusive document that is sold to businessmen. The annual subscription is about \$135 for a 12-monthly production. I cannot justify the costs that McCabe charges for his letters, but it is handy to borrow a copy occasionally. Some of the extracts should be noted. In the letter of October 1979 he stated:

The defeat of the Labor Party in the recent South Australian election is significant. Following my visit to

Adelaide in June, I wrote in the July letter that "from an investment viewpoint, South Australia needs to pull up its socks and shake itself out of its lethargy. The State needs action and leadership to turn the economy around . . ." I would suggest the old establishment has had its day and it will need a very strong, clean broom, bristling with exciting new management, to revitalise and reshape the State economic future.

The Liberal Party victory immediately boosted uranium stocks on the share market, and there are some loud and clear messages that must be hitting Mr. Hayden right between the eyes. The Labor Party's unrealistic attitude to uranium mining is just one of them. I stand by what I said in June, that the chance of Labor returning to Government with Mr. Hayden as Leader is zilch, barring an embarrassing accident by the Liberal-Country Party coalition. I don't like having to make that statement, because Australia needs a strong Labor Party, just as it needs a strong Liberal-Country Party, whether they be in Government or in Opposition.

In July 1975, Mr. McCabe stated in his letter:

Adelaide has problems. The city of parks and churches is a beautiful place to live, but there appears little area for growth in secondary industries, and, with the Santos fiasco and a negative approach to uranium mining by Mr. Corcoran's Government, the future appears bleak.

McCabe's assessment of South Australia in July 1979 was as follows:

For every five to six people employed in Adelaide, one is employed in the motor industry. Whilst the motor industry, on the surface, seems to be turning up, there is grave doubt about its long-term future in South Australia, with the tendency to lighter body shells per ratio of engine power. The trend in America is to produce vehicles that have the minimum of 25 miles per gallon capacity and, therefore, with increasing emphasis on plastic in the body design. The headquarters of the plastic industry is in Melbourne and, even though Adelaide car manufacturers may gear up for plastic manufacturing, it would be difficult to take the market away from Melbourne.

The rural scene is similar to Western Australia, in that the last three years have been drought, prior to 1978. Last year was an excellent season, and this year appears to be even better with the rains now falling. However, the rural industry is not a major economic factor, and with property prices way above equivalent ones in New South Wales and Victoria, particularly in such areas as the Grenfell area in mid-New South Wales, it is difficult to recommend purchase of rural property in South Australia against Eastern States property, which is far cheaper. New South Wales property in many instances has a more regular and consistent rainfall than South Australian properties. . .

The major sources of revenue for South Australia are the motor car industry and white goods manufacturers. These are doing quite well, but there appears no room for expansion and with a negative growth rate, and the highest unemployment level in the country, Adelaide has problems. . .

Real estate has performed poorly and prospects are no brighter than they have been for several years. Speculative building of units is not recommended and properties that are more than two or three miles out of the city are more likely to stay level or go down in value, than appreciate at present or in the foreseeable future. South Australia needs a real kick, but where it's going to come from is difficult to see. It will need Mr. Corcoran to do something positive, as South Australia runs the risk of becoming Victoria's most westerly country city.

Another major problem is that all the State's markets lie in the East. Rundle Mall, whilst attractive and appearing busy at first sight, a second glance shows that the shops are

threadbare of buyers. You can't hang your hat on the winery industry, which is suffering many problems, and may suffer more with the August Budget. Some positive suggestions—why not lure students from other States to South Australian universities? I know you can't advertise interstate, but why not put articles in appropriate papers pointing out the benefits of enrolling in Adelaide universities rather than universities such as Newcastle, Wollongong, etc., in New South Wales and similar ones in Victoria? Why not really lobby for an international airport in Adelaide? Why couldn't Qantas or Alitalia stop over on its way between Melbourne and Perth once a week? This would open up Adelaide to so many overseas visitors.

Obviously, he did not do his homework, because neither of those airlines has ever applied to land at Adelaide Airport. Alitalia would not be allowed to land without Qantas being given reciprocal arrangements by the Italian Government, and that will not happen. The letter continued:

From an investment viewpoint, South Australia needs to pull up its socks and shake itself out of its lethargy. That is what McCabe had to say about South Australia then. In his October 1979 newsletter he stated:

The key elements on which the South Australian election were fought were unemployment and the poor health of business activity in the State. The fact of the matter is that South Australia had been missing out, and business was stagnating. South Australia can now look to better things ahead, and the result of the election only reaffirms my belief in the prospects for Australia in the 1980's. I have been stating repeatedly over the past months my confidence in the outlook for our future. The share market is a predictive market, and it is screaming aloud that 1980 is going to be a better year for the Australian business and economic community. If you share that confidence, then it will also be a better year for you. If you're not optimistic, then you are missing out and should reassess your own performance in the light of what is happening. That is the message that the Leader of the Opposition should appreciate and study. He should take heed of the assessment of those people who view the State from outside.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you think the Leader has been badly advised?

Mr. BECKER: I would not expect more than that from Mike Rann and Bruce Muirden. It is obvious that the Leader has not grasped the nettle, and the performance of his Party in the House this afternoon was again pathetic. It is time the Opposition had a training seminar so that members know what is going on. They should upgrade their performances in this House. McCabe finishes by stating:

Get with it and start taking advantage of the opportunities that are presenting themselves now. The previous A.L.P. Government could not accept and act upon the challenge given it to improve business confidence and reduce the cost of Government extravaganzas.

I think we have proved that time and time again. I remind members of some of the extravaganzas we had during those golden years of the Dunstan regime. We find, in the Auditor-General's Report, that the South Australian Theatre Company, for the year ended 30 June 1978, incurred an operating deficit of \$1 123 000. After applying the State Government and Australian Council grants, less amounts transferred to capital account, the net deficit was \$30 000. The Auditor-General pointed out that the average cost per head of the operating deficit for patrons attending performances by the theatre company was \$12.04. I believe that, in 1979, it was almost \$13, and at the present time it is still about \$10 per performance. In other words, the South Australian taxpayers are subsidising by

about \$10 a ticket the attendance of every person who goes to a performance by the theatre company.

No doubt the people in Port Adelaide, Mile End in my district, and in the district of the member for Stuart are not very happy to think that they are paying this subsidy, through their taxes, as well as the extra taxes introduced by the previous Government. Let us have a look at some of the tax increases with which we had to contend during the previous Government's term of office. The previous A.L.P. Government wanted continually to increase taxes, and the people of South Australia were starting to feel the pinch. Land tax increased by 210 per cent; stamp duties increased by 284 per cent; pay-roll tax increased by 548 per cent; liquor tax increased by 272 per cent (no doubt the average working man would be pleased about that!); racing tax increased by 1 062 per cent; motor vehicle licence and registration fees increased by 224 per cent; and other taxes increased by 713 per cent. The average working man felt the pinch at the beginning of last year regarding taxation and increased Government charges. Undoubtedly he would believe, as I believe, that organisations such as the South Australian Theatre Company must take stock and realise that the Government cannot continually prop up their operations. In other words, they should do all they can to become viable organisations.

I do not see why the average citizen should pay taxes to subsidise by \$10 every patron who attends the theatre. No-one can tell me that the average taxpayer in this State benefits by that kind of Government performance. Regarding the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust and the Festival Theatre, the operating loss for the financial year ended 30 June 1979 was \$3 600 000. The total deficits since inception amount to \$14 800 000, or almost as much as the complex cost to build. That money had to come out of our taxes. Surely, the Festival Theatre must now be made to become a viable organisation. The Jam Factory has not worked out. The grants for the year from Consolidated Revenue last financial year were \$620 000; since inception, they have aggregated \$2 200 000. How much longer are we going to go on propping up the Jam Factory? And we should not forget the comments made from time to time by the Auditor-General about poor financial management.

Mr. Keneally: You're in Government now.

Mr. BECKER: I know, and it is time that we started pruning some of the costs. This is my personal opinion.

Mr. Randall: Look what we inherited.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, we inherited this, and I do not see why my taxes or anyone else's taxes should be used to prop up some of these organisations.

Mr. Keneally: My taxes go to pay you, and that's worse.

Mr. BECKER: I did not know that the honourable member earned enough to pay any taxes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson.

Mr. BECKER: Under the Law Department, in the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1979, we find something that worries me considerably. Fines and costs unpaid for the past two years at major courts were as follows: Adelaide Magistrates Court for the financial year 1979, \$2 100 000, an increase of \$540 000 over the total the previous year of \$1 500 000; at Port Adelaide, \$589 000; and at Elizabeth and Salisbury, \$371 000. In other words, about \$3 000 000 is owing in unpaid fines and costs. The 1979 figures include outstanding warrants of commitment totalling \$1 400 000. As at 30 June 1979, recovery action at the Adelaide Magistrates Court had yet to be taken in respect of 8 070 matters amounting to \$899 000. Of these, action on 1970

Government revenue matters amounting to \$357 000 was delayed for reasons outside the department's control. Somehow, under the previous Labor Government, matters going back to 1970, totalling \$357 000, have not been collected. The taxpayers of this State have every reason for wanting to know why that has occurred and what action has been taken to collect that money.

In 1978-79, 18 700 warrants for the non-payment of fines totalling \$1 520 000 were issued by the Adelaide Magistrates Court. Total fines and court fees received in 1978-79 amounted to \$7 900 000, an increase of \$1 080 000. This cannot be allowed to continue. The money must be collected or decisions must be made to improve the whole unfortunate situation. It is a scandal that the people who passed through three courts owe over \$3 000 000 in outstanding fines. Under the previous Labor Government, the taxpayers were asked to pay increased taxation, so that the Government would not need to reduce its services. What the Premier is doing (and this has been lampooned by the Leader) is making these departments function responsibly, doing all we can to reduce costs and collect income.

The Monarto Development Commission is another extravaganza that we simply cannot afford. Interest on loans to date total \$7 600 000. Accrued interest on Commonwealth and State Government loans now totals \$5 900 000. Repayments of principal and interest on \$9 100 000 Commonwealth loans are deferred for 10 years and then repayable over 20 years with interest compounded at current long-term bond rate. From 1985 (assuming 10 per cent interest rate) annual repayment will be approximately \$3 000 000 with total repayment of \$48 000 000.

Repayments of State Government loans of \$2 700 000 are deferred but interest is not compounded. In addition, debenture loans from institutions, etc., outstanding as at 30 June 1979 totalled \$7 900 000, making total outstanding loans of \$19 800 000.

Monarto site rents and leases for the year ended 30 June 1979 totalled \$290 000. Excess of expenditure over income was \$1 701 000, making accumulated losses \$5 700 000.

The South Australian Film Corporation lost \$1 800 000 for the year ended 30 June 1979. Loans outstanding now total \$3 000 000, and it is now insolvent with a net asset deficiency of \$900 000.

The South Australian Land Commission has been mentioned many times. It has loans from the Commonwealth totalling \$52 700 000. As at 30 June 1978 \$45 500 000 had been spent on land acquisition. In 1978-79, \$2 600 000 was spent on land acquisition and improvements. Repayment of deferred loans and accrued interest at the end of the 30-year term could exceed \$280 000 000. If you add that \$280 000 000 to the amount we owe on the Monarto Development Commission (and we project that that could be another \$48 000 000), the Government will have to pay out \$328 000 000 in unnecessary amounts of interest and capital. No Government can continue to operate its finances on that basis. It is the quickest way I know of putting the State into bankruptcy, and what a tragedy and disaster that would be if the people in South Australia had to continue to bear the brunt of such a cost. This was the way in which the management of the State was being carried out by the previous Labor Government, and that is where we were heading.

Another area that concerns me greatly is the State Transport Authority. It had excesses of expenditure over income for the financial year ended 30 June 1979 of \$46 500 000, compared with \$37 500 000 in 1977-78. The anticipated loss this financial year is \$46 000 000. This

means that over three years our transport authority has lost over \$130 000 000. Loans outstanding at 30 June 1979 totalled \$62 600 000, compared with only \$22 000 000 in 1977. The State Transport Authority is also heading for absolute financial disaster when we consider the interest commitment. During that same period the authority has received \$44 400 000 in grants for urban public transport projects, new trains and buses. The brakes have to be put on. It is fair and reasonable that the Premier as Treasurer would request departmental officers to examine the situation within their departments. It happens every year. As I said earlier, we must put a figure on it, and not just ask what can be reduced. The Government has fixed a figure of 3 per cent. Our financial advisers months before the election suggested that at least 5 per cent could be saved. I think the Government has adopted a reasonable attitude in settling for 3 per cent. It does not mean that there will be cuts of 3 per cent all over the place, but what it does mean is far more responsible management and cost awareness within the Public Service.

Again this afternoon, as private members' business was adjourned, we observed that the member for Mitcham was not in the House, and I have said on several occasions that he has the worst attendance record of anyone in this Parliament. I think it is totally unfair on the people he represents and the taxpayers of this State that he cannot be present in the Chamber for most of the time of the sittings. Since the commencement of this Parliament he would not have averaged 20 minutes on most occasions. I was interested to note in the October issue of the *National Journal of the Australian Democrats*, in an article headed "Profile of a candidate", the following:

Shape up your appearance. Wear your best-men ties, and for heavens sake, always clean shaven and reasonably short hair. People do not trust a face they cannot see behind the beard. (Ask Don Chipp!)

I think that is a message for the Democrats and for their Leader. He is never in the House.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How would the member for Mallee go on that one?

Mr. BECKER: There is no problem there. He has promoted himself well right from the moment of his endorsement, as has the member for Mawson. The people could see what they were going to get, but the member for Mitcham has changed during his time in the House. We are critical of the change.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I only hope you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can afford me the full protection that you gave to the member for Hanson.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can assure the honourable member that the Chair will be completely impartial.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am sure you will, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Parliament rather hurriedly went into recess in November last year, mainly because I feel the Government was coming under extreme pressure from the Opposition. As my Leader stated in his Address in Reply speech, the Premier freely admitted to the press that he and his Ministers were exhausted. Judging by the way they have been acting since, I think we should have had a further two months off. I and a few others on this side of the House were disappointed then because we had had no chance to partake in the traditional Address in Reply debate. I had geared myself up to attack the Government in certain areas, and suddenly the Deputy Premier decided that the business of the House was over and we should go away and revive ourselves. Members on this side did not go away and revive themselves; we carried on actively promoting our viewpoints, working within our electorate offices, and using our time rather wisely. I understand

most members of the Government went away on holiday.

I am pleased now that I did not get a chance to speak in November because in the recess period this sham of a Government has proved beyond doubt to the South Australian people, by its continual bungling, that it is incapable of making a firm decision. It has no cohesiveness, it is divided between those who toady to the power broker, the Deputy Premier, and others, a minority, who feel that collective decisions should be made.

I intend to list these blunders, but in the brief time available I should like first to talk about the Norwood by-election. When I came into the Chamber yesterday, I noticed some sick faces on the Government benches. I suppose they were sick because, on the figures of Saturday's by-election, which was so convincingly won by our candidate, Greg Crafter, there will be at least three oncers on the Government side at the next election.

An honourable member: Tell us who they are?

Mr. HEMMINGS: No, I think those oncers have already worked out who will leave this Chamber. I sympathise with them, because they have become accustomed to the gracious living that we have as members of Parliament. The member for Mitcham is always telling us how well we live, and one oncer has been saying that members of Parliament do not get enough money, but should have more. It will be ironic if the tribunal takes note of his submission and increases the salary, and if the member for Todd finds that he is not here in 1982.

Mr. ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that, if the honourable member had read—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must state his point of order.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I have been misquoted, because obviously I did not state that we were deserving of a raise. Had he read the article—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. If the honourable member has been misquoted, he has an opportunity at the appropriate time to raise the matter.

Mr. ASHENDEN: I think I have been misquoted by the honourable member.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But the honourable member does have, at the appropriate time, an opportunity to raise the matter.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I am a fair-minded man, and, if I have misquoted the remarks of the member for Todd, I apologise. The electors in the areas represented at the moment by the oncers will realise at the next election what the electors of Norwood realised last Saturday. They have realised the error they made when they voted on 15 September. The electors of Norwood changed their vote last Saturday, and I can see at least three seats coming over to our side at the next State election.

I notice the member for Rocky River sitting quietly on the back bench, watching the posturings and the ham acting of the Ministers. As a future Leader of the Liberal Party, he must realise that, when he takes over the shambles, the job of leading them back from the wilderness will be even harder.

Let us look at the areas where the Government has dithered and backtracked, and generally made a botch of things. The Football Park problem is still not resolved, but I give the Minister of Transport his due. If he had had his way, it would have been resolved.

Let us look at Moore's. The events of that fiasco would be laughable if they were not so tragic. The Victoria Square Traders Association does not know whether it is coming or going with the different statements coming from

the Premier's office. If the Premier's most recent statement is his final one, we will have shoppers, prisoners, and lawyers mingling together at the Monday sales.

Then we had the fare increases which were on and not on. The four blocks for the new tickets were made and the Minister said they were not, except for one which a junior clerk had ordered without the Government's knowledge or consent. Does the Minister of Transport expect this House to believe that, when we know that minor items put forward by departments have to go to Cabinet for approval? Such minor items as photo-copiers, office furniture, and telephone bills have to go to Cabinet for approval, yet the Minister tells us that one block was ordered by a junior clerk without the Government's consent or knowledge. I have a lot of time for the Minister of Transport, who is one of the more able members of the Government, but he had a minor lapse there. He was caught out, and instead of saying honestly that the new blocks had been ordered he blustered and fell down. In the next breath, however, he told us that fares would have to go up. He cannot have it both ways.

I turn now to the matter of land rights and the betrayal of the Pitjantjatjara people. It is a betrayal, so that the Liberals' mining company friends can profit by a few million dollars. The previous Bill was completely acceptable to the Pitjantjatjara people. It received unanimous support from the Select Committee, and it passed through this House. However, as soon as the Government got its greedy little fingers on the Treasury benches, the principle of allowing legislation that had been passed to go through went out the window. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs made soothing statements to the tribal elders. That is a joke, if ever there was one. It reminds me of the Department of Jewish Affairs set up by Hitler in the 1930's to destroy the Jewish people. What is happening is not the physical destruction of the Pitjantjatjara people, but the destruction of their culture and their heritage for the almighty dollar.

Many concerned people see this sell-out for what it is, but how does our worthy Premier describe these concerned people? I quote from the *News* of 31 January, under the heading "Fair go' pledge on land rights", as follows:

People involved in protests over proposed changes to Aboriginal land rights legislation were "beating hollow tins," the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said today. Their concern was premature, he said. "Draft legislation is yet to be prepared, and I am hopeful that further talks with the Pitjantjatjara Aborigines can be held before Parliament resumes next month," he said.

We have the Catholic church coming out strongly in support of the Pitjantjatjara people, and also the Anglican church. Is the Premier saying that they are beating hollow tins? The *Advertiser* of Saturday 16 February contains a report on their views, as follows:

A Roman Catholic commission yesterday called on the South Australian Government to set up an independent tribunal to define the extent of tribal lands outside the North-West Aboriginal Reserve.

Ownership of the "non-nucleus" tribal lands is in dispute between the South Australian Government and the Pitjantjatjara. The Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, in a statement from Sydney, also said it disagreed with an assurance given it by the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, that the Pitjantjatjara faced no threat to their "enjoyed possession" of the North-West Aboriginal Reserve and adjacent lands.

In the latest development over the Government's announcement last week to allow mineral exploration in "non-nucleus" tribal lands, the commission criticised the

Government for its handling of the Pitjantjatjara people's claims. In a separate statement issued in Adelaide yesterday the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Adelaide, the Most Rev. Dr. J. W. Gleeson, and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Port Pirie, the Most Rev. B. Gallagher, supported proper safeguards for the Pitjantjatjara. The commission funded and set up by the Australian Bishop's Conference said the tribunal should contain some Pitjantjatjara members.

It goes on:

The Government announced on Thursday it would grant freehold land rights to the North-West Reserve, but would continue negotiations for the "non-nucleus" land adjacent to the south and east of the reserve. It did not outline details of powers to be given to the Pitjantjatjara in the North-West Reserve.

Following the announcement the Pitjantjatjara Council reacted angrily and said it was obvious the Government intended to prevent Pitjantjatjara claims to the "non-nucleus" land. The Catholic commission said yesterday it had written to Mr. Tonkin in November last year suggesting a tribunal would be the fairest way to apportion land ownership in the disputed "non-nucleus" area.

The commission said it supported completely the endeavours of the Pitjantjatjara to bring their case before the Government and the people of South Australia. On Thursday it sent a telegram to the Pitjantjatjara Council expressing "solidarity with the leadership and role exercised by the council in its struggle for recognition of full ownership and control of traditional lands".

"We also disagree with the South Australian Government's claim, made by the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, to this commission, that the Pitjantjatjara face no threat to their enjoyed possession of the North-West Reserve and adjacent properties," the commission said yesterday. "It is the commission's view that the Government's claims have been contradicted by its own action in proceeding to grant licences for mineral exploration in the area."

In their statement, the two South Australian bishops said: "In our desire for progress we are putting at risk a fundamental human right, the right of the Pitjantjatjara people to preserve the spiritual heritage which is theirs."

I now wish to read what the Anglican Archbishop had to say concerning land rights. He is reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 February, as follows:

The Anglican Archbishop, Dr. Keith Rayner, last night warned the State Government it would only have itself to blame if suspicion and hostility were aroused over Aboriginal land rights. "I am very concerned that the Government has determined its policy in relation to exploration in so-called non-nucleus land of the Pitjantjatjara people before it has determined its land rights policy in relation to these people," Dr. Rayner said yesterday.

"The Government should withhold action on granting mineral exploration rights until its overall land rights policy has been determined, publicly announced and subjected to open discussion. The people must be fully involved in these discussions. Unless this is done, the Government will have only itself to blame if suspicion and hostility are aroused among the Aborigines and the community at large."

Thus, two Roman Catholic Bishops and one Anglican Archbishop have expressed concern about this matter, yet the Premier describes those kinds of people as people who are beating hollow tins. It is relevant that we should note that it was in November 1979 that the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace wrote to the Premier suggesting that the setting up of a tribunal would be the fairest way to apportion land ownership in the non-nucleus lands. It takes no stretch of the imagination to know why that correspondence was not released by the Government: it was completely ignored.

In the past two weeks two other churches have come out in support of the Pitjantjatjara people—the Uniting Church and the South Australian Church of Christ. How many more people need to declare themselves before the Government recognizes that the vast majority of South Australians are concerned about the Pitjantjatjara people? The demands made by the Deputy Premier to mine at all costs and to ignore the culture and heritage of these people is the wrong course.

I have spoken of the many blunders the Government has made since it was elected. It was elected with the support of the media, vested mining interests and others whose interests will come to light later on this year. How does the Public Service stand while all this bungling goes on? The Public Service has become bewildered and alarmed at Ministerial decisions made and countermanded. The Public Service does not know where it is going any more. I think members on this side and members opposite would agree with me that we have the finest Public Service in Australia. We have public servants who are completely impartial and work their hardest to serve the Government of the day. How can one blame public servants today who, because of the inept bungling of the Ministers in charge of their departments, are perhaps prone to talk to the media or the Opposition? I am not saying that they are talking to the Opposition, but one could easily understand their being forced into a situation where they do not know where they are going.

I know that some Ministers, to give them their due, are struggling to do a decent job with their portfolios. Obviously I cannot mention them because, in effect, that would be the kiss of death for them if a Minister was seen as a competent person by the Opposition. By and large, as I have said before, they are a bunch of inept bunglers. The tragedy is that the two biggest bunglers are the Premier and the Deputy Premier. Did I hear somebody on the other side say "Yes"?

It is no secret that the Deputy Premier rules the Cabinet; the Premier does not rule the Cabinet. The Deputy Premier and Ross Story have teamed up and they ride roughshod over the rest of Cabinet. The Government of this State has been reduced to a two-man rule. I can recall in 1972 when the Federal Labor Party won the election and the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister formed a Government so that things could get moving again. Liberals all over the country said that that was a dictatorship. That is what we have at the moment—a dictatorship. It is even more tragic that the dictatorship consists of one elected member and one appointee of the Liberal Party. The appointee also sits in at Cabinet meetings.

The stories keep coming through that the Deputy Premier uses standover tactics to get his own way. He reduces members of Cabinet by ridiculing them and he uses every way he can to make them feel small. This was patently obvious with the Pitjantjatjara sell-out. The Minister of Environment and the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs were obviously outdone. I felt sympathy for those Ministers. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs was obviously trying at least to protect the rights of the Aborigines. The Minister of Environment, through his historical relics branch, was making an attempt to preserve those relics. Those Ministers were completely overruled by the Deputy Premier. Whilst I do not have a copy of the statement, there was one made by the Deputy Premier (after the Minister of Environment got his public dressing down) that mining should take place.

Members opposite, alarmed at this trend, are freely admitting that a Cabinet reshuffle is imminent. Two likely victims are the Minister of Health and the Minister of

Education, with health to go to the other place to take the heat out of it, and the tip is that the Hon. Ren DeGaris will get the job. There is no greater area of Government mishandling and failure to listen to reason than in the field of health.

Members will recall in the Premier's Budget speech that rather pompous statement concerning the reduction in the Health Commission budget. The Premier told us that patient care would not suffer in any way. I warned this House at that time that there just had to be a lowering of standards, and that in the end it would be the patients who suffered. Hospital administrators warned of having to close wards, but that was ignored. We were told by the Minister that further funds would be made available if hospitals were unable to manage. There was no indication of how much or from where it was to be obtained.

Let us look at how patient care has suffered in these few months. This may seem rather trivial to some members opposite. For example, nurses were subjected to a new roster system with one aim, which was to reduce cost. It was not designed to improve efficiency, to make life easier for the nurses, or to make life better for the patients; the single aim was to reduce the cost to the hospital. This callous decision was carried out at the expense of nurses and can lead only to a decline in patient care. Under the new roster system a nurse can expect to receive only five hours sleep. How long will it take for nurses to suffer fatigue which could lead to errors on their part, with patients the obvious losers?

With regard to other staffing areas, again I warned this House that there would be widespread reduction in non-nursing personnel. It is happening already and getting worse. I would like to read to the House a statement which was made by Mr. R. F. Morley (as reported in the *Advertiser* of 9 February 1980) and which clearly demonstrates that already hospitals are being stretched to the limit. The report states:

Staff cuts in South Australia's Government hospitals were causing widespread industrial unrest, a union leader said yesterday. The Australian Government Workers' Association general secretary, Mr. R. F. Morley, made the statement after about 80 members of the union at the Northfield Hospital and adjacent Morris Hospital held a 1½-hour stop-work meeting yesterday morning.

Those who took part included domestics, pantry maids, catering staff, porters and medical orderlies. Mr. Morley said the reason for the meeting was that staff members were unable to take their annual leave and long-service leave because there was no-one to replace them. The Northfield Hospital was down at least nine domestics and the Morris Hospital was three medical orderlies short in the very sensitive area of treatment of paraplegics and quadruplegics.

"In my opinion the staff shortage is now affecting patient care . . . and it is through no fault of the employees, who are dedicated workers," Mr. Morley said. The meeting had decided to call occasional stopwork meetings to draw attention to the staff problems. Mr. Morley said he believed industrial unrest would spread to other hospitals unless the Government took a more realistic view of staffing.

Another 16 medical orderlies were needed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to maintain the service to patients. "We said 12 months ago to the Government of the day that there was room for cost-cutting, and a steering committee was set up to look at this without people having to lose their jobs," he said.

"But the overall picture now in regard to the Government general hospitals is one of deterioration. Some of our hospitals are in such a position that they can't even keep the places clean simply because of the lack of staff. Morale among staff is at a very low ebb. What started out to be a

cost-saving exercise has now turned out to be a monster."

The Northfield hospital staff were sending petitions to the Premier, Mr. Tonkin and the Minister of Health, Mrs. Adamson, complaining about the staff shortage.

I wonder what was the result of that petition. It has been said to me that general, recognised public hospitals are now becoming second-class institutions. I have been told that lights are turned off at a certain time at night in the corridors so that people have to grope around. That is the kind of situation that we are facing; patients going to hospital expecting some respect and dignity are being treated like second-class citizens. We all know that the Government would like to foster private hospitals, so that patients would have to take out heavy insurance to get the treatment that they deserve; they would have to pay for it. This Government does not recognise the rights of people at all.

The choice of breakfast is now eliminated and a continental breakfast is being introduced, and we all know what that means—a piece of toast and a cup of coffee. It is practically a widespread practice now that biscuits are no longer being supplied with morning and afternoon tea. To some people that may mean nothing, but all it represents is a lousy \$16 000 a year saving at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That is the type of cost-cutting that is going on as a result of this Government's Budget.

I would like to make one thing clear. I do not blame the administrators or the heads of nursing staffs. The responsibility lies fairly and squarely on this Government. It is its philosophy to reduce the cost of health care and, if public patients suffer as a result, well who cares?

The administrators' hands are tied, and it is obvious that they will get no support whatsoever from the Minister. I refer to that rather obnoxious submission made by the South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association to the national commission of inquiry into the efficiency and administration of hospitals. I would like to quote from an article to show exactly what the A.M.A. thinks of the administrators of our public hospitals. This appeared in the *Advertiser* on 29 January 1980, as follows:

The A.M.A. says in a submission to a national commission of inquiry into the efficiency and administration of hospitals that South Australia has suffered from problems of excessive growth in the public hospital sector. "The recent establishment of the Flinders Medical Centre is widely regarded as an extremely expensive form of hospital provision," it says. Other reasons cited for "an explosion in hospital costs" are increased services resulting from technological changes in medicine and demands for hospital services created by "an increased number of paramedical staff".

The submission says the effects of recent upheavals in the hospital management system are far from over and "distrust and suspicion occur at all levels with resulting highly defensive postures being adopted".

Later, regarding the Public Accounts Committee Report, the article states:

The A.M.A. says that, while the P.A.C. report has been criticised for some errors of detail, the main thrust of its criticisms is generally recognised as correct. "Although the P.A.C. report contained a number of criticisms of the Health Commission—in particular the excessive amount of centralisation of decision-making and the rapid growth in staff of the State body—the general feeling is that the bureaucracy was able to use the report to defend itself by turning the criticisms around and attributing the blame for poor performance on to the medical profession," it says.

This is the comment I found most objectionable:

The A.M.A. says doctors are being made scapegoats for cost increases, yet there has been a four or five-fold increase

in the number of lay administrators in South Australian hospitals in the past 10 to 15 years without change in the number of doctors and little change in output.

What was the Minister's reaction to those charges about our own Health Commission and in particular about the administrators? In the same article, under the heading "Valid—Adamson", appeared the following:

The Minister of Health, Mrs. Adamson, said the A.M.A. submission had raised valid and important points which were "unarguable".

"The question of management of hospitals is a critical one and it is well recognised that more resources must be put into the financial management of hospitals," she said.

At the same time the medical and paramedical profession itself must come under scrutiny if costs of services are to be contained.

In effect, that is a tacit agreement to what the A.M.A. is saying, and that the administrators and boards of management are incapable of running the financial management of hospitals. Is it any wonder that the administrators are angry with the Minister? I can assure honourable members that they are. Their Minister deserted them when the doctors made outlandish charges. They are having to live within their individual budgets set by the Minister. Some measure of support should have been forthcoming, but I assure the administrators in the public hospitals of this State that they will be waiting a long time for that.

We also know that the cuts in health and welfare services are causing considerable concern to the South Australian Council of Social Services. The council is concerned that, with the present economic crisis increasing as it is—and, let us face it, it will only get worse—there will be an increasing need for welfare and health services related to personal stress, emergency finance, relief and housing needs. The council wanted the Government to take these factors into account when considering the Budget, but it was virtually ignored. We can easily anticipate the end result in health and welfare services; there will be total chaos. Already, resources are being stretched to the limit, and people are being turned away or shunted from one voluntary agency to another. The system has been breaking up for about 18 months, and yet, in this area where the State provides services, where we know that the Federal Government has consistently cut down its grants to States in the field of health and welfare, we take it one step further and reduce the allocation for such services.

I must admit that there was some welcome news; an announcement was made on Monday, I think, by the Minister that an additional \$4 500 000 was to be allocated to five hospitals in metropolitan Adelaide. The lucky recipients were the Royal Adelaide Hospital (\$1 500 000), the Flinders Medical Centre (\$1 200 000), the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (\$800 000), and the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Adelaide Children's Hospital (\$300 000 each). I was particularly pleased about the allocation to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, because it is the hospital closest to my electorate, and I realised the problems that that hospital was having.

However, we were not told in that press statement how much other hospitals had requested in additional finance and why they were refused. All recognised hospitals were facing problems. Problems are also being faced in the hospitals at Port Pirie, Mount Gambier and Whyalla. Why were those hospitals refused additional finance? We all saw the answer to a Question on Notice asked by me of the Minister. It was said that all hospitals had their funding cut by a considerable amount in comparison with what was requested. It was obvious that more money was requested.

Perhaps the Minister would like to tell us why the hospitals were refused and whether there is more money available from the source from which she obtained the \$4 500 000 to help the hospitals previously mentioned. Will the money allocated to those lucky hospitals be used to re-employ staff who have been laid off, to improve patients' meals, or to make nurses' lives more bearable? I doubt it. As I said previously, the administrators' hands are tied. The money will have to be used to offset further cuts that were in the pipeline.

I now turn to the Minister of Health's extraordinary behaviour concerning Mr. Bruce Guerin. Time and time again we have had conflicting answers to questions put by the Opposition about Mr. Guerin's dismissal and what role the Premier and the Minister played in that coup. The answers become more and more confusing. In a reply given yesterday to the member for Playford, the Minister became emotional and asked the Opposition how it expected the Government to clean up the mess of the Health Commission in five months. Yet, last year the Minister stated that all of the Guerin committee recommendations had been agreed to and were being carried out. In fact, everything in the garden was lovely. However, yesterday, in reply to a question from the member for Playford, there was an emotional outburst that five months is not long enough—it will take years.

One of these days the truth will come out, and, when questions and answers are put alongside the truth, the Minister will feel rather foolish. Let me make a calculated guess about why the Minister is so reticent about giving a clear-cut answer to Opposition questions about Mr. Guerin's dismissal. I claim that the dismissal was a political move agreed between the Minister, the Premier and senior members of the Cabinet. The excuse given was that there was now no need for an Executive Commissioner—that was the line that the Minister gave us in November last year. I feel that when Sir Charles Bright, head of the advisory committee, heard of the dismissal, he was aghast, so they had to work out something to take the blame away from the Minister, the Premier and senior members of the Cabinet. The ideal scapegoat was there. There was a hurried meeting, and the commission was in effect told to dismiss Mr. Guerin. I do not know whether Mr. Guerin agreed with that line. That let the Minister off the hook and the rest we know. A new position of Chief Executive Officer has been created.

We will find out the truth one day about exactly what happened; it may take us some months, but we on this side will eventually find out the reasons why Mr. Guerin was dismissed. There is another aspect of the Minister's attitude to one section of community health care that I find rather bewildering, and that is the field of women's community health centres. I would have thought that these groups would receive the fullest co-operation from the Minister.

I say that, not because the Minister would have been prone to favour her own sex, but because she would have realised that the women running these centres have proved to be very efficient. No-one can deny that women's community centres are being run efficiently by some paid and volunteer workers. It seems, however, that every effort is being made by the Health Commission to frustrate their operations. Perhaps the Minister believes in the old adage that only men can make administrative decisions, or is perhaps being strongly advised. I hope that it is the latter.

I have received numerous letters from different groups saying that the Government is dragging its feet or is placing unacceptable demands on these centres. I urge the Minister to reappraise the situation, especially as regards

the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre. I will read a letter that I have received from the St. Peter's Women's Community Centre. It has been addressed to me, as shadow spokesman for health, and states:

We strongly protest the restrictive nature of the Government's attitude regarding future funding of the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre (R.C.C.). As things stand at present, the Government seems to be giving R.C.C. two choices for its future: (1) Continued funding, with a manager whose duties involve "administrative and clinical oversight". The R.C.C. has operated successfully for 3½ years on principles of shared decision-making and responsibility, trust and confidentiality. As volunteers, they could not continue their work for R.C.C. on any other terms. Therefore, if a manager is retained, their volunteer services would cease. (2) Withdrawal of funding if R.C.C. does not co-operate with the Health Commission in accepting the manager and handing over full control of their funding.

We feel that the continued important work by the R.C.C. in helping women through crisis situations would be greatly jeopardised if a manager is retained and full control of funding is handed over. We therefore urge you to do everything in your power to provide full support for the R.C.C.'s future existence as an organisation providing an important community service. On behalf of the Co-ordinating Collective of the St. Peter's Women's Community Centre.

The letter has been signed by members of the collective. These people are not asking for vast sums; they are asking for a grant to carry out the work. As one can see from the letter, they are mostly volunteers, but they have their self-respect. They do not want a paid manager to come in and give clinical oversight, they want to continue helping people out in a crisis situation. I again urge that the Minister use her power to ensure that the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre continues to function as the co-ordinating committee would like it to do.

Finally, although it is some time since the new Opposition members made their maiden speeches in this debate, I congratulate them on their extremely fine effort. They have proved that they are able to carry on the work that their predecessors were carrying out. I also pass on my congratulations to the new Government members. As I always like to end on a jovial note, and not upset Government members too much, and now that the member for Hanson has entered the Chamber, I point out that I found in my office a copy of the Liberal Party's health policy, issued by Mr. Becker, M.P., shadow Minister of Health. If he would like to claim it during the dinner adjournment I will gladly return it to him.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I will describe to the House the Government's policy with regard to the development of South Australia's uranium resources. Our view is that mining and processing of uranium should proceed, subject to all environmental impact statement requirements being satisfactorily met and all necessary procedures being followed in production operations to ensure the proper handling of products and the sale of uranium to approved countries.

The starting point in the explanation of our policy is the immensity of South Australian uranium resources and the now known capability of them to be mined economically at current prices to supply the demand from the late 1980's when nuclear electricity will be making a much larger contribution to world energy needs.

Estimates presently available to the Government suggest that South Australia has potential commercial

resources of about 500 000 tonnes of U308. Most of these were discovered as a result of prospecting authorities granted by the former Labor Government. The importance of these discoveries is best illustrated by reference to the world situation. As we understand the situation, there is every reason to believe that Australia's potential uranium resources will exceed 1 000 000 tonnes of 308. This represents 20 to 25 per cent of commercial uranium reserves in the Western world. In South Australia, therefore, we now know our potential reserves amount to about 10 per cent of presently known world reserves. The already announced Australian plans for uranium development will bring considerable benefit to the nation in terms of foreign exchange earnings.

The context against which the development of these reserves must be considered is one of continuing demand for uranium as an energy source. The activities of the OPEC countries are severely restricting the quantities of petroleum that are available and are, at the same time, causing the price of those supplies that are available to escalate rapidly. The burden that this has placed on the economies of many nations, both developed and underdeveloped, is well known to members. Suffice it to say, countries such as France, Japan, the United Kingdom, Korea and Taiwan have had no alternative but to accept nuclear power as the main source of energy for expansion of their generating capacity.

While coal has in some situations been suggested as meeting this demand it is not always available or suitable. It has to be transported and shipped, and customers are not always willing to accept coal as a reliable alternative for electric power generation. Looking to the future, there is increasing concern that the long-term burning of coal, notwithstanding stringent controls, will lead to increasing environmental objections in the form of discharges that produce acid rain, sulphur dioxide emissions and increasing volumes of carbon dioxide discharges that are slowly warming the atmosphere because of the so-called glasshouse effect.

Overall, there is the increasing demand for energy. Underdeveloped countries are becoming increasingly sophisticated both in their industrial processes and lifestyles as they move towards "developed" status and are increasing their requirement for energy. Developed countries are moving towards increasingly capital intensive industrial processes, and expectations of improved standards of living continue. This is increasing the demand for energy. We live therefore in a world which requires increased energy to maintain its momentum at the same time as the availability of traditional energy sources is becoming restricted.

While increasing effort is being devoted to the renewable energy sources (wind, solar, tidal), they are not yet developed to the point where they can fill the gap either practically or economically. It is generally agreed that the necessary technological developments required to enable renewable energy sources to play a significant role will not be made until well into the twenty-first century.

The situation with which we are faced, then, is one in which there is the threat of an increasing energy shortage as the years progress. It is in this context that nuclear power and thus South Australia's uranium resources are so vital and, because of the lead times involved, decisions must be taken now to meet the needs of the future.

The estimates that we have available to us confirm the increasing importance that nuclear energy will have in the future. While there are conflicting views as to the precise size of the demand for nuclear energy, there is general agreement that demand will increase substantially by the end of the decade. The most recent reliable information is

from the O.E.C.D. and the Nuclear Energy Agency. They have estimated that installed nuclear generating capacity will increase from 110 000 megawatts in 1978 to 1 000 000 megawatts by the year 2000.

This forecast was made last year when 400 000 megawatts generating capacity was operating, under construction or on order. This represents an increase of nuclear generating capacity from 8 per cent of all western world capacity to 32 per cent of western world generating capacity by the year 2000. In terms of reactor numbers there are over 800 in operation, under construction or on order.

Apart from these broader factors, there is also the economic benefit to South Australia that should result from uranium development. Experience elsewhere suggests that orderly, controlled development of uranium resources can greatly enhance local economies. Thus, to take two examples, Saskatchewan in Canada is seeing major improvements in housing, schools, universities and hospitals, as well as an overall improvement in living standards, as a result of uranium and other mining developments. Similarly, Niger, which currently produces 5 per cent of the world's uranium, is also undergoing a transformation.

It is against this entire background that South Australian uranium is seen as having an important role to play. In reaching our decision to allow developments to continue we have had regard not only to market and economic factors but also to the real and pressing need for many countries to have an additional energy source. There has been discussion in the community as to the risks involved in the use of nuclear power, and we have sought to satisfy ourselves as to the situation with regard to these risks.

With regard to the production and processing of uranium, the situation is clear. The Federal Government's Environmental Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act 1978 provides for the protection of the health and safety of the people of Australia and of the environment from possible harmful effects associated with nuclear activities. With these provisions in mind, three codes of practice are being developed by a Commonwealth-State consultative committee in which South Australia is playing an active role. These codes will cover radiation protection in mining and milling of radioactive ores, transport of radioactive ores and waste management in uranium mining and milling.

With regard to radiation protection in mining and milling, a code of practice has been in existence since 1975. This code was described by the Ranger inquiry as the most comprehensive and restrictive available in any country. The work of the Commonwealth-State consultative committee has been directed towards recasting the code into a form suitable for enactment. These discussions are almost completed, and it can be expected that South Australia's health and mining legislation will be amended to require the code's provisions to be adhered to as a matter of law in all uranium mining and milling operations.

Meanwhile, discussions with mining companies and health authorities indicate that the provisions of the 1975 code are working satisfactorily. Indeed, mining companies tend to go beyond its requirements and, often in conjunction with health authorities, undertake comprehensive monitoring and precautionary programmes to ensure that exposure of workers to potential radiation hazards is well below the allowable limits. The interest of the community at large in the safe conduct of mining operations is served by the environmental impact procedures established by the Department of the Environment. These have been drawn up having regard to

experience interstate and overseas, and require careful attention to be paid to the specifically uranium related aspects of mining projects. This is in addition to the normal environment protection requirements, such as impact on flora, fauna, landscape and historic sites.

With regard to the use of uranium as fuel for nuclear power plants, we have carefully considered developments in Australia and overseas. In addition to the exhaustive inquiries by the Ranger inquiry (the Fox Commission), there have been the Flowers Report and Mr. Justice Parker's Inquiry into Reprocessing at Windscale (both of these inquiries in the United Kingdom) and the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry regarding mining in Saskatchewan in Canada. Most recently, of course, there have been the inquiries following the accident at Three Mile Island in the United States. In addition to these reports, we have had regard to the views of such notable Australians as Sir Mark Oliphant, Sir MacFarlane Burnett and Mr. Bob Hawke.

We have also considered the reports prepared by the advisers who accompanied Mr. Dunstan on his uranium study tour early last year. They were Mr. Ben Dickinson, a former Director of Mines in South Australia and Mr. Ron Wilmshurst, Technical Director of Amdel. The view of both these experts was that mining should proceed. Mr. Dickinson, in his report, said:

Overall the visit resulted in unanimity that mining and treatment of uranium could proceed in South Australia, subject to the application of rigid international safeguard controls and of codes for waste management within the framework of consumer countries. The consensus view was that effective safeguards could be operative in the early 1980's in most countries whose Governments had made commitments to honour the non-proliferation treaty and International Atomic Energy Agency agreements, including the non-acquisition of nuclear explosives.

In anticipation of these conditions becoming established it was also the consensus view that the safeguards required for the sale of South Australian uranium to customer countries could now be drafted and form the basis for detailed discussions with the Commonwealth Government regarding their implementation.

Mr. Wilmshurst, in his report, took the following view:

There is no technical reason why concern about waste disposal or safeguards should prevent uranium mining in South Australia.

The team reviewed the procedures for vitrification and deep burial of wastes in stable geological formations. Mr. Wilmshurst reported:

In summary then the burial, after some years of surface storage, of cans of solidified waste in granite at depths in excess of 500 metres has been demonstrated to offer a viable ultimate disposal procedure for highly radioactive waste. The Swedish studies have gone far beyond this and have extended into prediction of the effects of drinking groundwater from a well adjacent to a granite disposal site up to one million years into the future. These effects have been shown to be, under conditions deliberately chosen as being unfavourable, far below those of natural background radiation.

Legal safeguards on uranium sales were also reviewed in some detail, and Mr. Dickinson reported:

Provided I.A.E.A. safeguards are applied to all phases of the nuclear cycle in customer countries and that customer countries accept nuclear waste disposal criteria developed in the more advanced nuclear countries, South Australian uranium can be sold safely for nuclear power generation. It is opportune now to prescribe conditions of sale based on these premises (now acceptable in most countries) in consultation with potential producers, consumers and the Australian Government.

Honourable members should be aware that, as a signatory

to the non-proliferation treaty, Australia has an obligation to make its uranium available to other parties to that treaty. As the Fox Report has stated:

Article IV of the non-proliferation treaty, as a counterweight to its undertakings relating to weapons non-proliferation, incorporates an obligation upon all parties to facilitate, and grants to all parties the right to participate in, the "fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information".

While the report pointed out that the article does not create a binding obligation in a legal sense it goes on to say:

The non-proliferation treaty only became possible because of the assurances in article IV concerning the provision of nuclear equipment, materials and information for peaceful purposes.

Australia's reputation with regard to non-proliferation generally and the negotiation of safeguards is seen as high. This follows the announcement on 24 May 1977 of the Australian policy of safeguards for nuclear exports. This policy has been reflected in the bilateral safeguards agreements that have been negotiated between Australia and existing and potential customer countries.

Recently a safeguards agreement was negotiated with the United States, and others are in the course of being finalised. Before moving on to projects that are presently contemplated in South Australia, I would like to refer to the incident at Three Mile Island. This has been discussed in the press and elsewhere in a manner which suggests that this was a disaster. In terms of the risk to the population living near the plant, this is not a true view of the situation. The facts of the matter are that people working in the plant or living in the areas adjacent to it were not exposed to levels of radiation greater than those regarded as generally acceptable. The safety mechanisms associated with the plant ultimately operated, as they were designed to do, to prevent any harmful release to the atmosphere. What the report does show however is the need for more effective operator training and maintenance in nuclear power plants in the United States.

In other words, it was not the technology that failed but rather the regulations and control applicable to nuclear plants. It is pleasing to note the steps being taken in the United States to strengthen regulatory and control arrangements to ensure that safety procedures operate effectively in the future.

The Three Mile Island incident does, however, indicate the need for suppliers and Governments of supplier countries to be concerned at the nature and quality of operations of end user customers. This is quite apart from the non-proliferation safeguards that are the responsibility of the Australian Government. I therefore state that this Government would consider taking up a portion of the equity in any conversion or enrichment plant being built in South Australia to enable it to be directly involved as a party in negotiations for sales of converted or enriched uranium.

This would ensure that any concerns that the South Australian Government of the day might have, as regards choice of customers or customer performance, would be reflected in sales contracts and the conditions they contain. We will maintain close co-operation with the Commonwealth on these matters because of the responsibilities of the Federal Government for safeguards and the involvement of Commonwealth agencies in sales negotiations.

As members know, there are three projects involving uranium production presently under consideration in South Australia. These are based on deposits at Beverley, Honeymoon and Roxby Downs. The Government has

given the companies concerned its assurance that mining leases will be granted and that its support will be given to certain infrastructure requirements.

Conditions of lease will provide for Government environmental and development policy requirements being met. It is anticipated that these projects will proceed when sales contracts have been arranged and Commonwealth Government export approvals have been given, including completion of the procedures required under the Commonwealth's Environment (Impact of Proposals) Act.

The benefits to South Australia from these and any other similar projects are expected to be threefold. First, there will be increased employment as a result of development of uranium resources. For instance, mining at Roxby Downs is expected to create 4 000 to 5 000 jobs both on and off-site. Secondly, there will be additional royalty income to the State. This will allow taxes on individuals to be reduced or the range of services provided by the State Government to be increased. Thirdly, the State will take part in the development of new technologies to be applied to the mining and processing of uranium. Of the three projects mentioned, by far the most important is, of course, in the long term, the Roxby Downs deposit being developed jointly by B.P. and Western Mining.

B.P. is to provide \$50 000 000 in meeting the cost of exploration, metallurgical testing and other work necessary to complete the feasibility study. In return for its participation in the project, B.P. will ensure that funds are made available for the development of the mine and associated facilities up to a capacity of 150 000 tonnes per annum of copper with associated products. When translated into mining terms this proposal amounts to an annual ore production rate of over 7 000 000 tonnes a year.

As mentioned, a mining project of this magnitude would require a work force of 5 000, say, 3 000 at the mine with a township of 10 000 to 15 000. The mine would be comparable with Mount Isa and its life would be of the order of 50 years or more. Honourable members would know that Mount Isa's population is in excess of those figures. The impact of such an operation on the economy of the State, like Mount Isa's impact on Queensland, would be immense. Sales from the project, when it is fully developed, are expected to be in excess of \$500 000 000 a year.

The former Labor Government gave its written approval to the companies' broad proposals for the Roxby Downs exploration and feasibility study work, which it is expected will be largely centred in South Australia, and with AMDEL, local engineering and construction firms and State Government instrumentalities giving every possible assistance, the former Government's undertaking has been confirmed by the present Government. Expenditure by the companies is currently in the vicinity of \$1 000 000 a month. Most of this is spent in South Australia.

As well as mining and processing, uranium conversion and enrichment have an equally important role to play in South Australia's mineral industry scene. Conversion and enrichment have special appeal to this State, as they afford the means of providing important new manufacturing activity in the State and at the same time doubling the export value of Australian uranium. With uranium resources equivalent to or greater than those of other States and being centrally situated for processing yellow cake from other parts of Australia, a South Australian locality makes sense for the siting of an Australian uranium processing centre.

Discussions late last year with representatives of British Nuclear Fuels Ltd. and Urenco-Centec, with whom the former Labor Government had also been negotiating (in a rather more clandestine fashion than we are) confirm that additional uranium conversion and enrichment capacity for world markets are likely to be needed by the end of this decade.

Studies on conversion are being undertaken with the assistance of B.N.F.L., which presently converts 5 per cent of the world's uranium production to hexafluoride (the raw material for enrichment) at its Springfield plant in the United Kingdom. National policies can be anticipated that will require portion of Australia's uranium production to be converted in an Australian plant.

With regard to enrichment, as is known, the Government is working with Urenco-Centec to assess the feasibility of establishing an enrichment plant in South Australia. Urenco-Centec was formed as the result of the Treaty of Almelo between Britain, Holland and Germany. It currently operates plants in the United Kingdom and Holland, and a third plant is being considered for Germany. A particular strength of the Urenco-Centec organisation is multi-national control by the three Governments of its operations, to minimise proliferation risks, even though each plant is operated by local management and is financed from local sources. In the event of a plant being established in South Australia, it can be expected that Australia would share in the overall control of its operations and, as I foreshadowed earlier, South Australia would consider providing part of the equity. Another strength of the Urenco organisation is that the centrifuge enrichment method developed by it uses far less power than the gas diffusion method developed by the French organisation Eurodif.

The South Australian Government is, of course, aware of the work of Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia, established at the request of the Commonwealth Government, and will maintain close liaison with it. The establishment of a conversion and enrichment industry in South Australia would ensure that the State obtained major economic benefit from its large deposits and also was able to influence, in a very direct way, the marketing of Australian uranium.

Mr. Speaker, this, then, is the Government's policy on this complex and sensitive matter. We believe that it represents a measured, responsible and careful approach. On the one hand, the importance of South Australian deposits enables us to take an active role in the establishment of policies regarding the development and the marketing of Australian uranium. On the other hand, there are very real, tangible, and necessary economic benefits available if we proceed with the development of our resources. This situation exists in a world where the need for energy resources other than coal and petroleum is becoming increasingly urgent, day by day.

In these circumstances, to make our uranium available to suitable customers under appropriate controls is the only responsible approach. Not to do so would be to deny a source of energy to countries which have no option available except the nuclear option for a significant part of their power generating capacity at present and in the future, and to condemn them to economic depression. This would surely be disastrous for the Western world and developing countries and cause greatly increased hardship and suffering. To use Bob Hawke's words, all we will be doing is making energy scarcer and dearer to those we should be supporting. I commend our policy to the House.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HILLS FIRE

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have to inform the House that there is, in the Adelaide Hills, a serious fire danger at the present time, and that a fire has begun at Heathfield and is burning rapidly towards the east fanned by the high temperatures and the wind currently in that part of the metropolitan area. The big problem is, basically, one of terrain and the difficulty in fighting the fire, combined with spot fires that are occurring in advance of the front. Longwood Post Office has been burnt out and several houses have been burnt. Plans have been made to evacuate the township of Mylor, should this become necessary.

There is one fire appliance burnt, its crew injured and taken to hospital. The Army has been alerted and permission has been given by Canberra for their use as required. The Department for Community Welfare has set up an emergency office in the Heathfield High School. It has arrangements for emergency housing in hand, and both that office and the central office of the department in G.R.E. Building, 50 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, will be open all night. The central office phone number is 51 6801.

The Director of the Country Fire Services, Lloyd Johns, has been given overall control for all emergency measures,

in view of the fact that the fire is now covering a number of local government areas. Since a number of Ministers and a number of members have been closely involved in dealing with the emergency, it is my proposal that the House should now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

Mr. BANNON: Naturally the Opposition is seriously concerned by the information the Premier has given us about this natural disaster. It is pleasing to see the prompt way in which the Government has responded and the way in which various services of the State are being mobilised to take account of the disaster. We offer all our support and assistance in whatever way may be appropriate. I am please to second the Premier's motion.

Motion carried.

At 5.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 21 February at 2 p.m.