

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 August 1980

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

PETITIONS: EDUCATION FUNDING

Petitions signed by 32 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cutback in funding for the Education Department of South Australia were presented by Messrs. Max Brown and Hemmings.
Petitions received.

PETITION: MANOORA PRIMARY SCHOOL

A petition signed by 100 parents and residents of Manoorra and district praying that the House reduce from 80 km/h. to 25 km/h. the speed limit past Manoorra Primary School was presented by Mr. Evans.
Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 68 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Russack.
Petition received.

PETITION: STURT C.A.E.

A petition signed by eight residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any proposal that would close Sturt College of Advanced Education or transfer any of its programmes in teacher education or the health professions to any other institution or location was presented by Mr. Lewis.
Petition received.

PETITION: SHOP TRADING HOURS

A petition signed by 40 720 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the recommendations of the 1977 Royal Commission into Shop Trading Hours and vest jurisdiction to determine trading hours in the Industrial Commission of South Australia was presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown.
Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 60-1, 71, 73, 75, 77-9, 83-5, 105, 157-8, 163-6, 168-71, 173-4.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

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

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: During Question Time last Thursday, in answer to the first question from the Leader of the Opposition, I inadvertently misquoted the Government's pre-election policy on pay-roll tax concessions. For the record, the clause should read:

The employment of just one extra young person by each firm can mean 7 000 new jobs for young people.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: It is worth listening to again; it is a very good policy. Although this policy statement was certainly not a promise to create 7 000 new jobs, but a description of how 7 000 new jobs could be achieved, the scheme is in fact attracting youth workers at the rate of more than 200 per month, which augurs well for the creation of new full-time jobs over the three-year period.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DATA PROCESSING BOARD

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY** (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: As the Minister responsible for the Department of Services and Supply, I have been giving a great deal of attention to the need to co-ordinate computing developments within the Government. As a result, I now announce the Government's decision to establish a data processing board which will have a leading role in the management and control of Government data processing projects. This Government is determined to ensure that there will be no repetition of the serious difficulties encountered with public sector computing in the past.

There is already a heavy Government investment in data processing, and it is certain to increase greatly in the future. The Government's aim, therefore, must be to ensure that it obtains proper value for the large investment involved. The major responsibilities of the data processing board will be as follows: to advise the Government on general policies for data processing development and on allocation of resources for such development; to appraise significant computing development proposals for the Government; to co-ordinate larger scale data processing developments where several Government departments or instrumentalities are involved, or where a joint approach is more economical or is required to meet common needs; to promote the establishment of sound planning and management processes in the data processing area, and ensure effective and ethical practices in the acquisition and operation of computer installations; and to evaluate systematically the performance of data processing systems within the Government.

The data processing board will have eight members who will be drawn from the senior management of Government departments, statutory authorities and bodies outside the Government. I have appointed Mr. Bruce Guerin of the Public Service Board as Chairman of the board. Other members are now being approached, and I expect the board to begin its work next month. The management of all departments and statutory authorities will be required to commit themselves to and accept responsibility for data processing developments in their areas.

The data processing board will not consider projects involving computers and related resources costing \$50 000 or less. Proposals for larger developments will be appraised by the board, and its advice will have to be taken into account before further commitment is made to such projects. The data processing board will become

directly involved in projects only where Government-wide policies or priorities are involved, where co-ordination between several bodies is required, or where there is a clear advantage to be gained from a joint development.

The board will give early attention to reducing the time and expense involved in acquiring computers, and to the development of project management skills to ensure performance targets are met. Computers may be sophisticated, powerful and expensive and require some special treatment because of that, but they are also tools of management, and it is important that decisions on computing be made in a clear management context.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAYS ARCADE FIRE

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Following the fire which occurred in Gays Arcade on 3 August 1980, there has been a good deal of public comment on the means whereby that fire was controlled. It is important that the facts be presented to Parliament to put the matter into perspective. Assessments are still being carried out to determine the exact damage to the buildings. No lives were lost and no injuries were reported.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend those firemen and officers who contained the fire and were able to save approximately two-thirds of the building. At the time of the alarm, there were 37 firemen and officers ready for immediate duty at headquarters as well as 79 firemen ready for immediate duty at outstations. In addition, by standing arrangement, there were another four officers available on call at home, which amounted to a total of 120 firemen and officers readily available to assist in any fire outbreak.

The fire call was received at headquarters on 3 August 1980 at 0532 hours and by 0538 hours the fire was attended by eight major appliances from headquarters, crewed by 33 firemen. Some appliances were on the scene within two minutes of the call. Additional appliances were also called to attend the fire—one from North Adelaide, one from Woodville and one from Norwood. This provided an extra 17 firemen, giving a total of 50 firemen available for containing the fire. The Chief Officer assumed command at 0622 hours and considered the fire under control at 0716 hours.

Other appliances could have been called in from other outstations, but this was not considered necessary by either the Chief Officer, or officers who assumed responsibility for the fire operation, prior to the Chief Officer's arrival. The Chief Officer has advised that the number of firemen in attendance at the Gays Arcade fire was quite adequate for the purposes of containing that fire, and I would like to quote to this House his exact words:

On my arrival and inspection of the fire scene, it appeared that there were adequate appliances, crews and hose lines, and that the fire was contained in the centre of the building. I had every reason to believe that the fire was under control. I have no reason to believe that more men would have made any difference in this particular circumstance.

He also added:

The Superintendent and the Senior Superintendent who were in charge of the fire before my arrival had the authority to call in extra crews if they thought they were necessary.

There were 71 additional firemen ready for immediate duty at outstations while the Gays Arcade fire was attended.

These firemen were available for fighting other fires which may have started.

As members will know, a Committee of Inquiry into Fire Services was appointed by Cabinet on 10 October 1978. The terms of reference of the inquiry were to examine the aims, objectives and operations of the South Australian Fire Brigades Board and recommend to Cabinet on the means of providing the most effective, efficient and economic fire services in districts proclaimed under the Fire Brigades Act.

In particular, the committee examined and reported on the adequacy of the present organisation and operations of the Fire Brigades Board, including the effectiveness of its executive decision-making structure, and any other matters relevant to the most efficient, economic and effective provision of fire services by the Fire Brigades Board.

The major concerns being expressed by the Fire Fighters Association at present are in relation to manning. I have already indicated to the House that the Fire Chief considered that there were adequate numbers fighting in attendance at the Gays Arcade fire and adequate staff and equipment. The report on Fire Brigade personnel contains a recommendation that consideration be given to building a fire training school for recruits. There were no recommendations as to the level of manning. This was considered by the committee of inquiry properly to be within the province of the Fire Brigades Board.

Several submissions were made to the inquiry on manning levels, including one from the Fire Fighters Association which, in summary, recommended that a number of new stations be built, and that a number of country areas be taken over by the Fire Brigades Board and, finally, that the level of manning should be increased by one man per appliance.

The Government has accepted the terms of the committee's report in all but a few aspects, namely, the question of industrial democracy, funding, and the recommended change of name. The Bill to give effect to the changes which will bring the Fire Brigades Board under the direct control of the Minister in the future is in the final stages of preparation. It is intended that this Bill will be introduced within the next few days. As soon as the legislation has been passed, the new board will be asked to consider funding arrangements and manpower levels as a matter of urgency.

Mr. Millhouse: You should have made that decision and not have left it to others to make.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In the meantime, I would point out to the House that articles such as that which appeared in this morning's press do little to help the morale of the fire fighters or the sense of security of the general population. The Fire Chief's report makes it quite clear that, although the fire was serious, there were at all times adequate staff and appliances to contain it. To suggest otherwise is a reflection on a Fire Chief of considerable standing and reputation.

In the meantime, the people of the metropolitan area can be assured that steps are well in hand to bring about the working review which has been envisaged by the recommendations of the committee of inquiry, that is, a review by the board.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: In this House last week statements were made and questions asked by members opposite in the aftermath of the Tognolini escape. They indicate that doubts exist regarding the status of Mr. Cassidy's input to the Stewart Report. Mr. Cassidy was employed as an outside consultant to provide suggested security changes for appraisal by Mr. Stewart, the now Director of Correctional Services, and possible inclusion in his report. I approved Mr. Cassidy's engagement on 7 December 1979 at the suggestion of the then Director, Mr. Gard.

At no time was it intended that Mr. Cassidy's suggestions should be a report in its own right, or regarded as such.

This does not mean that gaol security was being ignored or given low priority, and in fact the evidence shows that a number of Mr. Cassidy's and other suggestions were being implemented. In reply to the member for Florey's question about the "Cassidy Report", I confirm, as I have stated before, that at the time the Cassidy suggestions were so irresponsibly leaked to the press I had not seen Mr. Cassidy's contribution to the final report.

Mr. O'Neill: You waited—

Mr. Millhouse: You jolly well ought to have, Allan.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey and the honourable member for Mitcham have constantly interjected on the honourable Chief Secretary after he has been given leave of this House to make a Ministerial statement. It will be necessary for me to warn those members and any other member who interferes with the completion of the Ministerial statement for which leave has been granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As I recall, a reporter asked me on the telephone late one evening to comment on what he said was "a report" his paper had been given on gaol security. The only formal report commissioned on security which I was aware of was Mr. Stewart's at that time unfinished report, and I answered the reporter honestly when I said I did not know of a finished report and certainly had not seen one. This responsible attitude to telephone questions from a reporter, allegedly quoting from a document, was then turned into what can only be termed as a half-baked witch hunt.

This is what I was referring to as a "fabrication" when replying to the member for Florey last week. The whole attack on me (and I am not casting this on the member for Florey) was a fabrication. I knew of Mr. Cassidy's contribution to the Stewart Report, and in reply to the Secretary of the A.G.W.A. mentioned it by name, following the wording of Mr. Morley's inquiry. Mr. Morley in his letter referred to it as "the Cassidy Report". For the information of the House, I shall read Mr. Morley's letter, dated 14 February, as follows:

We understand that Mr. Cassidy has completed his report on the security at Yatala Labour Prison, and that this has now been submitted to the department. On behalf of the Gaols and Prisons Branch of this association, I request that a copy of the complete report be forwarded to this association. This will assist the officers in helping to tighten security at Yatala, and also to understand any changes that the department may make, based on this report. I await your favourable advice on this matter at your earliest convenience.

At the time that letter was sent to me I had not seen or heard of this report or its provisions. My reply, dated 20 February, stated:

I refer to your letter of 14 February 1980 regarding a report on the security at Yatala Labour Prison prepared by Mr. F. Cassidy. As I have not yet received a copy of this report, I am unable to make any comment as to what action will be taken

in relation to it. However, I shall bear your request in mind and take the appropriate action in due course.

Mr. BANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I point out that this statement is inordinately long, and I wonder whether the Minister is aware that we are not debating the no-confidence motion that was suggested last week.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable Minister sought leave to make a statement on a matter of public importance. The manner of presentation is entirely up to him. The Standing Orders allow him to give such detail as he believes is in the interests of the public. The only opportunity to prevent such action in future is for any honourable member to refuse leave—not a course of action that I am recommending. I make the point for the benefit of all honourable members that matters of public importance can be dealt with in the House by way of Ministerial statement, and in this case leave has been granted to the honourable Minister.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Nowhere in my letter have I said, as suggested by the member for Florey, that I would not divulge the report because it was confidential. The member was in error last Thursday.

The fact remains that the definitive report on prison security, prepared by Mr. Stewart, was not completed until last week, although a number of measures to improve security have been taken since we took office, some of them based on Mr. Cassidy's assessment. I was certainly not going to say to any reporter that I had seen the Stewart Report, when that report had not been completed, and was not available, as was the case at the time when Mr. Cassidy's assessment was given to the media.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (The Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Further Education, Director-General of—Report, 1979.

By the Minister of Environment (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976—Regulations—P.E.T. Bottles.

ii. Constitutional Museum Act, 1978—General Regulations, 1980.

iii. National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978—Regulations—Fees—Black Hill.

iv. West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954-1975—West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1978-1979.

v. District Council of Light—By-law No. 19—One Way Streets.

By the Minister of Planning (The Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Planning and Development Act, 1966-1980—Metropolitan Development Plan—District Council of Munno Para Planning Regulations—Zoning.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1978—

i. Betting Control Board Rules—Amendments.

ii. Rules of Trotting—Amendments.

By the Minister of Health (The Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Mental Health Act, 1976-1979—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978—Regulations—Various Amendments.

QUESTION TIME

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier say whether it is true that the agreement with the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund on the building of the proposed international hotel, in Victoria Square, is being renegotiated and, if it is, why, and on what conditions, and whether the Government now intends to provide additional financial support for the hotel venture, including a \$5 000 000 guarantee for the builders?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Some final negotiations are taking place to tidy up some of the detail of the agreement between the Commonwealth Superannuation Fund, the consortium and the Government. I do not think that there has been any change in attitude expressed during the course of these negotiations. I am unable to determine at this stage what is the exact finality. I shall be pleased to let the Leader have a copy of the agreement once it has been concluded, as I have already informed him by letter.

BOTTLE DEPOSITS

Mr. OLSEN: Does the Minister of Environment intend to respond to a call for a 10 cent deposit on all bottles and, if not, why not, and can he say what steps are being taken or have been taken to ameliorate the litter problem caused by bottles? I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 27 October 1979 wherein the Local Government Association of South Australia at its annual general meeting called for a 10 cent deposit on all glass beverage containers in the interests of public safety and litter control. Additionally, the activities of concerned councils, conservation groups and citizens in relation to bottle litter are receiving considerable media publicity. Indeed, the Mayor of Port Lincoln was reported at that time to have commented that the broken bottle problem had escalated alarmingly during the previous year.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for that question because I know it is one of interest to many people in this State. I also thank him because it gives me an opportunity to say a bit more about what action the breweries have taken recently in regard to bottles. The recently announced increase in the refund to consumers for empty beer bottles should have a significant impact on containing glass litter in South Australia.

I certainly welcome the decision by the two South Australian breweries to increase the refund to 30 cents a dozen for the 370 millilitre echo and the 740 millilitre size bottles, and I think that everyone should welcome that decision. This is in fact equivalent to a 2½ cent refund a bottle, and I would suggest it represents a substantial increase over the previous refund of 15 cents a dozen for 740 millilitre bottles and 12 cents a dozen for the echo bottles. I am confident that the new refund rate will have a significant impact on the rate of return of beer bottles.

It is interesting to note that the first Government to introduce mandatory deposits on beverage containers,

Oregon, determined a deposit of 2 cents for beer bottles. This rate has applied since 1972, and it still ensures a bottle trippage of about 25 times in that State. I would suggest that this contributes to significant environmental benefits as well as significant savings to consumers. It is widely recognised that the thoughtless and malicious disposal of beer bottles causes the greatest litter problem at recreation areas, and this applies particularly on beaches and in areas used by the public for recreational purposes.

I believe that industry is co-operating with the Government to try to solve the problem, and in the meantime the Department for the Environment and Keep South Australia Beautiful (KESAB) are continuing to monitor the problem. I have been concerned for some time about the problem of broken beer bottles and only recently have discussed this matter with the Local Government Association. A meeting with the breweries was held later in the year. As a result of that meeting it was decided to increase the refund rate on beer bottles.

I believe that a 10 cent deposit on all glass containers would cause significant dislocation in the industry, and I am personally yet to be convinced that such a measure is entirely necessary. I would suggest that industry is aware of its responsibility as is the Government, and I am confident that we can work together to determine positive environmental and health benefits through the voluntary recycling of containers.

RADIATION

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether raw uranium ore is being crushed and milled at the Amdel inner city laboratories at Conyngham Street, Frewville, and Osmond Place, Thebarton, and, if it is, what precautions are being taken to ensure that local residents are not exposed to low-level radiation from radon gas and from loose dust reported in the area? Will the Government arrange for an independent environmental impact report to be conducted on the sites so that the public may be satisfied that there is no hazard?

The Deputy Premier will be aware of a report on this matter made on 18 April 1980 by the Health Commission. That report, on the handling of uranium ore at Amdel, stated that radiation measurements were not made at either site because the Health Commission did not possess the appropriate instrumentation. The commission's report, however, listed a number of weaknesses in the radiation safety procedures used at the Amdel sites, including the precautions adopted when uranium ore is handled. The report details a breach of the regulations by Amdel involving worker safety precautions, and cites deficiencies in the physical accounting of radioactive substances there. The Health Commission's report also revealed that Amdel did not possess adequate monitoring equipment to measure the different types of radiation being emitted from uranium ore. Since neither of the two bodies that should have been vitally concerned with this important matter had the necessary instrumentation, will the Minister arrange for an independent environmental report to clear up public concern on this matter?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition's new-found concern with this matter is interesting because, after the State election, Amdel carried on as it had done, quite happily, for a number of years under the Labor Government. Low-grade uranium ores of the type that Amdel is receiving now were also received prior to September last year. The sudden interest that has been generated by the likes of the member for Mitchell and the member for Elizabeth in relation to the matter, which did

not exercise their minds at all during the term of the Labor Government, amazes me. I am pleased to tell members opposite what is happening. The grade of ore received by Amdel at present is no different from the grade of ore that has been received for some time past.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member listens, I can tell him that the Health Commission has inspected the Amdel premises since this Government came to office because, as the honourable member knows, reports were supplied to a union, and the Public Service Association was also interested. This Government has not tried to hide anything; the reports were made freely available. Mr. Norton Jackson, the Director of Amdel, welcomed the investigation. In fact, film badges had been used for some time at Amdel, and they were monitored regularly. In the vast majority of cases, there was no reading, but on the odd occasion that anything was registered, the total dose received was less than one-hundredth of the permissible dose according to the radiation standards set internationally.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It still recorded radiation, though.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had all of this fuss, but when the honourable member comes into this granite building, he receives extra radiation about the same as one would obtain from the cores at the Amdel laboratories. If he enters a brick house, he receives additional radiation. If the honourable member believes that life was not meant to be radioactive, he is living in a dream world, because background radiation is with us all the time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible comment.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As a result of the visit by a Health Commission physicist, recommendations were made during the life of this Government in regard to processes that had been operative during the life of the previous Government, I might add; those recommendations are being acted on. There has been no attempt to hide anything at Amdel. There has certainly been an attempt by some members of the Opposition particularly to stir up trouble. I will relate what is happening so that the honourable member can be reassured that things are happening now that did not happen when he was in the Ministry.

One of the recommendations of that report was that Amdel prepare a monitoring programme for approval by the Occupational Health Branch, and a monitoring programme has been prepared, approved, and is in action to the extent that equipment is available. Additional equipment required is on order.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: They haven't got it yet.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It certainly was not acquired during the life of the Labor Government. The thing that interests me is the sudden concern—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are in Government now.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are in Government and doing things that the former Government did not see fit to do. Members opposite now see fit to stir up trouble and raise unwarranted fears in the minds of people, yet members opposite were asleep while in Government.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You're a bit touchy.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Not at all, but the honourable member's hypocrisy is so apparent that one cannot help being slightly amused about this new-found fear and concern for the public, when members opposite were in Government for 10 years and did nought.

Mr. Bannon: Get on and answer the question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If you can control your conferees on that side I shall be happy to do so. The second recommendation is that there be preparation of a radiation manual and that this be issued to staff. The action taken is that a draft of the manual has been prepared, submitted to the Occupational Health Branch in draft, and has been approved. It is being prepared for printing and publication shortly. Portions of it are already being used.

A further recommendation is that possible effects of the tailings pit on groundwater be assessed. The Department of Mines and Energy has prepared a report which advises that contamination is most unlikely. The report recommended that its findings be confirmed by drilling. One drill hole has already been completed and two further drill holes are planned shortly. In relation to the radiation around the circumference of that tailings pit, I am told there was no detectable radiation above background level one metre from the edge of that pit. I think the honourable member can be reassured that this Government is taking seriously the question of radiation protection, an issue which was completely neglected when his Party was in Government.

WOMEN'S REHABILITATION CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Chief Secretary say whether the article in the *Sunday Mail* comparing the television programme *Prisoner* with the Women's Rehabilitation Centre is based on fact? Did the journalist verify any of these statements with the Department of Correctional Services before publication of the article? When I visited the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, I found very little to compare with the television series. In fact, when I visited the centre there were only 19 females there, a surprisingly small number compared to the number of males in prison. This would suggest that the law and the courts are very lenient towards females.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There is very little comparison between the conditions and staff/prisoner relationships which prevail in the Women's Rehabilitation Centre and those portrayed in the television series *Prisoner*. The centre at Yatala is a modern, well-run institution holding some 25 people, and many inmates lose their only stable relationships when they are released, and they sometimes become quite emotional. Many maintain contact by correspondence after leaving. Staff and inmates participate together in gymnasium, yoga exercises and recreation, and that is hardly indicative of a group of people that does not enjoy good relationships.

There are, of course, some people admitted there for violent offences who may be difficult to control, but in general they present few problems. The department does not condone violence, gangs, or group pressures of any kind, and I find it difficult to believe that a person could be hassled by the mob when they are under observation most of the time; even the shower wings have microphone alarms which pick up unnecessary noise. The claim that an inmate had had her head shaved is completely false, as in the past 8½ years no such incident has happened. The number of people who are reported for misconduct is small, and complaints to the Ombudsman from this institution likewise are very rare, so the reporter was probably getting a highly coloured version of the institution. No contact was made with the Department of Correctional Services to verify any of the statements made by the former inmates.

URANIUM

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Health publicly release her department's report, prepared by Mr. D. J. Hamilton, on the handling of uranium ore at Amdel's Thebarton and Frewville plants, and will she inform the House when the Health Commission intends to obtain adequate monitoring equipment so that proper safety checks can be made?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am tempted to ask whether the honourable member was listening when the question was put to the Deputy Premier, because both parts of the question he has asked were answered by the Deputy Premier. It is obvious that the report of the occupational health officer has been made available to the union's nominees, which indicates that it is a public document; if it has been released to the union, it is in public hands. Also, the Deputy Premier has indicated that the equipment required is in process of being purchased.

MID-NORTH RAIL SERVICES

Mr. RUSSACK: As the Australian National Railways Commission has announced its intention of ceasing all local passenger services on the routes to the Mid-North towns, except those services connecting with the Indian Pacific, will the Minister of Transport tell the House of any reactions of people in the affected areas? Will he say what is the present situation and whether the Government intends taking any action concerning the matter? A number of towns in the Goyder District, including Riverton, Blyth, Brinkworth, Hamley Bridge, and Balaklava, are involved in this proposal. Having received approaches from many deeply concerned constituents in those centres, I ask the Minister for assistance and information.

Mr. O'Neill: We are going to put in an O'Bahn.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Florey. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is true that the Australian National Railways Commission has informed me of its intention to cease services on the Mid-North lines, and for the benefit of the honourable member I shall state briefly what they are. A reduction of 17 trains is proposed on the Adelaide to Burra to Peterborough line, 12 trains on the Adelaide to Balaklava and Gladstone line, 14 trips on the feeder bus from Riverton to Jamestown, and 12 trips on the feeder bus from Gladstone to Wilmington and Quorn. On receipt of a letter from the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Hunt, I looked into the matter and prepared a letter, which I sent to many interested parties, including all the district councils along the routes involved, as well as to the Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Railways Union, to find out their reactions to the proposed reductions in services. I have also written to Mr. Hunt acknowledging his letter, and, as the Australian National Railways Commission intends to cease the services as from 1 September, I have asked the Federal Minister whether the date of cessation of the services could be postponed, to give me time to assess the views of the various interested parties to whom I have written.

I have received some responses already. It must be remembered that it would be possible in some instances to replace the service with additional bus routes along the line. We could certainly organise that, but I want to assess the whole situation before I go to Cabinet with a recommendation. So, I have asked the Federal Minister for Transport for a deferment.

TENDERING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier indicate to the House what criteria are used by the Government to determine which work, formerly done by Government employees, will be given to private interests? Will he assure the House that no waste, duplication or financial loss will result from the letting out of such work? An employee newsletter, published at the Ottoway depot of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, indicates that 6 000 plastic strainers were ordered from a private firm for 26c each, whereas they could be produced at the depot for about 9c each. In addition, pistons costing over \$3 from a private firm would cost only an estimated \$1.90 if produced at Ottoway. In respect of counter-box screws, the newsletter states that a private firm modified an existing E. and W.S. standard, thus increasing the cost. If the Premier does not have the information at his disposal, will he obtain a report from the department, because I am extremely interested in this situation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Ideally, we would like to see all contracts that can be let out to private tender let out to private tender. There is no question, on the figures that have been obtained, but that the result of letting work and supplies out to tender is that the Government saves handsomely. I have picked up one of the matters to which the honourable member has referred, namely, the question of the production of one item which, by private contract, he said would cost an estimated \$3, whereas if undertaken at the Ottoway works it would cost \$1.90. However, I point out to the Deputy Leader something that concerns me greatly indeed about the thinking of Opposition members. I remind him that it was necessary for the Government to bolster the Ottoway operation (I think, from memory, to the tune of \$500 000).

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The former Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The former Government did that. That figure is conveniently forgotten by the Deputy Leader when coming to his conclusions. It is one of the fundamental principles of programme and performance budgeting, an example of which I hope will be in the House for the next Budget, that we get a full detailed estimate of the net cost to Government of any particular operation. Obviously, in making that assessment, the Deputy Leader has not taken into account any of the funds (whether Loan funds or the interest payable) and the amount that should be apportioned to the cost of those items. This goes through many operations of this sort. Undoubtedly, South Australian taxpayers can get a thoroughly good deal (indeed, a better deal) by letting out works to private tender and by the Government keeping out of areas which are already well served by private enterprise. That is the fundamental criterion that we follow.

UNREGISTERED HAIRDRESSERS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Industrial Affairs say how many unregistered hairdressers are operating illegally in the metropolitan area and what action the Government can take to prevent this improper practice from continuing? On 10 June 1980, a constituent of mine (a registered hairdresser) purchased a salon at 233 Burbridge Road, Cowandilla, from a person who did not operate the business but who employed a manager (Mr. Darryl Rutter).

Two days after my constituent purchased her hairdressing salon, Mr. Rutter and another person opened a men's and ladies' hairdressing salon at 231 Burbridge Road,

trading under the name of "Maiden Hair". My constituent suffered a considerable number of appointment cancellations in the first week and, when she spoke to the six persons who were involved, she was told that Mr. Rutter informed them that he would be opening his new shop a few doors away.

I understand that Mr. Rutter is an unregistered hairdresser and has been conducting a business for some considerable weeks. I further understand that considerable representation has been made to the Minister's department and the Hairdressers Registration Board without any action being taken to close the business or discipline the people involved in the breach of the Hairdressers Registration Act.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: To answer the honourable member's question directly, I have no idea how many illegal hairdressers are operating in the metropolitan area, and I am sure no-one else would have any idea. Secondly, the control of hairdresser registration does not come under my Ministerial control: it comes under the control of the Hairdressers Registration Board, which is a statutory authority set up under the Hairdressers Registration Act. That board has the power, the duty and the responsibility to police the Act and to make sure that people do not operate illegally under the Act by not registering. If the honourable member has specific cases that he would like to bring to my attention—

Mr. Becker: I have already done that.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN:—cases besides the one he has raised in the House (he has implied that other cases had been referred to the board on which no action has been taken), I ask him to refer them to me and I shall take up the matter with the board. I point out that the board is free of Ministerial control. If it is failing to carry out its responsibilities under the Act, I will certainly look at the Act and see whether it should not be altered to make sure the board does carry out its responsibilities under the Act.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You've got the responsibility, of course.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If the honourable member would look, he would see that the actual power under the Act is delegated to the board. I suggest that the honourable member looks—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Who appoints the inspectors?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: If the honourable member looks at section 17 of the Act, he will see that the board has direct responsibility for the inspection work as well.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Who employs the inspectors?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The board, not the Minister, would employ any inspectors. I ask the member for Hanson to refer such matters to me, and I will take action on them.

STANDARD GAUGE LINE

Mr. PETERSON: Can the Minister of Transport say which route on LeFevre Peninsula for the standard gauge railway the State Government supports? I have had talks with the General Manager of Australian National Railways, who has informed me that the line will be operating by 1982. That is a reasonable concept to serve industries in the Outer Harbor terminal and the 400 hectares of undeveloped land on the peninsula, but the routing of this line is of great concern to the residents, as there is obvious potential for a vastly increased rail traffic on the peninsula.

There are two possible routes: one route will require the purchase of two houses. One family built its house itself and has lived in it for many years, and the other family

moved into its house in February this year. The line will also run adjacent to the back fences or back doors of two aged persons villages and adjacent to a school. The other route will create much less disruption, and it would appear to cost about the same. As the Government is in full possession of all the facts on this matter, and as it is of great concern to the residents, I am sure they will be interested to know the Government's opinion.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government is very pleased that the standard gauge will be completed within two years, and it looks forward to that occurring and to the benefit to this State that will accrue from that important project. The extension of the standard gauge line to Outer Harbor, which was negotiated between me and the Federal Minister for Transport, will be part of the standard gauge agreement. It will be, I think from memory, the third schedule of the standard gauge agreement, but I am not sure about that.

The route shown in the third schedule will go through the area mentioned by the honourable member. However, the standard gauge agreement will allow the route to be varied upon the written agreement of both the Federal Minister and me. I have instituted negotiations, as I think the honourable member is aware, between A.N.R., the Railways Commission, as well as the Department of Marine and Harbors, to see whether we can reroute that section of the line down, I think, Dunnikier Road. I can see no reason why that should not take place.

FIRE-FIGHTING

Mr. EVANS: Can the Chief Secretary state what arrangements, if any, exist for this State to call on Commonwealth departments for help with personnel and equipment for fire-fighting in metropolitan Adelaide? I should like to know from the Minister the details, because we have within the metropolitan area Army personnel at Keswick, the Air Force at Edinburgh, and D.C.A. at West Beach Airport. Each of these departments has people who are trained in fire-fighting and have the necessary equipment for fire-fighting. It has been pointed out recently by members of the South Australian Fire Brigade that, in the case of an extreme emergency where there was perhaps more than one major fire in metropolitan Adelaide, they could find it difficult to have a reserve force and also fight those two fires. I should think that it would be possible for us to have an arrangement with the Federal authorities whereby we could use their personnel and equipment without placing a heavier cost upon the South Australian taxpayer.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As I think applied on "Ash Wednesday", an arrangement exists between heads of Government, at Premier to Prime Minister level, whereby in the case of an emergency the Army, the Air Force or any other Federal Government instrumentality can be asked for help, and it will be forthcoming. That situation has always existed, and the matter raised is covered by that heads of Government arrangement.

ANSETT AIRLINES

Mr. SLATER: Will the Premier join with the Leader of the Opposition in protesting to the joint executives of Ansett Airlines (Mr. Rupert Murdoch and Sir Peter Abeles) about the proposed closure of Ansett's air hostess base in Adelaide and the likely job losses resulting therefrom? The Leader of the Opposition has sent a telegram to the joint executives of Ansett Airlines asking

for a reprieve for the base, which employs 66 South Australian hostesses. These hostesses face unemployment unless they are able to move interstate. This may be impossible for many of them who are married and have commitments in Adelaide. Perhaps Mr. Murdoch would respond to a joint approach asking Ansett to back South Australia and prevent further job losses.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The concern of the honourable member for the air hostesses employed by Ansett Airlines is quite commendable, and I am sure that it will be shared by every member in this House. I am pleased indeed that the Leader of the Opposition has taken the action that he has taken in support of an approach which the Government has already made.

TOURISM

Mr. GLAZBROOK: In relation to the review of the Department of Tourism and the very tight schedules attached to the review, will the Minister of Tourism confirm that the consultant committee is now working on the brief? Since the Minister's impact statement on tourism for the State, because of the obvious decline that South Australia has suffered in regard to tourism over the past few years and the announcement about the review, a great deal of industry interest has been sparked off, so much so that I am constantly asked whether the review is going ahead, what stage it has reached, and who was appointed to carry out the work.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can assure the honourable member that the review is proceeding according to schedule, and indeed, as he has said, it is a tight schedule. I hope to have a report and recommendations in my hand by October. The appointed consultants are Rob Tonge and Associates, of Maroochydore, Queensland. That firm was the only specialist consultant firm that presented a proposal to the Public Service Board, and it is eminently qualified to carry out this consultancy job.

I receive fortnightly reports from the committee, the first of which reports informed me that the senior officers of the department have been interviewed, as have representatives of the Tourist Advisory Committee to the Government and representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I understand that members of the review committee are currently in Melbourne looking at the workings of the Melbourne office of the South Australian Tourist Bureau. They will proceed from there to Sydney and, following that, a meeting has been arranged with representatives of the South Australian Regional Association of Tourist Organisations. The members will then proceed to review the 20 submissions that have been received from the industry.

It has already become apparent that the industry in South Australia is in urgent need of upgrading; that fact was recognised by the Government when it appointed this review committee. I fully expect that the recommendations will put before the Government ways and means by which the department's organisation and staffing may meet the challenge of upgrading the industry from the point of view of leadership by government in partnership and consultation with private enterprise.

Mr. D. RYAN

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Premier investigate, and report to this House on, allegations by Mr. Des Ryan, co-author of the book *It's Grossly Improper*, that the Liberal

Party offered him and Mike McEwen more than \$35 000 to pursue their inquiries, apparently to get the dirt on Dunstan?

Several days after the former Premier's resignation, Mr. Ryan went to see the Premier's press secretary. In front of a justice of the peace, who was brought in as a witness, Ryan stated that he and McEwen had decided not to proceed with the publishing of their manuscript because they had not found evidence of political corruption or political conspiracy. Ryan stated that they had been convinced by a publisher that they were attempting to criticise Dunstan for all the wrong reasons.

Ryan wanted it made known that the authors' inquiries had not been motivated by political prejudice or imbalance and it was for this reason that they had turned down large financial offers from the South Australian Liberal Party. Ryan claimed that they were first offered \$13 000 by the Liberals; when this was refused, the offer went up to \$35 000. Following another refusal, Ryan claimed that he received a phone call from the Liberals offering unlimited funds to pursue his inquiries. From Mr. Ryan's claims, it appears that the Liberals were desperate to smear Dunstan at any cost. The final offer was refused, although something else convinced Ryan to rethink what he described as the authors' "moral decision" not to publish the book.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not believe that anyone in this Chamber or in South Australia would regard the subject matter of the book that has been named by the honourable member with any pleasure. I found what parts of it I read to be extremely distasteful, and I think most other people found the same. The allegation that has been made by the honourable member, that the Liberal Party offered large sums of money, is totally without foundation. I would simply say—

Mr. Keneally: The allegations were made by Mr. Ryan.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have only the honourable member's word for that. It is quite out of the question that such an action would be taken by the Liberal Party, just as I would imagine it would be totally out of the question that such an action would be taken by the Labor Party in other circumstances. I am not particularly concerned with the book, and I believe very much that the publication of it was quite irrelevant to events in South Australia. There is no truth at all in the statement that the Liberal Party offered money. Whether or not Mr. Ryan was offered money by a member of the Liberal Party, a member of the Labor Party, a member of the Australian Democrats, or a member of anything else, I am not party to that knowledge, but it certainly was not the Liberal Party.

DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether the Department of Fisheries submitted a report to the Dow Chemical Company in response to that company's environmental effects statement and, if it did, will the Minister disclose the details of that report?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Department of Fisheries made a response to the Dow environmental effects study. I cannot give a chapter and verse recitation, but I will let the honourable member have it in due course.

Mr. J. R. SWINCER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Chief Secretary a question which is not antagonistic: it is not about prisons, and it is directed to him as Minister of Fisheries. For what reason

did the Minister revoke the special permit of Mr. J. R. Swincer to trawl for prawns? Mr. Swincer has been to see me, and he told me that he had a prawning permit as well as an A class fishing permit. He showed me a number of documents, including extracts from *Hansard* (and I see the Minister of Industrial Affairs is interested in this, because he previously championed Mr. Swincer's cause in this House).

Mr. Swincer told me that he has about \$250 000 worth of equipment in a boat and whatever goes with it for prawn fishing particularly. He also purchased an aeroplane for his business. He told me about his prosecution pursuant to section 46 of the Police Offences Act and the circumstances surrounding it, for which he was fined \$60, although the maximum penalty (I remind the Minister) under the Act is \$100 or three months imprisonment. Mr. Swincer has finally shown me the letter from the Minister dated 29 July in which the Minister stated that he had received a transcript of the submissions that had been made on the matter and which referred only to the prosecution and the facts surrounding it. On that, he decided to revoke the special permit pursuant to section 37 (3) of the Fisheries Act.

The Minister is entitled to do that, as people are absolutely in the power of the Ministers in regard to these things nowadays. I do not know what sort of man Mr. Swincer is; he may not be a blushing violet or a clean-skin, but apparently his permit and his A class licence have been revoked, according to Mr. Stevens. Mr. Swincer has lost his only chance of livelihood. He was punished in the Magistrates Court for an offence he committed, and I am not condoning the offence.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to come to the end of his explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am just coming to the end. Finally, I point out to the Minister that this person has now been ruined by the Minister's revocation. He will have to sell up, if he can sell his stuff, and go away. That is a very heavy second penalty on the man, and for those reasons—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's no good without a licence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is no good at all without a licence.

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be no discussion across the benches between the two members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Therefore, I ask the Minister what were the reasons for revoking the permit?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member raises a very complex question. We have lost one Fisheries Department officer from a vessel, and the action of the person to whom the honourable member refers was of such a nature that it could have put a Fisheries Department officer's life at risk, or the lives of several people at risk. I am not prepared to condone this sort of thing from people who are engaged in the fishing industry. In view of the complexity of the question that the honourable member raises, I shall give him a considered reply.

PINBALL MACHINES

Mr. RANDALL: Can the Minister of Planning outline any controls his department has on the locating of pinball machines in existing business premises? Local government in my electorate is becoming increasingly concerned about, and has reported to me, several reports of pinball machines being used in existing premises to raise revenue. Can the Minister clarify the position?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: There is no control under zoning regulations for the placement of pinball machines in relation to existing premises or if they are ancillary to an

existing use permitted in any particular zone. It is interesting to note that more and more councils are becoming concerned about the number of amusement parlours and pinball machines being installed in their areas. Recently I have had correspondence from councils that have expressed concern about this matter. I should explain to the member for Henley Beach that the position may be different if there is a proposal to make a new use of existing premises primarily for the purpose of accommodating pinball machines. As the honourable member will appreciate, such a use would normally be classed as an amusement hall, which is listed under use group 12 in operative zoning regulations of metropolitan councils. Reference would have to be made to the particular zoning regulations to see whether use group 12 was permitted or not, or whether it was subject to council consent.

In the case of the Corporation of the City of Henley and Grange (and I imagine that that is the council about which the honourable member is concerned), zoning regulations provide that use group 12 is not permitted in any particular zone. In other councils, for example, the Corporation of Hindmarsh, the regulations are such that use group 12 is not permitted in a local shopping zone, but is subject to consent in a district shopping zone and local and district commercial zones.

If the use of an amusement hall is not permitted in a particular zone, a Governor's exemption would be required if it was desired to support such a proposal. I understand the interest that the member has in this matter, as much interest is being shown and, in fact, concern is being expressed by councils about the increase in the number of amusement halls.

At 3.17 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Dr. BILLARD (Newland): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted. In my address I wish to relate my remarks specifically to one section of the Governor's Speech. This concerns the commitment made on the part of the Government to foster exploration for and development of the State's mineral resources and, specifically, as that relates to uranium mining in the Lake Frome area, and the mining of

copper, uranium and gold at Roxby Downs. This is an important consideration because it is an area where we now have a clear difference between the stand that has been taken by the present Government and the stand taken by the Opposition. This was clearly demonstrated earlier this year when the Leader of the Opposition unequivocally stated in this House his opposition to the development of Roxby Downs.

It is also an important question because of the emotional and heated arguments which have often surrounded this debate and which have led many people in the community to be confused and to have a lack of understanding of many of the basic issues involved. Because so much of this area has been covered before, I want to restrict my remarks to one section of that debate. I want to look at the total energy situation we are facing and how nuclear energy fits within that picture. I then wish to look at the major competitors of nuclear power, and I want to take a brief look at the relative economics and at some of the environmental consequences of each of those options. I believe it will then be apparent that the political debate that has surrounded the nuclear industry bears no relation to the scientific and technological position. I want to look then at some of the political forces that are at work in the debate, particularly as they relate to South Australia.

Finally, with time permitting, I shall look at some of the consequences for South Australia of this present Government's commitment to support a uranium mining and enrichment industry within the State.

I will look first at the total energy situation. Everything we do consumes energy, although not all forms of energy are appropriate to be used in each case. Indeed, there is much misunderstanding even on this point within the community, and I cite as an example the car sticker which says, "Solar employs, nuclear destroys." The premise on which that car sticker is based is that solar energy and nuclear energy are alternatives; they are not. Nuclear power is concerned with power generation only, and it fits within the energy spectrum as an increasingly significant source for large scale electricity generation. We are heading towards a society, in the 1980's and the 1990's, in which large scale electricity generation will be vital, and probably increasingly so.

There are many factors operating which are pushing us in this direction. First, there is the crisis in natural liquid transportation fuels, such as oil and gas. This pushes us towards public rather than private transportation, and it forces electricity generation to move away from its utilisation of oil and gas. Many people do not recognise that oil and gas make up quite a large proportion of the fuel base of electricity generation. I cite the 1977 figures for the O.E.C.D. countries which show that, of the total fuel supply for electricity generation, coal supply was responsible for 40 per cent, oil for 20 per cent, gas for 10 per cent, and nuclear power for about 10 per cent. In addition, the oil crisis means that there will be in future an increasing need for large scale conversion facilities, such as from coal to oil, and oil shale to oil, all of which will require large quantities of energy themselves.

The second major factor is the necessity for Third World development. It has been known for some time that there is a strong correlation between the level of power generation and the level of per capita productivity. There is then a loose correlation between this and the quality of life. An article has been written in recent times, for those who are interested, by a Mr. Ian Lowe, and published in the journal *Social Alternatives*, which discusses this issue at length.

Thirdly, there is a trend within the technology of power generation which favours larger centralised power

installations. For example, nuclear power stations must normally be at least of a size of 500 megawatts, and most comparisons are done with installations of 1 000 megawatts or more. This means that such installations cannot be justified in South Australia, simply because of their size, and this would apply to most States in Australia.

Lastly, quite apart from any of the previous three forces that I have mentioned that are operating, there is an increasing trend within industry towards capital intensive and power intensive industry. All of these factors push us towards a reliance on large scale power generation. There are, however, factors working in the opposite direction. Amongst these I will cite the developing solar technology which, although it is not directly competitive with nuclear power, is still quite important, and, hopefully, increasingly so. However, solar technology is currently developed only to supply low grade energy needs.

In addition, there are security requirements. Monolithic and centralised systems can never be as safe as they should be. They are vulnerable to accidents, to terrorist activities, and to manipulation by power groups within the community. Nevertheless, any discussion of power sources must be within the context that we recognise that there will be a large and increasing need for large scale electric power generation.

What then are the alternatives? I have already briefly mentioned coal, oil, gas, nuclear, and hydro-electric power. In the past 20 years, coal has formed a slowly decreasing proportion of electricity generation, from about 50 per cent of O.E.C.D. countries' power generation in 1960 to just under 40 per cent in 1977. Oil has formed an increasing proportion—from well under 10 per cent to just over 20 per cent in that period. Gas has formed a stable proportion, nuclear power an increasing proportion, and other sources, which are mainly hydro-electric power, have formed a decreasing proportion.

Let us look first at what might be termed the soft alternatives of hydro-electric power, and I will include in this solar power. If we look at the safety record of the soft alternatives, we see that even hydro-electric power, which has the advantage of being renewable, still has a cost which must be paid by the community. Lives have been lost due to our use of hydro-electric power, not only in the construction of dams but also in dam breakages. I cite, for example, dams which broke in 1928 at Santa Paula, California, with a cost of 450 lives; in 1959 at Malpasset, France, costing 412 lives; in 1963, at Belluno, in Italy, at a cost of 2 000 lives; and in 1972, at Buffalo Creek, West Virginia, at a cost of 118 lives. Certainly, there are dams around the world which, if they were to break, would cost several hundred thousand lives each.

Quite apart from the lives that have been lost due to hydro-electric power, there are, as we must all recognise, quite drastic environmental changes that result, and we have seen that for ourselves in Australia, with the situation in Tasmania. Solar power itself is not without problems. As I intimated earlier, solar technology is not yet as developed as it should be, but even if it were we should consider some of the environmental consequences that must result from that.

For example, if we were to replace our 1 000-megawatt electricity generating plant by an equivalent solar plant, it would require 50 square miles of collector area, and I think honourable members would agree that that would have some significant environmental consequences. Even the suggestions that have been made within recent years that we could, at some future date, site solar generators in space and beam their energy back to earth would of themselves have environmental consequences, because that energy must be beamed back to earth by the use of

microwaves, and of recent years we have discovered that microwaves themselves are damaging.

If we exclude the soft alternatives and the diminishing resources of oil and gas, we are left with only two alternatives: coal-fired generation and nuclear-powered generation, and I will comment now on those two alternatives.

I will start with an economic comparison. Economic studies which I have seen have been done on the basis of a 1 300-megawatt station running at 60 per cent capacity, or better, sited in the U.S.A. The siting of these stations is important if only because, when we compare them, we must compare the cost of resources. Coal, in the U.S.A., for these studies was quoted at \$25 a tonne, whereas coal in Europe, on the other hand, costs about \$55 a tonne. The U.S.A. studies found that nuclear energy was more economic at those coal prices. It is difficult to find what the comparable cost of coal in Australia would be but, so far as I can gather, prices for steaming coal are as low as \$25 a tonne f.o.b. (that is, on the ship in Newcastle) and, if we take into account port charges of about \$8 a tonne and an unspecified margin for profit, we can see that coal prices in Australia are much below those pertaining in the U.S.A. Hence, there would probably be no economic justification for nuclear power within Australia, although there is clearly economic justification for the use of nuclear power in either the U.S.A. or Europe, or in any of the many other areas of the world where coal costs more than \$25 a tonne. As I said earlier, there is a minimum size construction of about 500 megawatts in nuclear power stations which, in any case, eliminates most Australian States from considering the use of nuclear power, at least in the immediate future.

I move now from the economic consideration to a comparison between the safety of coal-powered generation and that of nuclear power. We can consider the safety at three different levels—the accidents leading to fatalities and injuries, the diseases induced by the industry, and the wider and perhaps global environmental impact of that industry. Let us consider, first, mining accidents and diseases resulting from both the coal and nuclear industries. During the past 80 years, there has been great progress in mine safety; nevertheless, it must be said that the coal mining industry has a shocking safety record. During the past 80 years, in Pennsylvania, U.S.A., 30 000 coal miners have died in coal mine accidents. In the Appalachian area, also in the U.S.A., black lung disease has afflicted 57 000 coal miners. In Australia, we have regular mine disasters, the most recent being last year, but these seem to be accepted as a fact of life. Studies of the accident rates have been performed by Prof. Richard Wilson, of Harvard University, who is a specialist in epidemic diseases associated with the power industry. He has estimated that, every year, black lung disease kills 4 000 miners and that, for every billion megawatt hours of electricity consumed, there are 1 000 deaths by black lung disease among coal miners, and 20 deaths are caused by excess lung cancers among uranium miners. So there we have a comparison between the death rate resulting from coal mining and that from uranium mining. In addition, there are wellknown problems relating to the mining of coal, particularly by the open-cut and strip methods, which cause widespread despoliation of the land.

I turn now to coal-powered generation and the safety impact there. I will quote from a paper, written by Barry Hunt, who is Principal Research Scientist with the C.S.I.R.O., who wrote a paper on this subject for *Habitat Australia* earlier this year. His paper states:

Amongst such features are the release of large quantities of oxides of sulphur and nitrogen which, at the very least,

enhance bronchial problems in the vicinity of power stations. "Acid" rain associated with the oxides of sulphur also causes plant damage, as recorded in Scandinavia from power station releases in England. . . In addition there are no specific controls on the far from insignificant amounts of radio-activity released by the burning of coal, or for that matter on the radio-activity remaining in the ash left by the burnt coal.

Regarding the radio-activity that results from coal-fired power stations, all coal contains small amounts of uranium and thorium. Tests performed on Canadian coal from Saskatchewan, where coal has 25 parts per million uranium, indicate that this leads to a discharge into the atmosphere of the equivalent of 400 curies a year of iodine 131 (and that is radio-active iodine 131). Although the quantities of impurities in coal vary substantially, this serves as a good example, and we may compare it with the figures that were being bandied about at the time of the Three Mile Island accident, as a result of which the press became hysterical at the possibility of pico-curies of iodine getting into milk. If we consider the comparison, there is a difference of a factor of 400 million in the level of radio-active iodine that was being worried about.

Even with efficient dust separation, there is still a discharge from coal-fired power stations of about 28 millicuries a year, which is still many orders of magnitude difference. Likewise, if we look at radiation levels, we can show that normal coal-fired power stations give rise to substantially higher levels of radiation than will ever come from a nuclear-fired power station.

I will now summarise the comparative health effects of each of the power sources by comparing the estimated deaths that would result from generating ten million megawatt hours of electricity. My source is Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Mann, who prepared their data in 1975. Coal-fired power stations and the coal fuel cycle are responsible for the death of between 10 and 200 people to generate that quantity of electricity. Oil-fired power stations, to generate the same quantity of electricity, would lead to the death of between three and 150 people. Gas power would lead to the death of .2 of a person (in other words, one person in five times that amount of power). Nuclear power generation would result in the death of between one and three people. That is clearly substantially less than that which results from its main competitor, coal-fired power.

The final point on this argument should be made by the American Medical Association, whose Council of Scientific Affairs recently reported that among the principal fuels available for electricity production over the next 25 years nuclear power has the lowest adverse impact on health. That was stated with the authority of the American Medical Association. I could go on at length to discuss a variety of other areas, such as the levels of radiation arising from the nuclear industry, and relate them to background radiation levels. We heard something about that earlier today from the Minister of Mines and Energy.

There is indeed a question as to whether there is any evidence for or against there being any effect from low levels of radiation, simply because it is not possible to assemble sufficient scientific data to prove statistical significance. We could also compare the dangers of nuclear power with those dangers which we readily accept in other human activities. By way of example, there is a finite danger resulting from all our activities, even eating and breathing. We may note that 1 000 people die annually in the United States due to inhalation or ingestion leading to suffocation, and there is therefore one chance in 200 000 that any person will die due to eating and breathing. That, by the way, is substantially lower than the probability of death from nuclear power

generation. However, in all these areas there are volumes of data showing that what I believe have simply been emotional and hysterical attacks on the nuclear industry are out of proportion to the dangers. Why is this so? Should, indeed, we abandon all coal-fired power? No, I do not believe that that is the case, but it does mean that we should proceed with caution.

Today we accept dangers in all our activities, and it may well be that at some future time we shall decide that the dangers associated with coal-fired power are unacceptable, but at present I believe that the dangers which are associated with this power source, although they are very much greater than are those associated with nuclear power generation, are not sufficiently significant for us to abandon it as a power source. However, it does mean that at the very least we should pursue with vigour nuclear solutions where they are most economic and where it is feasible to do so. It is my belief that our society's obsession with debating the finer details of the safety of the nuclear industry in total disregard of the far greater risks we take elsewhere is a luxury we cannot afford.

Apart from the immediate detrimental impact of coal-fired power versus nuclear power, there are the larger global environmental questions which face us in power generation. These are serious questions, and we cannot afford to divert our resources in chasing minutiae while major questions go unresolved.

There are two major environmental questions which I believe face us in power generation. The first of these is the carbon dioxide pollution that results from the use of fossil fuels. As I have noted before, fossil fuels (coal, oil and gas) are involved in about 70 per cent of electricity generation in O.E.C.D. countries. All these fossil fuels put carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. This in turn is ultimately taken out of the atmosphere by vegetation which, in turn, returns oxygen to the atmosphere. However, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is increasing because of the rapid industrialisation that has occurred over the last 50 to 100 years. It is estimated that the original level of carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere was 300 parts per million. This is now increasing due to the rapid consumption of fossil fuels and the decreasing area of forests. It is expected on current estimates to double to 600 parts per million by the middle of the next century, or earlier.

These figures sound quite small, and we may well ask why should we bother whether carbon dioxide forms 300 or 600 parts per million in the earth's atmosphere. The significance is that carbon dioxide traps more of the sun's energy in what is called a greenhouse effect, and the atmosphere heats up as a result. Scientists are still uncertain of what the exact consequences would be, but they include an average 2°C to 3°C warming of the globe. By comparison we may note that the Little Ice Age that occurred during the Middle Ages was associated with a 1°C drop in temperature. It could also lead to a 10°C warming of the polar areas. This would then be expected to have severe consequences on the world's climate. It may well melt the Arctic ice cap. If that occurs, the sea level would rise by about half a metre, and there would be substantial climatic changes. The extra carbon dioxide in the earth's atmosphere might also be expected to lead to unpredictable effects on ocean chemistry and biology.

These problems are not pie-in-the-sky problems; they are significant problems which we in the global community should be considering now. They are significant because, as I have said, the doubling of the carbon dioxide level is expected to occur before the middle of the next century. Yet lead times for changes in the patterns of energy use are normally quite long—about 20 to 40 years. Because it

is a global environmental problem, individual countries may be easily induced to ignore it and to off-load responsibilities on to the world community. There are, therefore, significant difficulties associated with a solution, difficulties that will be political even more than they are technological.

It is known that at present developing countries account for about 13 per cent of carbon dioxide production. However, if, as I suggested earlier, developing countries increase their power generation and consumption, they may be expected to rapidly increase the amount of carbon dioxide that they put into the earth's atmosphere. Estimates have been done which show a figure of 36 per cent in the year 2025. That figure of the proportion of carbon dioxide that will be put into the earth's atmosphere is nearly three times the figure for carbon dioxide that was put into the earth's atmosphere in 1974 by developing countries. Because of this problem and because of the long-term difficulties that will be created for our society, it is important that any introduction of non-fossil fuel power be encouraged, wherever the site may be in the world.

The second major environmental problem is a much thornier problem—thermal pollution. This pollution results from any activity, especially power generation, simply because any conversion of energy from one form to another is normally associated with a percentage of wastage. This wastage flows as a consequence of the laws of thermodynamics and is not something that we can easily avoid. However, if we continue on a world scale to increase power consumption, in the future we will be faced with thermal pollution on a global scale that will lead to a similar heating of the earth's atmosphere to that which would result from carbon dioxide pollution.

It is not for me to suggest possible solutions to this problem, but nevertheless the problem is significant and will have to be considered perhaps in this generation but certainly in future generations.

We have seen that nuclear power is comparatively clean compared to its competitors. Why, then, is there an obsession with nitpicking in relation to the nuclear industry? The evidence is overwhelming; it is supported by all scientific and medical authorities, yet the issue is kept alive. Indeed, in this State we have seen the Opposition continually criticise the Government's stance on this issue as well as the Government's efforts to develop the mining and export of uranium. This criticism has not been confined to South Australia: it has been a world-wide phenomenon.

I can cite examples of the frustration that has been felt by scientists and engineers within the nuclear industry; they wonder just what they have to do to prove to the public that the industry is much safer than its competitors. I refer specifically to a lecture given to an annual general meeting of the British Nuclear Energy Society and the British Nuclear Forum in December 1979. Following the lecture, there was a discussion, during which this frustration was aired. A Mr. O. H. Critchley, who is a nuclear safety consultant, stated:

Each time some safety issue is met, like a hydra's head another is raised by the opposition. So it goes on, and chopping them off, one after another, leads to no finality. Each minor incident is blown up out of proportion to denigrate nuclear power.

He then suggested reasons for the problem and for the hostility. He said:

I suggest . . . that the opposition to nuclear power largely relates to the hostility to modern technology as a whole. The lecturer, Mr. Davis, Vice President of the United States National Academy of Engineering and Vice

President of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, stated:

I believe in passing I mentioned the anti-growth and anti-technology side. I think, in fact, a good part of the opposition arises from that source. Whatever answer you have these people have another question . . . The problem is how do you get out and get television, radio and newspapers to pay attention when an engineer says something? If you say you are a scientist they listen to you a bit more, but if an engineer says something, particularly if it is factual and reasonable, my impression is that people could not care less. I do not know how we change that.

I suggest that, apart from the forces that are simply anti-growth and anti-technology, there is another force that is playing a significant part in the political debate about nuclear energy. This force operates wherever politics becomes tied to a technological issue and to changes in technology.

As we all know, technology is changing very rapidly. What was true technologically yesterday and what was a problem to technology yesterday may be solved today. If a political stance is tied to the insolubility of a technological problem, which subsequently is solved, then the political change, if there is to be political change, often means loss of political face. As a result, there is an inertia that tends to force politicians, especially, not to admit that the change has occurred. Some eminent scientists and Australians have been prepared to change their minds: I refer specifically to Sir Mark Oliphant and to Sir McFarlane Burnett. These people were sufficiently open-minded on this issue to change their stand when the facts were known and the research had been done.

However, it seems that in South Australia we have a Labor Party which is politically hooked into an anti-nuclear stance, like an addict who wants to kick the habit but does not know how to. It is true that following the election there were some signs of equivocation when, for example, Mr. Bannon equivocated on his position when speaking on 5DN on 24 October and suggested that perhaps the Labor Party would not close down Roxby Downs, although that position was subsequently changed when on 4 June this year he said in this House that he opposed the development of Roxby Downs.

Is it that the A.L.P. is hooked into an anti-technology, anti-growth position in South Australia? If this is so, I believe that the South Australian public ought to be told. Or is it simply that the Labor Party members have convinced themselves with their own rhetoric and cannot now change without losing face? Let us look at the record of the Labor Party on this issue since the last election. I have examined in *Hansard* questions that were asked in the first sitting of the first session of this Parliament. A total of 42 questions was asked relating to the question of uranium development, the dangers of the nuclear industry, and the dangers of radiation. Of those 42 questions, 34 came from the A.L.P., five from the Liberal Party, two from the Democrats and one from the Independent Labor member.

I do not wish to give those 34 questions greater currency by mentioning them again, but certainly they were not the type of questions designed to encourage the development of mining and enrichment of uranium in South Australia; rather they were designed to denigrate the uranium industry and to highlight and emotionalise dangers that may or may not be associated with that industry, and generally hold back the development of that industry in South Australia. That position culminated in the clear statement made in this House on 4 June by the Leader of the Opposition that he was opposed to mining development at Roxby Downs. This is the clear issue of

the difference between the Government and the Opposition in South Australia. There might be an excuse if members of the public were confused by emotional arguments and were unable to understand the great mass of technical and scientific information available on this issue. However, there is no excuse for the Labor Party, because it had expertise available and had advice available to give a realistic assessment of the evidence. We are therefore left to conclude that the A.L.P. is aligning itself with forces which are anti-growth and anti-technology and which, for the saving of political face, are doing their best to knock and destroy those ventures which are so vital to our State's future.

Do we need growth in South Australia? Let us look at the record of the past decade. The seventies was a decade of social change in Australia, not simply change induced by the former Government, but social changes overriding and beyond that Government as well. There was a change in the employment pattern which meant that generally a greater percentage of married women are now entering the work force. At the end of that decade, in spite of a net increase in participation within the work force of the population who were of an employable age, there was a greatly increased rate of unemployment. In addition, there were great technological changes, which will continue into the 1980's.

At the end of the 1970's, South Australia was caught in a fit of accelerated decline—not simply non-growth, but decline. I believe that as a result of all those reasons it is essential that South Australia, at least over the next 10 years and probably beyond that point, has, first, a growth economy, and, secondly, an open attitude to new technology if we are simply to survive the changes that we are now experiencing. It is because a growth economy is sufficiently mobile to accommodate change that it is needed in South Australia.

Let us look at some of the benefits to South Australia that would be rejected by the Opposition if it were in power. In reality we hope this is not the case, because we hope that the present Government's policies will continue to dominate in South Australia. I mentioned at the commencement of this address the possible development of uranium in the Lake Frome area. That is a medium to short-term development which would provide immediate, though perhaps not large-scale, employment within our State. At Roxby Downs, which would be rejected by the Labor Party, we currently have an employment level of 90, which is being increased in the immediate future to 170, and which it is estimated, when the project comes into production, will provide several thousand direct jobs. In addition to those direct jobs, it is estimated that three to four times that number could be supplied with jobs indirectly in associated industries.

The situation may be compared to the mining city of Mount Isa in Queensland, which has a population of 27 000 and which is served by its port, Townsville, a city which itself has a population of 85 000. Indeed, the comparison with Mount Isa is most significant. I remember as a boy in Queensland that, when the Liberal Country Party Government came to power in 1957, one major project which that new Government took on was the refurbishing and upgrading of the railway line between Mount Isa and Townsville. That project did not receive the support of the Commonwealth, and it was funded out of State resources. That was one of the earliest projects that began to get Queensland moving again economically, after a long period of having a Labor Government.

With regard to the royalties which result from such mining, I can quote figures which show the level of State income from mining royalties. Mr. Speaker, I seek leave

to have these figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

The SPEAKER: Is the information purely of a statistical nature?

Dr. BILLARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

STATE INCOME FROM MINING ROYALTIES

	\$m.	\$ per capita
N.S.W.	46.3	9.25
Victoria	32.6	8.56
Queensland	50.8	23.47
South Australia	3.3	2.60
Western Australia	51.6	42.25
Tasmania	1.4	3.62
Northern Territory	0.3	3.22

Dr. BILLARD: These figures show that South Australia's income from mining royalties has been \$3 300 000 per annum, which may be compared with Queensland's income from mining royalties of \$50 800 000 per annum. We should think of the differences in these figures in terms of the impact that that income would have on the State Budget. That is income which we have been rejecting when we reject mining development in this State. The figures also show how that mining royalty would be represented on a per capita basis.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart must not carry on a conversation that is audible in the Chamber, especially when he is not in his seat.

Dr. BILLARD: I am sure that members will be interested to know that South Australia at the moment collects \$2.60 per head per annum from mining royalties, which is the lowest collection of mining royalties per head of population of any State or Territory in Australia. Western Australia collects \$42 per head from mining and Queensland \$23 per head, but the South Australian figure is \$2.60. This situation has been inherited by this Government, a situation which the Labor Opposition would want us to continue, if what members opposite say about the development at Roxby Downs is to be believed.

In addition to the mining, we would be rejecting uranium enrichment. Reports already prepared on uranium enrichment show that an investment of \$1 400 000 000 over eight years would begin to generate income after four years, rising to more than \$500 000 000 per annum after seven years from the start. This would be a major boost to industry in this State, and yet we find, in the other House, a question being asked by an Opposition member which sought to denigrate that project and to knock the 1 500 jobs which would be created by it, by trying to show that the creation of those jobs would cost \$900 000 a job. Such an assertion ignored the fact that, although the creation of those 1 500 jobs might cost \$1 400 000 000, it would be generating income after eight years of \$570 000 000 per annum, and the investment would quickly be recovered.

This, then, is the situation we face in South Australia, where there is a clear difference between what is offered to the people by the Government compared to what is offered by the Opposition. The Government offers to the people of South Australia a future in which mining projects will be pursued with vigour, subject to rigid environmental standards. We will not hold back on development simply for the sake of saving the political face of the Labor Party, or simply because there are those who are anti technology and anti growth. It is those forces with which the Labor Party is aligning itself when it opposes such development in this State. The facts show clearly that, when we consider the alternatives to nuclear power, there is only one alternative at present, and that is

coal-fired power. At least on the basis of safety and the record of accidents and injuries that result from those industries, nuclear power is by far the safer, and the only bases on which we can choose coal-fired power over nuclear power are the bases of either economic advantage or the fact that nuclear power stations must be much larger to start with.

These, then, are the issues which I believe will assume increasing significance over the coming years, and for once I agree with the columnist Peter Ward, who said that the question of whether or not South Australia should proceed with uranium development will play a major part in the next election and succeeding elections in South Australia.

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): In seconding the motion, I wish to outline briefly some of the initiatives and responsibilities which the present Government has taken over the past 12 months, as well as those it intends to undertake in the ensuing 12 months. Before doing so, however, let me say that I am sure all members in this House would support the comments in His Excellency's Speech regarding the death of a former member of this House, Mr. Maurice William Parish. We all extend our condolences to the members of his family. He was the member for Murray during the years 1915 to 1918.

The background to the present Government's initiatives and its image of being a responsible Government came to the fore almost 12 months ago, when the member for Hartley, the then Premier, made the biggest Party-political error of his life in calling a premature election. When he did so, the supreme element of the democratic Westminster system of government under which we operate came to the fore. That is the system the member for Ascot Park debated on a recent television programme. This system of government was able to show itself in all its magnificence. The voice of the people was to act as judge and jury. This the people did, and, despite the bleak picture the Opposition attempts to portray, which is a legacy of the attitude which prevailed when it was in office, there still exists the confidence in the community about the present Government which existed a week prior to the election.

Why has that happened? It is because the Government has honoured its short-term promises and, as a result, the people are confident that the long-term promises will be kept. The purpose of those policies is aimed at building a vigorous and confident investment environment in South Australia. To this end, the Government has eliminated the threat of further anti-business legislation, as well as instituting a number of inter-related moves to facilitate growth and cut Government waste.

These changes include the restoration of competitive tendering for public works and construction projects, an end to the trend of establishing Government enterprise in competition with existing business, and the implementation of pay-roll tax promises at the beginning of the year which has made great inroads into our small business sector, despite what Opposition members may say. We have seen the abolition of succession and gift duties as from 1 January of this year and the abolition of land tax as at 30 June. There has been the removal of the threat to nationalise companies and segments of private enterprise, at the same time scrapping any intention to repudiate contracts. There has been the implementation of stamp duty promises in relation to the first home. Public response to both the stamp duty exemptions for first home buyers and the special pay-roll tax concessions for additional youth employees has been especially encouraging, as is the news that further concessions will be introduced in the pay-roll tax area.

By the end of May, by which time the stamp duty concessions had been operating for seven months, 4 872 first-home buyers had been granted the benefits of this concession. The total cost to the Government in forgone revenue was \$2 370 000 and the average exemption for each home purchaser was \$486.50. At this rate, we expect that, by the end of the financial year, \$3 000 000, which otherwise would have been paid in tax revenue, will have been spent in support of industries that build, furnish, and equip new homes.

With regard to the special pay-roll tax schemes, the position after the first five months was that 1 549 additional youth workers had been employed by 534 firms, all of which have qualified for substantial tax concessions. The tax cuts were made possible by tighter controls on Government spending since coming to office. This is in stark contrast to the policy of the previous Government, which was committed to keeping these taxes. On rereading the Governor's Speech, one can noticeably detect the continuation of the present Government's initiatives and responsibilities. The careful planning and control of the State's finances last financial year has given the Government an aggregate surplus of \$37 200 000. This surplus has enabled the injection of much-needed funds into areas of greatest need, such as \$9 100 000 for the Stuart Highway and the announcement yesterday of \$15 000 000 for the building industry. We have heard how these funds have been so warmly accepted by that industry. Provision has been made for the setting up of the infrastructure for expanding the mining industry and the now more feasible Redcliff petrochemical plant.

In order to ensure that Government expenditure is watched closely, it is intended to establish Estimates Committees in this House, a widely used principle in private enterprise. This is an innovative and responsible line of action for this State, a line of action that should have been taken a long time ago. A responsible attitude engenders confidence, and that has been evidenced by the response of various companies to the policies of this Government in such notable companies as General Motors-Holden's, with its expansion programme, Simpson Limited, John Shearer and Sons Limited, B. Seppelt and Sons Limited, Omark Pty. Limited, and Grundfos, a Danish company setting up its first manufacturing operations in Australia and choosing South Australia as the place in which to do so. That, surely, is an indication of their confidence in the policies of this Government.

To this end, it is encouraging to see that the Government intends to expand its pay-roll tax concessions and, contrary to what Opposition members have said, pay-roll tax concessions have helped a number of small businesses. It is even more encouraging to have learnt that, for the first six months of this year, there has been a 22 per cent increase in apprenticeships, compared to the position at the same time last year. As a former teacher of trade-oriented students, I find that news most welcome.

South Australia is now on the threshold of mineral developments that will have a major impact on our economy, employment and development. To this end, the Government's policies are doing all they can to foster further exploration for and development of the State's mineral resources. As we heard the Governor say, \$18 700 000 has already been committed to mineral exploration in the present year, compared to \$6 100 000 in 1978. These initiatives and responsible actions, together with the confidence shown by investors, will bear fruitful results for South Australia in the long term.

Already, various smaller companies are reaping the benefits, as they lay the groundwork and plan for larger

companies. As an official of one firm said to me, the work increase we are experiencing now will only truly be seen by the public in about 12 to 18 months time. It is an indication of the growth factor that will occur. South Australia's future has bright prospects, and it will come about much sooner if all people are encouraged to retain their confidence, chip in, and do their bit, rather than the bleak stories which are generated by the Opposition from time to time.

Unfortunately, we have elements in our society that would do anything in their power to undermine authority and confidence in order to make gains for their own ends. We have seen this same factor at work in other parts of the world. I take this opportunity to quote from a report, copies of which were circulated to most of us last week, from a periodical called *Freedom Lifeline*, August-September 1980 edition, under the heading "See How Apathy has Destroyed our Standards". The report refers to the fact that we should look at the points it brings out, and examine what has happened over the last decade in South Australia. The article comes from Mr. W. Cleon Skousen, a former Federal Bureau of Investigation official, who revealed those facts in his book, *The Naked Communist*. He has written down 39 points which the Communists are avowed to use as their technique in order to try to undermine the capitalist system in the Western world, because they, themselves, cannot use warfare to accomplish their aims, as in Vietnam and Afghanistan. So, to bring about these aims in the Western world, they employ other tactics. The publication states:

1. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.

That would be a foregone conclusion. The publication continues:

2. Do away with all loyalty oaths.

We have seen much of that occur during the past decade. The publication continues:

3. Continue giving Russia access to the World Patent Offices.

That would be very handy for Russia. The publication continues:

4. Capture one or both of the political Parties in all non-communist nations.

One wonders how far they are succeeding in this nation. Later, I will have more to say about the swing to the left. The publication continues:

5. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.

How often have we seen the Opposition here throw up the claim of civil rights in order to defend one of its policies. One of its most staunch advocates of the civil rights movement is now a Federal member. It would appear that, under these guidelines, the Communist Party is making some inroads into that one Party of our system of Government here. The publication continues.

6. Get control of the schools. Use them as transmission belts for socialism and current communist propaganda. Soften the curriculum. Get control of the teachers' associations. Put the Party line in textbooks.

7. Gain control of all student newspapers.

Many people say that that is already occurring. The publication continues:

8. Use student riots to foment public protests against programmes or organisations which are under communist attack.

9. Infiltrate the press. Get control of book review assignments, editorial writing, policy-making positions.

10. Get control of key positions in radio, television and motion pictures.

11. Acceptance of co-existence as the only alternative to atomic war.

12. U.S. willingness to capitulate in preference to engaging in atomic war.

13. Develop the illusion that total disarmament would be a demonstration of moral strength.

What an illusion! The publication continues:

14. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of communist affiliations and regardless of whether items could be used for war.

15. Extension of long-term loans to Russia and Soviet satellites.

16. Provide aid to all nations regardless of communist domination.

17. Grant recognition to Red China. Admission of Red China to the United Nations.

18. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the German question by free elections under supervision of the U.N.

We can see how successful Russia was there. The publication continues:

19. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the United States has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.

20. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the United Nations.

That, no doubt, would be a means of getting the numbers in the United Nations. It continues:

21. Promote the United Nations as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world Government with its own independent armed forces. (Some communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the United Nations as by Moscow.) Sometimes these two centres compete with each other.

22. Continue discrediting culture by degrading all forms of artistic expression.

23. Control art critics and directors of art museums.

24. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them censorship and a violation of free speech and free press.

Fortunately, we have seen measures designed to introduce some sanity into censorship control here. Continuing:

25. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and T.V.

I believe a new book is about to be launched that talks about the effect the Dunstan regime had on the moral standards of South Australia. I believe the book will be launched in Adelaide on Friday. Continuing:

Present homosexuality, degeneracy and promiscuity as "normal, natural, healthy".

For how long have we seen this debate taking place in this State over the past decade, and have these matters not now become normal, natural and healthy matters for discussion? The publication continues:

27. Infiltrate the churches and replace revealed religion with "social" religion. Discredit the Bible and emphasise the need for intellectual maturity which does not need a "religious crutch".

28. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools, on the ground that it violates the principle of "separation of church and State".

29. Support any socialist movement to give centralised control over any part of the culture—education, social agencies, welfare programmes, mental health clinics.

30. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the communist apparatus.

Would that not be handy for the communist movement? No. 31 states (and I think we saw some evidence of this recently with the sacking of a gentleman named Mr. Salisbury):

Discredit and eventually dismantle the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Whilst that is a U.S. body—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House, including the lack of any Minister in the Chamber at present.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SCHMIDT: Regarding the reference to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, we saw exactly the same thing occur here with the Salisbury affair, when the former Administration quite successfully sought to get rid of all files on any persons who might have any connection with undesirable bodies. We would not want the Communist Party to be regarded in any way as an undesirable body according to the terms set out in this article. Paragraph 32 is very interesting and states:

Infiltrate and gain control of more unions.

We saw this play a major role in the last election, when the Labor Party itself recognised this hazard, a great chain around its neck that was dragging it down.

It did this quite noticeably when it made endeavours to leave out some of the more so-called left wing elements of the Party in its advertising. One remembers the advertisements, giving a picture of a team following the leader; some members of the team were missing. One of those was the member for Elizabeth. I am told that he was on holiday, but I tend to believe that the Party was rather embarrassed by the Leader's being associated with the left movement of the Party and, because of the tide of public opinion, which was going against the left wing, it in no way wanted to be associated with that left wing element; therefore, it promoted the little white angels of the Party and camouflaged the black sheep hiding behind. The publication continues:

33. Transfer some of the powers of arrest from the police to social agencies. Treat all behavioural problems as psychiatric disorders which no-one but psychiatrists can understand or treat.

That comment is interesting in the light of the book *Cancer Ward* by Solzhenitsyn. This is obviously a form of treatment used in the Soviet Union at present. It continues:

34. Infiltrate and gain control of big business.

They may find that a bit harder to do. It continues:

35. Dominate the psychiatric professions and use mental health laws as a means of gaining coercive control over those who oppose Communist goals.

I had the privilege recently to attend a talk given by an eminent Jewish psychologist who was fortunate enough to escape the clutches of the Russian regime and who is now working in this State. He has been here for 11 months and has been working in Adelaide for five months. His discussion was very interesting in that he portrayed how some of the psychiatric hospitals in Russia are being used by the Government to detain those people who are prepared to come out and comment against the Administration in Russia. He gave examples of the conditions under which these hospitals operate. People sleep on floors; up to two people sleep in the one bed; and conditions are appalling. The salary rate of professional officers is also appalling. Some \$160 a month is the top salary for a leading psychiatrist in one of these hospitals.

The psychologist to whom I refer had never heard of a disposable syringe until he came to work in Adelaide; in Russia, recycled syringes are used. The drugs used in Russia were of an inferior nature and, therefore, large quantities had to be used to gain the effect desired, or other means had to be adopted to supplement the drugs. The psychologist also said that pressure was put on this noble profession to comply with the orders of the K.G.B. He gave an example of one of his friends who refused to certify a dissident who was assigned to him. Having thus

refused, this venerable doctor soon found himself under such tremendous pressure that he had no alternative but to seek employment in another part of Russia.

Of course, the K.G.B. was astute enough to not come out directly and say, "You have disobeyed one of our rules." To gain the same effect, pressure was put on this person; his work was continually downgraded, he was harassed, and in the end he had no option but to give in and go where he was directed. There we have a classic example of how psychiatric hospitals are used in Russia. The publication continues:

36. Discredit the family as an institution. Encourage promiscuity and easy divorce.

Point No. 37 is as follows:

Emphasise the need to raise children away from the negative influence of parents.

Have we not heard much of this in our society nowadays, where there are great pressures to allow children to be brought up in places other than with their parents? Point No. 38 is as follows:

Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the Western tradition that students and special interest groups should rise up and use united force to solve economic, political and social problems.

How often do we see various elements, notably Labor Party members in Queensland, encouraging and participating in rather violent street activities in order to discredit a Government? Point No. 39, the final one in the submission, is as follows:

Overthrow all colonial Governments before native populations are ready for self-government.

I think that there are perhaps some movements like that underfoot in Australia. This is a rather interesting document that the gentleman pointed out. Certainly, some thought needs to be given to whether some of those processes are not occurring in our own country, and notably in our own State. It was stated earlier that perhaps we should look at some of those points and see whether they have not been working in this State in the past decade.

Before embarking on that document, I said that other elements in our society were endeavouring to undermine the authority and confidence of our community. The scenario in which one sees this destructive element at work can be seen in the Marxist philosophy, which has as its antithesis the destruction of the capitalist system in favour of a socialist-controlled system. In practical terms, this can be seen in such events as the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea. Members may remember the time when we were asked to support the North Vietnamese because it was seen as a civil war. Of course, our sympathies were greatly invoked because it was a civil war and naturally these people deserved our help. Unfortunately, we are still being asked to give them some form of support, and they are now certainly embarking on more than a civil war, when they encroach on neighbouring countries such as Kampuchea. We are seeing the hardship that has been caused there for the refugees. We have also seen evidence of the Russian annexation of Afghanistan.

One could draw a loose analogy with the Shakespearean play, *Julius Caesar*, in order to illustrate the destructive elements which are at work in our community and which are often not seen as such until it is too late. The play, as the name suggests, is set at a time when the Roman empire was at its greatest. At the same time, a Soothsayer was able to warn Caesar that doom was near.

The decline of Rome would be hastened by the actions of one man, who was revered by all people and seen as their entrusted friend. That man, namely Brutus, betrayed Caesar as well as the people of Rome whom he loved and

who, in return, loved him. Brutus's actions accomplished only short-term gains in exchange for long-term disaster. Little did Brutus realise that, as he thrust the dagger into Caesar's back, he was making the "most unkind cut of all" and was thereby bringing to an end the glory of a noble, proud and strong empire.

The symbol of what Caesar stood for, namely, a noble, proud and strong race can be likened to the people of South Australia, who are noble and proud, and who form a strong community that has much to offer the well being of this State. Similarly, we have a Brutus, namely, the former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, a man who, just like Brutus of old, was able to win the hearts of the people and have them revere him. That gentleman has turned on his own noble race for his own benefit and that of his Party and made the "most unkind cut of all". He has, through his efforts to incite violence, of which we heard something earlier in the year, thrust the dagger of divisiveness into the backs of the South Australian people.

Members may recall that a similar tactic was used by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, when he realised that he could no longer hide his mistakes and endeavoured to camouflage them by inciting violence in the hope that he could get the nation sufficiently divided and emotive enough to vote him back into power. He learnt quickly that Australia is not a third world banana republic and that Australians could not be forcibly motivated. The responsible nature of Australians came to the fore, and we saw one of the greatest landslide victories, in this case for the Fraser Government, that the nation has ever seen.

Members may recall that the same thing occurred in 1977, and as a result of three years of responsible action we will see the Fraser Government returned to office later this year. In support of that, we have evidence of the fact that Australia is regarded highly by other nations as well. I refer to an article by Mr. Tony Baker in the *News* of Tuesday 29 July in which he talks about the fact that the oil barons have us over a barrel. That article states:

That cliché tag about Australia being the lucky country will take on new meaning in the next 12 months, according to predictions by some of the world's top economists. They believe the industrial world faces recession, but that Australia will be relatively untouched.

That will be due only to the policies that the present Government has been adopting over the past three years. The article continues:

The predictions come from the secretariat of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the so-called rich nations club of 24 countries, including Australia. Oil prices are going to dominate the economies of the industrial capitalist world, it says in a paper looking ahead to the financial year to June 1981. Imported oil has gone up about 130 per cent since the end of 1978. A period of decline is ahead. "Unlike the forecasts of six months ago, the expected decline is fairly widespread, affecting not only the United States but also the major European economies and a number of the smaller countries," says the O.E.C.D. assessment.

It is interesting to note that it maintains that in Australia there will be a small decline towards the end of this year, and an improved position again next year, compared to other countries. According to Mr. Baker, we are still the lucky country, and we can attribute that luck to that fact that we have had a responsible Government at our helm for the past three years, and may we have that Government at the end of this year for the next three years.

With regard to the analogy I drew previously to the play *Julius Caesar*, the people of South Australia gave evidence

of their strength and their pride and did not allow themselves to be wooed or incited by violence by the character that I called Brutus before. For years "Brutus" Dunstan had been working towards allowing uranium mining, and had "Cassius" Hudson, with that lean and hungry look, obtain Crown Law opinion on the matter. We heard a lot more about this matter in previous debates. It was quite obvious that the A.L.P. was quite prepared to go ahead with uranium mining. I can remember quite well the kerfuffle that occurred at the beginning of last year to which I shall refer in a moment. I now refer to one notable gentleman, namely, Abraham Lincoln, who said, "When we hide Government business from the people, we are betraying them." Surely, that is what we have seen happen over the years through "Brutus" and "Cassius", to whom I have referred.

How are we being betrayed? Members will recall the long debate that occurred in January and February last year. I shall quote from one newspaper article referring to the A.L.P. conference in 1979. The headline states, "South Australian delegates rule out the vote on uranium". In other words, the A.L.P. wanted to abolish any chance of a referendum being held on uranium mining because it knew that the people of South Australia might well have given the support that it did not want at that time.

To that end we had "Brutus" travelling overseas trying to get information on this subject, but unfortunately some of his own renegades back here were trying to do otherwise. He actually named some of them. Reference was made to the Trades and Labor Council Secretary, Mr. Bob Gregory, former Senator Jim Toohey and former Attorney-General, Mr. Peter Duncan, who spearheaded the defeat of that matter which "Cassius" Hudson was trying to implement, namely, the holding of a referendum. We know that "Cassius" was defeated, and we know how "Cassius" was defeated. "Brutus" Dunstan, at the start of the debate on this matter in this House, stated:

I will be supported this afternoon by the Minister of Mines and Energy—

that was "Cassius" Hudson—

who will support everything I say.

Members can see what power "Brutus" had over "Cassius" on that occasion, and we now know why the referendum did not proceed. He was told that it should not go ahead. It was not done on a fair basis. Also, it was interesting to note at the time that when "Brutus" returned from his jaunt overseas he left two of his notable men behind, two eminent consultants to the Department of Mines and Energy, Mr. Wilmshurst and Mr. Dickinson. Apparently, these two gentlemen strongly supported in 1976 a pro-uranium lobby. Again, "Brutus" was able to squash that one.

In that whole debate several attempts were made to try to have something resolved. As we heard earlier, the Opposition in no way was going to align itself to that policy, because it was nitpicking and was just trying to bow, as the article says here, to the left-wing extremists in the Labor movement. We have seen too much of that happen over a period of time. As our present Premier then stated:

The decision by the Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) on uranium mining and development had effectively condemned South Australia to a future of industrial stagnation and economic disaster.

We can see, with the present Government and our change in attitude on that subject, how, as I said earlier, there is now a marked confidence in this State, with smaller industries and larger companies firmly investing in this State. Through that investment we will see opportunities

for other people to gain employment and, more notably, we will see our economy go on the up again.

Unfortunately for the Labor Party, it is often besieged by the left-wing intrusion into its workings. I refer to another article of 29 July in the *News* headed "Lurching to the left". That is the problem that is besieging the A.L.P., particularly with the resignation of Mr. Batt, from Tasmania, who is now going to take up some post overseas. The report states:

Mr. Batt was a moderate who fell victim to an aggressive left-wing hostile to his style.

This was hostile reaction to the style that Mr. Batt was seeking to introduce to the A.L.P. movement. We have seen similar signs in South Australia of people trying to introduce such a moderate level of activity. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition trying to do the same thing just prior to the last State Council meeting of the A.L.P. when he saw problems brewing between the union element and the branch element in relation to the voting system. To try to make it look democratic and a good system, greater voting power was given to members of branches. Hidden underneath all that was the fact that, as a compromise, a greater say was given to trade unions, particularly to the South Terrace movement and the strong left-arm boys in the policy-making area. The article states:

In New South Wales, the recent bashing of Labor M.P. Mr. Peter Baldwin because of faction fighting within the A.L.P. has created a running sore for the Labor Party which will not heal before the Federal poll.

Later, it states:

The New South Wales Labor Government has had many similarities to the former South Australian Labor Administration under former Premier Don Dunstan. When the articulate smooth-talking Leader is away the Government's rough edges are quickly exposed.

We saw how quickly that happened in South Australia under Dunstan. As soon as the Labor Government lost that gentleman the Party collapsed in its shoes, and now we have a new Government in power. Apparently, the A.L.P. in New South Wales has a similar problem: as soon as Mr. Wran is away the rough edges of the Party are quickly exposed. Of course, we all hope that his health will improve, but from a Party point of view the Labor members are hoping that he will recover and be able to lead the Party again.

As a stratagem to try to give itself some credence for the forth-coming Federal election, the A.L.P. has adopted an ancient Roman system of ruling, a triumvirate: Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hawke, and Mr. Wran. The word "triumvirate" means an association of three men in office. One of them, of course, is not yet in office, but no doubt he hopes that he will be. More importantly, a triumvirate is defined as being there for any political ends. Really, the A.L.P. is endeavoring to set up a camouflage screen to try to woo the people of Australia into believing that under the triumvirate of so-called moderation there are future possibilities.

Mr. KENEALLY: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. SCHMIDT: I have referred to the camouflage triumvirate being set up by the Federal A.L.P. in its efforts to try to woo the people of Australia into thinking that, if the A.L.P. were to be successful, there would be a moderate form of Government; it has put up these three wonderful men, who, on their own, may appear moderate. However, we have seen this happen before. We can never under-estimate the power of the left wing within the A.L.P., and no doubt if it were to be successful, although heaven forbid that that should happen, at the next Federal

election, it would not be long before this triumvirate would quickly crumble, as happened in Roman times, and the left wing would come to the fore again.

The problems of the A.L.P. will continue, and it was heartening to read in yesterday's paper the comments of Mr. Peter Baldwin himself that the bashing did some good. That was the bashing he received no doubt from some of his own Party colleagues in New South Wales. What a price that is for a Party to pay, that one of its own members must succumb to this form of behaviour within its own ranks because they cannot agree amongst themselves. The faction fighting goes on! Such brutality must be looked on by the community as being an element of that Party. Such a perpetration of incited violence on the Australian people was attempted by Mr. Whitlam, when he had his back against the wall.

He tried to motivate Australians into taking up violence, and in January we had it again when "Brutus" Dunstan tried to incite South Australians into taking up some form of violence if things did not go their way. It seems to be part of their nature, and one would hope that Australians are wise enough (and I am confident that they are) not to be fooled by this camouflage screen of the Federal triumvirate but will act accordingly and show that we do not want men who are prepared to stoop to all sorts of means of hoodwinking people, particularly the use of or the incitement to violence to gain their ends. It is time we got back to some more positive elements. It becomes very gloomy when one talks about the A.L.P. for so long, because one tends to fall into the doomsday approach promoted by that Party.

I want to get back to the positive and innovative proposals put forward by the Governor in his Speech at the opening of this session.

It was stated in yesterday's media that the Government is endorsing the report that we examine our future work force. This is a very imperative measure, because we have seen already what can happen when certain sectors of the work force are not properly ascertained and we go in the wrong direction. One notable area is the teaching profession, to which I will refer in a moment. Back in June this year in the B.H.P. journal there were strong recommendations from that company saying that there would be a great short-fall of engineers in Australia as well as other skilled tradesmen. With the sort of money that will be invested by this company over the next few years, it sees that it will require some 20 additional mining engineers in the next few years. The article continues to refer to the growth that the company understands will occur in the mining sector. There is a great demand for mining engineers and tradesmen. Yesterday's press also stated that there would be a shortage of geologists, draftsmen, bookkeepers, gardeners, delivery men, accountants and metal workers in the next few years. These people will be in great shortage by 1981, which is not very far away.

To this end, Government agencies, schools and all sectors of the employing agencies need to look carefully at how we can encourage our future market, namely, the people in schools, to take up courses that will put them into areas where there will be the greatest deficiency instead of doing the run of the mill subjects, as they have done in the last few years, only to find themselves surplus to the needs of society. Referring to the plight of some people who have participated in job activities or courses and now find themselves unemployable, it is heartening to see the action taken by the Government today in providing free off-peak bus travel for unemployed people to travel around the city to find employment. That is a commendable action.

Referring to the education scene, I express at the outset my dismay on travelling through my electorate in seeing schools that were poorly neglected by the former Administration. We are experiencing a rather lengthy campaign by various sectors of the teaching community in saying that more money should be invested in education in order to sort out all the problems in that system. One of the problems is that over the years there has been a devastating neglect of some of the existing schools.

I was quite appalled when travelling through my district to find several schools where little has been done over a number of years, and that some schools have been trying since 1976 to have some of their buildings upgraded, but to no avail. At one school, in particular, transportable buildings were brought there in 1977. The buildings were erected, and the outside was painted, so that it looked good to passers by, but the inside is anything but pleasant—undercoat paint, nails not properly driven in, and bits of timber slapped around here and there to renovate the place sufficient for it to be used. For the teachers and students to have to work in such a shabby environment is more than disheartening. I can think of another school where old church building premises were taken over. The back room of the building has holes in the walls and is very shabby. Attempts have been made for years to get it renovated. We hear so much about the previous Government's promoting its new glorious schools (and I do not deny that they were needed), but, by the same token, if more prudent care had been taken so that such white elephants as Monarto were not set up, money could have been diverted to areas where it was really needed to satisfy present needs and, as we got the means, then things could have been promoted for the future.

People tend to forget quickly what is done for them. If one quickly reflects on what this Government has done since it came to office less than 12 months ago, one would realise that one such area was outlined in the Governor's Speech, paragraph 10 of which states:

My Government is pledged to maintain the high priority of education within its total programme.

Priority was given in the past financial year, in that we increased the Education budget by \$308 000 and the teaching force in the primary area by an additional 30. This goes well when we consider that many schools are crying out for the lack of teachers but, more importantly, many schools are crying out because they do not have specialised teachers, mainly in the remedial teaching area. This, again, is an area that was sadly neglected by the former Administration and we are pleased that this area is now receiving attention by the present Minister, who has devoted himself entirely to the whole problem since being in office in order to try to overcome some of the shortfalls that existed in the past.

Commendation must be paid to the press over the past couple of weeks, because it has been running a somewhat long programme on the whole education problem, thus generating much public debate. As many people as there are in the community, so there are as many comments on this issue. A notable one is a letter written by Mr. Adams, in last Tuesday's *News*. He asks, "Why not give us a fair go?" He points out some of the plights of teachers. On reading his letter, one might tend to regard it as being cynical, rather than being of dire need. He makes some interesting points, one of which is the number of hours worked by teachers, and another is the hard work they are expected to do. He points out the difference between primary and secondary teaching. We are aware that primary teachers have a large responsibility placed on their shoulders, because what they teach children at a young age will see them through to the latter years of their

education. He raises points about non-contact times, particularly in reference to conferences and curriculum committee meetings. He states that these areas are a very soft option for some teachers to be able to use and capitalise on in order to get themselves out of doing some work, and thus exploiting the whole system.

We are quite aware that inservice conferences and curriculum meetings are a very necessary and a vital part of the education system but, as this gentleman points out, the method is open to abuse, and it may be that we should give attention to that to ensure that it is not abused, because it becomes quite an interesting factor when one looks at some conferences that are held at some of our coastal resorts.

I know that many conferences are held at Goolwa, where the accommodation for teachers is given free of charge. They pay for some but not all their meals, and sometimes they spend three days at such conferences. One wonders about the amount of good that comes from these conferences. We cannot deny that certain people who promote the conferences will argue that they are justified, but if one considers the man-hours spent by teachers away from their school, the fact that extra staff must be brought in, and also the extreme cost of accommodation, one must raise a big question mark about this whole matter.

Another matter in the education system that needs a lot of looking at is the system of promotion. One must question how it is that Principal Education Officers, having come up through the system and having gone to schools and read a screed about someone, then make a formal assessment of the person regarding personal, managerial, organisational, and curricula skills.

Throughout this whole process, little attention is given to the fact that these officers have not sought an opinion from a person's peers or from other members of the staff about how the person is regarded by the staff, whether the person can get on well, and whether the person has managerial skills. Another interesting factor is that these Principal Education Officers, probably having done little training in management skills, suddenly become the be all and end all of the decision on who is a good manager or who is able to manage the finances, administration and organisation of a large complex like a school.

I think that much more attention will have to be given to having courses on management skills innovated through those conferences, because, with the large amounts of money now being administered by schools, the large number of pupils in some schools and the large number of staff that have to be administered and organised, people should be given a form of back up in educational managerial skills to assist them in this difficult programme.

Finally, I draw attention to another very innovative and positive action by this Government. It is in the area of expanding community health. I am happy to say that in my district, the Minister of Health has said, she will provide a district community health centre, rather than one large regional health centre that would not service the people quite as well as would a smaller district centre. The feedback that I get from my district is that people are very happy about having been told that this will occur.

Another positive aspect of the whole health programme is that legislation will be introduced relating to standards of food. We need to give much attention to many of the ingredients allowed to be used in food, such as some additives like preservatives and colouring that have a deleterious effect on some children. We know that these additives have an effect particularly on some children who are hyper-active. If we can take any measures that will promote proper nutrition and eating habits in our community and will not put in these pseudo-dependency drugs for certain persons, we should do everything possible to improve food standards and nutritional habits.

I commend the actions of the Government as outlined in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a matter that has caused me considerable concern ever since I have been a member. I am referring to the provision of adequate long-term education facilities in the Ceduna area so that its expanding population needs can be met not only for the present but also for the future. Unfortunately, the need for improved facilities at the Ceduna school has involved a protracted and quite unsatisfactory series of events.

Mr. Whitten: It's a long way from Whyalla to Ceduna, isn't it?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should just listen. Unfortunately, when the original decision was eventually made and work was commenced on the new school, the first mistake that the previous Government made was the decision to construct a Demac-type building. More than \$5 000 000 has been spent on that Demac building, which in the view of a large number of people in Ceduna is quite unsatisfactory, and I agree with that assessment. I believe it would be difficult to get a better position to build a school: from the site one can observe the sea on two sides, and it is a very good site for building. However, the Demac unit resembles a large group of boxes put together. It is difficult to ventilate that building properly, and I believe that the air-conditioner must operate at all times. Further, it is difficult to admit natural light into the building, and it was not designed for local climatic conditions. I believe that whoever was responsible for choosing this building at Ceduna has a great deal to answer for. The person concerned only had to look at the old stone building to see the type of building that is suitable for the area.

Mr. Keneally: We've got them at Port Augusta.

Mr. GUNN: I know, and I would think that you have problems there, too. In my view, this type of building is completely unsatisfactory. However, that decision was made, and nothing can be done about it now. The people of Ceduna are landed with a Demac building and will be for a long time. Fortunately, no-one else in South Australia will be as unlucky as the people of Ceduna, because no more of these buildings will be provided, thank goodness. I am pleased that the Minister has agreed to provide a far more suitable building at Leigh Creek, which will be designed to fit in with the climatic conditions. The Leigh Creek School Council certainly put on a turn and made its views well known in relation to this matter, and it had my total support. As I have said, I am very pleased with the approach taken by the Minister and his department in relation to that matter. However, the situation at Ceduna has attracted a considerable amount of media coverage. A number of statements have been made, and many of them have been inaccurate while others have been quite malicious. The Public Works Committee reported on 20 October 1977 in relation to the Ceduna school, as follows:

The planned replacement school for Ceduna is designed to cater for an enrolment of 850 children, with nominally 600 in the primary section and 250 at secondary level.

On 4 April 1979, the Superintendent of Facilities—Building Operations and a project officer (who shall remain nameless) visited the school and were asked why the plans

showed only 16 primary teaching spaces, which implies 37 students per class. The Superintendent pointed out that the teaching spaces had been reduced to cut down costs. He said that small primary withdrawal rooms would have to be used as separate classrooms, as well as some secondary classrooms for primary teaching. In his report, which appeared in the Public Works Committee report referred to, he said:

A variety of teaching strategies is difficult in a school where the easy flow of children and staff from one facility to another is restricted.

The previous Minister decided to reduce the size of the building, and this decision caused the problems that we are facing today because, if one looks at the projections of population for that area, one will see that obviously no consideration was given by the previous Administration, or whoever was responsible, to population trends. Ceduna is a growth area, one of the few in South Australia. The previous Government had a history of neglecting to consider population trends; if it had considered them, the Monarto fiasco would not have occurred.

I now refer to the problems that occurred this year, when the issue got out of hand. At the end of term 1, there were 626 students in the primary school and 252 in the secondary school, making a total of 878 pupils at the Ceduna school. It is estimated that, by 1984, there will be 1 074 students. Obviously, the department had to quickly consider means by which this problem could be overcome. It was decided that, in view of the fact that no more Demac buildings were to be constructed, units should be shifted from Whyalla.

When that suggestion was eventually made public, the staff and others involved at the Whyalla Stuart High School were very much opposed to it. I received a fairly strong letter from the organisation, which raised the bristles on the back of my neck. I was diverted from my original course. I admit that at first I was ready for a fair fight with the staff; however, being a reasonable person, after looking at the situation at first hand and considering the use that the staff was making of the building, I had to admit—

Mr. Keneally: And the size of the teachers.

Mr. GUNN: No, that had nothing to do with it. I had to admit that the unit was being put to very good effect. It was providing facilities for an underprivileged group of people in that area in which there was a lot of unemployment and in which, it would be fair to say, a large percentage of the community is disadvantaged. I found out later that the cost of shifting that building would be about \$130 000.

It was obvious that, if a building had to be shifted from Leigh Creek and would become available, it should be shifted to Ceduna because, whatever happened, the Demac building from Whyalla would take some time to get to Ceduna and would still not overcome the long-term problems in that town. As well as the Demac unit from Leigh Creek, there was a need for some temporary classrooms at Ceduna; this presented a difficult situation. A gentleman called Mr. Anderson, a well known member of the Labor Party and spokesman for that Party when he was at Hawker, attempted to turn the matter into a political fiasco by organising a torrid campaign against me.

Mr. Whitten: What was his name?

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Anderson; the honourable member can check his records. He should be aware of the gentleman concerned. Certain sections of the Institute of Teachers have set out to make life unbearable for the Minister and for the Government. We are well aware of that. It was my considered opinion that Mr. Anderson was

part of that group. However, without worrying about personalities, my concern and that of the Minister was to ensure that the long-term needs of the school were met. The Regional Director has done an excellent job, under great provocation; he gave certain undertakings and requests were made which I conveyed to the Minister after I attended the school council meeting at Ceduna. The Minister replied and I am pleased to say that a demographic study has been carried out, which makes a number of recommendations that have my total support. Briefly, they include the recommendations that a sub-school with a design capacity of 200 students be developed in the south-eastern corner of the existing area of the site by February 1982 (that is essential) and that the existing capacity of 800 to 850 students at the Ceduna Area School be maintained. Various other options have been indicated by the demographic study. The Government has honoured its undertaking. Two of the Atco-type buildings have arrived on site.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): Last Thursday, in reply to a question that I had asked, the Chief Secretary said that, in an attempt to justify earlier mistakes, the relevant proposition was not a report but the Cassidy remarks. I am referring to what I believe to be the Cassidy Report. If a Government wants to maintain in office an incompetent Minister, that is its business. It is well known that the Premier has absolute power to appoint Ministers. It is almost equally as well known that the Premier is indebted to the Chief Secretary, as the Chief Secretary remained loyal to the Premier when the Liberal Party tried to dump him before he became Premier. Maintaining an incompetent in office is one thing. However, when a Minister is untruthful it is an entirely different matter. The Government has a responsibility to Parliament and to the people of this State to see that an untruthful Minister—

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order and ask for your ruling, Sir. The honourable member has referred to the Chief Secretary as untruthful. That is unparliamentary and is unworthy of the honourable member. I ask for your ruling, Sir, because it is inaccurate.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. It has never, to my knowledge, been unparliamentary to use the word "untruthful". There is another word of three letters which is sometimes held to have the same meaning and which is recognised as being unparliamentary.

Mr. O'NEILL: Thank you, Sir. If the honourable member can contain himself, I will show that he is wrong and that I am correct when I say that the Minister has been untruthful: either that, or he has not been responsible for his actions. I will leave the choice to the member for Eyre.

I refer to the events that occurred following the escape by Tognolini from Yatala Gaol. Therein is another story. I was assured in writing by the Chief Secretary before Tognolini's escape that the Minister had taken steps to see that no further escapes would occur. That was after the two fellows got out in May. Obviously, the Chief Secretary has not covered the situation, because he was unable to stop two fellows driving a truck into the gaol to get one of their friends out. I refer to a report headed "Gaol Report not seen—Minister" in the 1 July issue of the *Advertiser*, in which the following appears:

The Chief Secretary, Mr. Rodda, said last night that he had not seen a copy of the Cassidy Report or known of its existence.

I refer also to a report headed "I won't resign over Yatala—Rodda" in the 2 July issue of the *Advertiser*. This report, which is a beauty, says the following:

Mr. Rodda denied that he had not been aware of the report.

I presume that means that he is agreeing that he had seen it. However, that is a rather convoluted way of putting it. He continued:

I knew that there was a report. I have not seen the report. Incidentally, it states earlier that the report was commissioned by the Government early in December and given to the Government in February, yet the Minister had not seen it in July.

Mr. Greg Kelton, in his column in the 5 July issue of the *Advertiser*, said that Mr. Rodda had ordered the report in December last year and that Mr. Cassidy presented it to the Government in February. Mr. Kelton also says that the Minister successfully stonewalled his way through a 25-minute barrage of questions. Another way of putting it would be to say that he refused to answer the questions. It is my opinion that the press was very kind to the Minister, but after today I would say that the Minister has been very unkind to the press.

In his reply to me last week, the Minister said that it was a complete fabrication, in response to my question in regard to the report, and he went on to say that it was a copy of the Cassidy remarks. He accused me of fabrication. Today he said that he was not accusing me of fabrication, so I can only assume that he was accusing the press of fabrication. However, the interesting thing about this report that is not a report, is that, having said last week that it was not a report (and he said that in the first line of his answer), he goes on to assert that it was the Cassidy remarks. He gets up in this House today and says, and I quote, because I made a note when he spoke, "When that report was leaked to the press I had not seen Mr. Cassidy's report."

At the risk of being unkind to the Minister, I say that at least he is being rather pedantic. I do not know what he is trying to accomplish, but there was a document in existence; he made statements to the effect that he had not seen it; then he said that he had not said that he had not seen it; then he accused me of fabricating a proposition; then he said today that I had not fabricated it but that somebody else had. That may have been the press; we do not know. I think the Government should have a look at the situation. Here we have the Minister who is in charge of prisons, the Police Force, and fisheries, and we saw how competent he is at that during the last session. He is in charge of the Fire Brigade, where we have another potential disaster facing us.

The Government must face its responsibilities in respect to the performance of this Minister. Members of the Government have a responsibility to put pressure on their Leader to say, "All right, we know that you had a debt to the Chief Secretary; we know he stood by you when we tried to cut your head off; we know he was the individual who voted and saved your neck and hence allowed you to become Premier and perhaps kept out the member for Rocky River or somebody else who aspired to leadership of the Party; we know this, and that you honoured that debt when you made him the Chief Secretary." But members opposite should tell the Premier that for the sake of their Party and for the sake of South Australia he must draw the line. The Premier must speak to this incompetent, this Mr. Nice Guy—maybe he is a Mr. Nice Guy, but the facts do not bear it out. He got up in this House and cast aspersions on the integrity of the wife of a former Minister and consequently almost got himself a punch in the nose for it when he was in the corridor.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: Government members were not there but I saw the reaction of the former Minister. The

situation is this: Mr. Nice Guy is an absolute incompetent; he does not have good relations with officers in the department; he comes into this House and, in desperation, accuses people of fabrication, and then without withdrawing such statements he says that the person accused did not fabricate it. He does not know what he is talking about. He tells the press one thing on one day and a different thing on the next. As far as I am concerned, the amazing thing is that the press is not more severe on him. In view of his statement today, I hope they they will see this matter in the same light as I do, in that it can only be a slight on the reporters who reported in respect to his earlier statements, and that he has accused them of fabricating the situation.

It is time that the Liberal Party, for its own good, got rid of him. I object to a Minister's being untruthful in this House in respect of circumstances under his control. However, I suppose that, if the Government wants to leave him there, it is to the long-term advantage of the Labor Party, because if he goes on the way he is going he will precipitate a disaster which could bring about an election which, given the state of the latest polls in respect to the popularity of the Government, can only see the return of a Labor Government, because the Government's popularity is at 40 per cent, and the Labor Party's is at 47 per cent, and that is a commentary on the interesting remarks that were made earlier in respect of the relative standings of the Parties.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I remind the honourable member who has just resumed his seat of the old saying "Early ripe, early rotten"! By the time of the next election the percentages that the honourable member quoted will not be a true reflection of the attitude of people in South Australia. As a matter of fact, Morgan has not spelt them out, and I will not go into the coding or the whole credibility of the Morgan poll, but I can assure the honourable member that those figures are considerably out.

The reason I join in this debate today is that I want to register my protest, disgust and dismay at the lack of teeth in some of our legislation. Unfortunately, this has been allowed to go on for some years. I thought that when the previous Government took the opportunity in September 1978 to amend the Hairdressers Registration Act we would remove the major problem that had existed for many years involving those engaged in hairdressing and associated trades. I am disappointed that the Hairdressers Registration Board has taken little action that I can see about a complaint from one of my constituents who wrote to the Secretary of the board on 15 July and stated:

I am a registered ladies and gents hairdresser—and she then gives her registration number and the address of her salon at 233 Burbridge Road, Cowandilla.

Mr. Keneally: Are you giving her some free advertising?

Mr. BECKER: I think she deserves an opportunity to obtain justice, because the story I am about to unfold is, in my opinion, quite miserable. She states:

On 20 May 1980, I contracted through . . . Licensed Agent of 168 Angas Street Adelaide, to purchase a hairdressing salon at 233 Burbridge Road, Cowandilla, paying a substantial amount for the business and goodwill, settlement taking place on 10 June 1980.

I point out that about 90 per cent of the purchase price happened to involve goodwill. The letter continues:

I purchased the business from Kenneth Charles Heinicke of 36 Dinwoodie Avenue, Clarence Park. He owned the business for about 18 months. Mr. Heinicke did not work in the shop, but had bought the shop so his son . . . could become an apprentice hairdresser. At the time I negotiated to purchase the business [the son] was an apprentice

hairdresser to the manager of the shop, a Mr. Daryl Rutter. I spoke to Mr. Rutter in company with my father, and during the conversation I asked him if I was likely to lose any clientele. He told me that I might lose half a dozen. I also asked Mr. Rutter what he would do if I bought the shop, and he said he did not know. I asked these questions of Mr. Rutter as it would have an effect as to whether I would purchase the shop or not.

I commenced business at the shop on Tuesday 10 June 1980 . . . two people kept their appointments, both having been booked in by the previous staff. On Wednesday 11 June, one person had been booked in by the previous staff, this person also keeping the appointment. On Thursday 12 June, I saw that a new hairdressing shop had been opened during the morning at 231 Burbridge road . . . [two doors east]. Prior to this the shop had been closed with blinds drawn down so that the inside of the shop was not visible. I then ascertained that this shop had been opened by Daryl Rutter and Mark Osborne. (If I had known this, I would not have bought the business from Mr. Heinicke.) On this day, 12/6/80, two people who had been booked in for appointments by the previous staff failed to keep their appointments. There were five people booked in on Friday 13 and five for Saturday 14, but not one of these persons kept their appointments. All being booked in by the previous staff.

My constituent then took the opportunity on 17 June to visit six people who had made appointments. They told her that Daryl Rutter had informed them that he was opening a new shop. My constituent's letter to the Hairdressers Registration Board continues:

I am very disappointed and hurt and in my opinion Daryl Rutter has been most immoral and unethical in what he has done. However, I now have reason to believe that the ladies' and gents' hairdressers business at 231 Burbridge Road, Cowandilla, named "The Maiden Hair" is jointly owned by Daryl Rutter and Mark Osborne, both of whom have been in the shop every working day except on Mondays, as they do not open on Mondays for business. I believe that Mark Osborne is not a registered hairdresser or an apprentice hairdresser.

This has subsequently been verified. The letter continues:

Furthermore, it might well be that Mark Osborne may be misleading people that he is a hairdresser by various forms of advertising, as you will note.

She refers to advertisements in the local newspaper and those distributed in letterboxes, clearly showing that this is a ladies' and gentlemen's hairdressing business. My constituent concludes:

I am forwarding this letter for your information and consideration as to whether there is any infringement concerning the Hairdressers Board of Registration, advertis-

ing as within mentioned, and also as to whether an apprentice hairdresser can be an owner or part owner of a hairdressing salon.

Up until Friday, my constituent had not heard, although she had made several representations to the Department of Labour and Industry. I had tried to ring the board, but the Secretary was not there on that day.

When we considered this legislation in September 1978, I supported the Bill on behalf of the then Opposition after I had made a considerable number of inquiries, not only at the board but also at the School of Hairdressing and from people in the industry who believed that that was the time to clean up the hairdressing business in South Australia, and especially in the metropolitan area.

I must be fair about this. My colleague, the member for Fisher, did not agree with my point of view and he warned us in relation to whether this could be done within the principles of free enterprise. We were led to believe that, if the Bill then before the House was passed, action would be taken to benefit consumers. From what I can gather, the Hairdressers Registration Board is not under Ministerial control, but is classed as a statutory authority, and yet the Minister is unable to assist. If, as it appears, the board has not sufficient staff, it is unable to police the Act. What is the point of putting legislation through Parliament if these various organisations, such as statutory authorities, cannot police it? When the Minister introduced the Bill, he said it had taken six years for the legislation to get to Parliament, for various reasons, including Government priority.

Mr. Evans: It's taken 140 years.

Mr. BECKER: That is true. Even so, since 1972 the then Government had been pressed to do something about the Act. I feel sorry for my constituent, because she could lose several thousand dollars, although her own skills as a registered hairdresser would show. To purchase a business in this situation is bad enough. The employer has no control over his employee, who goes two doors down to try to steal customers. That is bad enough, but for the board to allow it to continue since 15 July is beyond me; it is a reflection on its ability to police its own legislation. One of its own members stands to lose money, and the board has done nothing about it. I asked a question in the House to try to get something done, but still nothing is being done. This makes a mockery of the legislation and makes one wonder whether it is all worth it. The warning here is to the Government and all new members of Parliament that in future when we put legislation through we must make sure that it is going to work.

Motion carried.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 6 August at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 August 1980

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

S.T.A. RAIL DIVISION

60. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Have there been any discussions or negotiations with the Federal Government or the A.N.R.C. in relation to the selling or handing over of the S.T.A. Rail Division to the A.N.R.C. and, if not, will the Minister make a public statement that the Government has no such intention?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No such discussions have taken place, nor is it the Government's intention.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 981 asked in the last session of Parliament.

61. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is it the intention of the S.T.A. Rail Division to control all metropolitan train movements from a central location and, if so—

- (a) where will the complex be located;
- (b) how many signalmen will be affected within the Adelaide metropolitan area by these changes;
- (c) what is the proposed staffing of the complex;
- (d) when will the complex be commenced and completed;
- (e) what is the anticipated cost of the complex; and
- (f) will A.N.R.C. seconded signalmen operate the C.T.C. equipment in conjunction with train control personnel and, if not, what is the S.T.A.'s intention with regard to surplus signalmen?

2. Has the S.T.A. entered into negotiations with the A.N.R.C. or the rail unions with respect to retraining, re-education or relocation of any signalmen affected by any changes to the current train movement operations within the S.T.A. Metropolitan Rail Division?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Transport Authority proposes to appoint a firm of consultants to conduct a study of the signalling requirements of the metropolitan rail system. The feasibility of controlling all metropolitan train movements from a central location will form part of the study. Should a decision be taken in favour of this arrangement the matter of staffing will be considered in conjunction with the unions concerned.

2. Negotiations concerning the retraining, re-education or relocation of any signalmen affected by changes to the current train movement operations will be entered into at the time such need arises.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 985 asked in the last session of Parliament.

CHIROPRACTIC BOARD

71. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Is the Government aware that the United Chiropractors Association of Australasia Limited claims that it is under-represented on the Chiropractic Board?
2. Does the Government share the Association's concern in this matter and, if not, why not?
3. Who are the members of the Chiropractic Board and

what associations or interests, if any, do they represent?

4. What further action, if any, does the Government propose to take in this matter?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No. Members were appointed on the basis of merit, irrespective of association membership.
3. The members are:
Jeanette Matysek (solicitor)—Chairman
Ian Pascoe (medical practitioner)
Brice Douglas (chiropractor)
Irene Evans (chiropractor)
Derek Lomas (chiropractor)
Graham Morris (chiropractor)
Members do not represent any association.
4. None.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1022 asked in the last session of Parliament.

ARGENTINE ANTS

73. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

Has the programme of eradication of Argentine ants announced by the Minister on 11 October 1979 begun and, if so, what funds have been allocated to the programme, how many staff have been made available, what funds have been spent to date and what progress has been made?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The eradication programme has not commenced. The situation is currently under review following a field survey in March 1980.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1083 asked in the last session of Parliament.

SALVATION JANE

75. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. What is the anticipated date of release of biological control agents for salvation jane in South Australia?
2. What part will be played in the programme by officers of the Department of Agriculture?
3. Where is it planned to release the control agent?
4. Has a programme been established to monitor effects?

5. Will provision be made for compensation for bee-keepers and farmers economically disadvantaged by the results of the programme and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The biological control agents were to be released in South Australia after 1 October 1980. A recent injunction has restrained the release, and the matter is now *subjudice*. It is consequently not appropriate to reply to the other matters.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1085 asked in the last session of Parliament.

77. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. On 1 July 1979, how many staff and weekly paid employees were engaged in—
 - (a) parasite breeding programmes for control of blue green and spotted alfalfa aphids and pea aphid;
 - (b) breeding of aphid-resistant varieties of lucerne and medic?
2. On 30 June 1980, how many staff and weekly paid employees were engaged in—

- (a) parasite breeding programmes for control of blue green and spotted alfalfa aphids and pea aphid;
- (b) breeding and selection of S.A.A. and B.G.A. aphid resistant varieties of lucerne and medic; and
- (c) breeding and selection of pea aphid resistant varieties of pasture and grain legume plants?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

- 1. (a) 16.
- (b) 21.
- 2. (a) 7.
- (b) 18.
- (c) Nil.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1090 asked in the last session of Parliament.

APHID

78. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

- 1. What funds were allocated to the parasite breeding programme for spotted and blue green aphid for 1979-80 and what has been allocated to the programme for 1980-81?
- 2. What funds were allocated to the breeding and selection programme for aphid resistant varieties of lucerne and medic for 1979-80 and what has been allocated to the programme for 1980-81?
- 3. What funds have been allocated to programmes of selection and breeding of pasture and grain legume plants resistant to pea aphid for 1980-81?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

- 1. 1979-80—\$140 560. 1980-81—No specific allocation but any required funds will be funded from moneys available to the Pasture Research Section of the department.
- 2. 1979-80—\$325 000 approximately. 1980-81—\$237 000 approximately.
- 3. No specific allocation has been made. Resistance to pea aphid will be incorporated in the overall aphid resistance breeding programmes of the department.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1091 asked in the last session of Parliament.

DEMAG

79. **Mr. LANGLEY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs: Has the Minister received any tenders for the purchase of Demag and, if so, has finality been reached and what will happen to the employees following the sale?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Following the public call in May 1980 for parties interested in the possible acquisition of the Demag system to register, a number of enquiries were received. These enquiries are now being considered by officers of the Public Buildings Department and the Department of Trade and Industry with a view to establishing the best basis upon which a detailed proposal can be submitted to enquirers for a firm offer. Personnel formerly engaged in the manufacture of DEMAG have been found alternative employment in other working areas of P.B.D., or transferred, in accordance with the agreement reached with the U.T.L.C., to appropriate employment with other Government departments or authorities. No employee will be retrenched.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1093 asked in the last session of Parliament.

GOVERNMENT CARS

83. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. When does the Minister propose to give the member for Mitcham an answer to letters of 28 November 1979, 6 and 27 March, and 23 May 1980 about the use of Government motor cars and why has he not done so before now?

2. Does the Government want to restrict the use as at present of Government motor cars by Ministers and members of Parliament and, if so, why does it not take action to do so and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I advised the honourable member on 12 December 1979 and 14 April 1980 in reply to his letters that the matter of the use of Government motor cars was being examined. Cabinet has now determined a new policy with respect to the use of Ministerial cars and the honourable member was informed accordingly by letter on 9 June 1980.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1011 asked in the last session of Parliament.

SMOKING

84. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: Does the Government consider it undesirable that people should smoke in shops where food is displayed for sale and sold and, if so, what action does it propose to take to stop people smoking in such shops and when will it be taken and if no such action is to be taken, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is considered that regulations under the Food and Drugs Act are able to provide the following controls:

- (a) No person, whether staff or customer, can smoke in any place where food is prepared, other than retail outlets;
- (b) No person while engaged in the preparation of food can smoke, and this would include a person so engaged in a retail outlet or food shop, but not a customer.

It is considered that these regulations do not allow control of smoking in premises where food is displayed for sale and sold, unless it is in the same place as food is prepared. This matter has been referred to both the Central Board of Health and the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee for consideration of a recommendation to provide control of smoking in places where food for sale is displayed.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1017 asked in the last session of Parliament.

NORTH-EAST TRANSPORT

85. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. How much money has already been spent on NEAPTR and how is that amount made up?

2. Of what use, if any, has the NEAPTR study been?

3. What work had been done, and for what purpose, on the construction of an LRT system for the north-eastern suburbs up to the time of the last general election and at what cost?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The cost of the NEAPTR study was as follows:—

	\$
Salaries for staff employed on the project	161 280.59
Administration costs, e.g. overhead, rent, etc.	159 757.84
Technical studies	658 234.04
	\$979 272.47

In addition, an engineer worked virtually full-time on the project from 1975 until 1978 whilst another engineer worked approximately 25 per cent of his time on the project over about four years, the estimated cost of their salaries being \$66 000.

2. The NEAPTR study provided a wide range of planning information pertinent to the need for transport in and to the north-east area. Much of the information was used in the review of transport options including the O'Bahn, which was summarised in the reports released in May 1980.

3. Up to the time of the last general election, preliminary design which would have been used for the basis of construction of the LRT system had completed preliminary design of an outline car specification for discussion with the vehicle building industry; defined system performance criteria of characteristics; prepared preliminary specifications for signalling and ancillary systems; prepared preliminary specifications for the traction power system, the alignment and civil engineering works from Tea Tree Plaza to Victoria Drive; commenced detailed investigations for tunnelling and the design of the alignment from Victoria Drive to Victoria Square; and prepared cost estimates.

The final activity completed prior to the general election was an intensive review of the subject material referred to above to enable the preliminary documents to be revised and modified pending finalisation of the preliminary design. \$390 404.09 had been paid out by the end of September 1979 for preliminary design work.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1018 asked in the last session of Parliament.

DAY CARE CENTRES

105. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Did the Minister of Community Welfare authorise the advertisement in the Messenger Press newspaper the *Courier* of 26 March 1980 headed "Child Care—Family Day Care" and, if so, why and, if not, who, to his knowledge, did authorise it and why?

2. Do not the facilities advertised therein compete with those offered by private day care centres?

3. What—

(a) assistance; and

(b) encouragement,

does the Government give to private day care centres?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The advertisement was inserted in accordance with delegated authority, to inform parents of the availability of family day care in the southern metropolitan area.

2. Family day care and child care centres provide different kinds of care and parents should be able to choose between them. To some, this might appear as competition.

3. (a) and (b), Child care consultants and district office staff of the Department for Community Welfare are available to advise and assist child care centres in relation to their care of children and standards generally. Education Department teachers and health surveyors from local boards of health are also available to assist centres with appropriate advice.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1109 asked in the last session of Parliament.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

157. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. How much money has the Government contributed in each of the last five financial years (including the present financial year) for—

(a) the maintenance and upkeep of Parliament House; and

(b) the administration and salaries of staff at Parliament House?

2. How has this amount been made up in each of those years?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Maintenance: 1975-76, \$50 247; 1976-77, \$66 565; 1977-78, \$70 070; 1978-79, \$67 102; 1979-80, \$71 163 (as at 30/4/80).

The above represents costs incurred by the Public Buildings Department for building maintenance. Costs for cleaning, power *et al.* should be sought from the Speaker, House of Assembly.

(b) Salaries: The Public Buildings Department is responsible for payment of salaries for the Secretary and staff of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and the administrative staff of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House. Other staff and administration costs should be sought from the Speaker, House of Assembly.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works staff: 1975-76, \$20 349; 1976-77, \$22 457; 1977-78, \$37 972; 1978-79, \$42 098; 1979-80, \$39 260 (as at 30/4/80).

Opposition administrative staff: 1975-76, \$65 899; 1976-77, \$93 620; 1977-78, \$125 439; 1978-79, \$123 466; 1979-80, \$117 497 (as at 30/4/80).

2. As above.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1019 asked in the last session of Parliament.

PREMIER'S TRAVEL

158. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier?

1. Why has the Premier been for a trip overseas since Parliament sat in April?

2. What, if anything, has that trip achieved for the State and who, overseas, if anyone, now has a greater overall awareness of South Australia as a free enterprise State with vast energy and mineral resources and an ideal place for investment and how was such awareness inculcated and by whom?

3. Who went with the Premier and why and what work, if any, did each of those persons (including the Premier) on the trip do while abroad?

4. What was the total cost to the Government of the trip and how is it made up?

5. Did the trip do anything and, if so, what to "put South Australia back on the map"?

6. Was any mention of the Premier being in the United Kingdom made in any of the following newspapers—

- (a) *The Times*;
- (b) *The Guardian*;
- (c) *The Financial Times*; and
- (d) *The Economist*,

and, if so, in which and on what dates?

7. Was any such mention made in any other newspaper in the United Kingdom and, if so, in which?

8. Was any such mention made on television or radio in the United Kingdom and, if so, in which and on which radio station, if any, was the Premier interviewed?

9. Was any such mention made of the Premier's visits to any of the other countries to which he went, either in the newspapers, on television or radio, and which, in any of those countries and, if so, what was such mention?

10. When is the Premier going on another trip abroad, where is he planning to go and why?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. The overseas trip was undertaken to:

- (a) re-examine and reorganise the Agent-General's office in London and investigate upgrading South Australian representation in Japan and Hong Kong.
- (b) discuss with businessmen, industrialists and investors in the countries visited their possible future involvement in the economic growth of South Australia.

2. Apart from a reorganisation of the Agent-General's office the trip achieved a greater overall awareness of South Australia as a free enterprise State with vast energy and mineral resources and an ideal place for investment.

3. The Premier was accompanied by the Director-General of the Premier's Department, Mr. G. J. Inns; the Director of State Development, Mr. M. P. Tiddy; and the Premier's Press Secretary, Mr. M. E. Quirk. All four members of the party were actively involved in the wide ranging discussions and undertook individual tasks commensurate with their areas of responsibility.

4. Total cost—\$31 011

	\$
Made up of—	
Airfares	17 636
Accommodation and associated expenses	12 512
Insurance	471
Sundries	392

5. Great interest was shown in South Australia's potential in all the countries visited and everyone spoken to welcomed the information given. Many said they were unaware of South Australia's great potential. Follow up talks began in Adelaide within two days of the Premier's trip on a number of possible developments as well as confirmation of Mitsubishi's take-over of Chrysler Australia, in which the Premier played a part while in Tokyo. For further details see Ministerial Statement 3 June 1980.

6. No.

7. The London *Daily Telegraph* carried a report of the visit on 8 April.

8. The Premier was interviewed by at least one radio station.

9. Aspects of the Premier's visit to Tokyo were reported on *Radio Australia* on 10, 15 and 16 April. The *Mainichi Daily News* (19 April) *Mainichi Daily News* (22 April) and the *Daily Yomiuri* (22 April); In Korea a report was carried in the *Korea Herald* (24 April). Two reports were carried in a Hong Kong newspaper.

In all instances the reports referred to South Australia's energy, mineral wealth and trading potential.

10. There are no such plans at present.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1021 asked in the last session of Parliament.

MUTAGEN TESTING LABORATORY

163. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Has it been decided to close the Environmental Mutagen Testing Laboratory in the I.M.V.S. and if so—

2. Has it been decided to close such laboratory, and if so—

- (a) who made this decision;
- (b) why;
- (c) when will it be closed; and
- (d) what will happen to Dr. Coulter?

3. How long has such laboratory been open and what function has it performed?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1., 2. & 3. There is no Environmental Mutagen Testing Laboratory in the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Dr. Coulter was employed as a medical research officer in a laboratory under the control of the Senior Director of Tissue Pathology.

4. His position has been terminated as published in the *Government Gazette* dated 26 June 1980. It is not appropriate to comment further in view of legal proceedings which have been commenced.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1070 asked in the last session of Parliament.

SPECIMEN CARRIER DEVICE

164. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Is there a specimen carrier device to carry specimens from the Royal Adelaide Hospital to the I.M.V.S., and if so—

- (a) when was it constructed;
- (b) who was responsible for the decision to have it constructed;
- (c) why was it constructed;
- (d) at what cost was it constructed;
- (e) has it operated satisfactorily and if not, why not; and
- (f) is it still being fully used?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows: Yes, there are two specimen carrying devices of similar design: one from the Royal Adelaide Hospital to the Institute and another operating vertically in the north wing of the Institute.

(a) 1973.

(b) The Public Buildings Department at the request of the Institute and incorporated in the Public Works Standing Committee's approval for alterations and additions to the old building.

(c) (i) to facilitate delivery of specimens to the Institute.

(ii) to permit proper security by allowing access doors to the Institute to be locked at nights and weekends.

(iii) to reduce costs of couriers.

(d) Public Buildings Department contract records are destroyed after seven years, and detailed documents are no longer readily available. Therefore, several days research time would

be needed to extract accurate costs. A realistic estimate is approximately \$130 000.

(e) No. Apparently the distance over which the specimens have to be carried is too great for this particular equipment and it does not meet the Institute's specifications with respect to noise and access to specimens in case of failure.

(f) No. However, the vertical conveyor in the north wing of the Institute is now operating satisfactorily.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1071 asked in the last session of Parliament.

TISSUE PATHOLOGY DIVISION

165. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Did the Division of Tissue Pathology at the I.M.V.S. buy a number of Zeiss microscopes and, if so—

- (a) how many;
- (b) was this against the advice of the instrument engineer of the I.M.V.S. and, if so, what did he recommend;
- (c) how much did each cost; and
- (d) are they being fully used, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) Yes, 15.
- (b) The instrument engineer (now Director, Engineering Services) was of the opinion that technically the Zeiss microscopes are not significantly superior optically to the Japanese Olympus microscopes. However, the request for higher quality resolution available in the Zeiss equipment was justified for specialist areas where detailed accuracy is of utmost importance and the microscopes must be used for many hours each day.

(c)

	\$		\$
1.....	9 338	9.....	5 000
2.....	8 936	10.....	5 000
3.....	10 046	11.....	5 000
4.....	1 387	12.....	7 769
5.....	2 909	13.....	8 061
6.....	2 909	14.....	10 842
7.....	2 909	15.....	5 000
8.....	5 000		

(d) Yes.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1072 asked in the last session of Parliament.

I.M.V.S.

166. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Were a Centrifichem, a Technicon Statelite and a Technicon Haemolog bought by the I.M.V.S. at a cost of approximately \$50 000, \$35 000 and \$100 000, respectively, and, if so, when and why was each bought?

2. Is it a fact that these instruments have not functioned according to specification?

3. Are these instruments now not being used and are they likely to be discarded?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. A Centrifichem analyser was purchased in June, 1978 for \$55 000 to estimate and standardise routine biochemical enzyme tests.

A Statelite analyser was purchased in June 1977, for \$26 000 to perform individual emergency biochemical tests (electrolytes).

A Haemolog analyser model 8/90 was purchased in June 1978 for \$91 000 together with a Haemolog analyser model D/90 for \$142 000. Both machines were purchased to automate haematological cell counts, including differential white cell counts.

2. The Centrifichem analyser has functioned according to manufacturer's specifications, but does not meet all I.M.V.S. requirements and is to be exchanged this month for a more advanced model at no additional cost to the I.M.V.S.

The Statelite analyser did not meet requirements and was referred to the manufacturer. This unit is to be replaced by a completely new model at no additional expense to the I.M.V.S.

Teething troubles were experienced with the Haemolog 8. These difficulties have been resolved and the unit is in routine service.

The Haemolog D was brought into routine service shortly after it was delivered and has given highly satisfactory service ever since.

3. All instruments will be used for routine diagnostic service and will not be discarded.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1073 asked in the last session of Parliament.

I.M.V.S.

168. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Was the salary of the Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology in the I.M.V.S. reduced by approximately \$6 000 at the time of the appointment of the present Director?

2. Was there discontent amongst staff members holding veterinary degrees following such downgrading of this position and, if so, what action, if any, was taken to allay such discontent?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, on the recommendation to the council by an inter-departmental committee to consider the future of veterinary pathology services set up by the former Government.

2. Yes. The staff have been addressed by the Director, who explained the situation. The veterinary pathologists are now pursuing a claim in the Industrial Commission following a work value study conducted by the Public Service Board at the request of the council.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1075 asked in the last session of Parliament.

EXPERIMENTS ON DOGS

169. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Have experiments on dogs been conducted in the animal operating theatres of the I.M.V.S. in the last five years and, if so, on how many occasions and when and have these experiments involved the housing of post-operative dogs in cages with open mesh wire floors?

2. Did the former Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology complain to the Director of the I.M.V.S. that this and other practices carried out on dogs

in the animal operating theatres were cruel and should be stopped, and did the Director threaten such Acting Director with disciplinary action if he should take the matter to the R.S.P.C.A. or any other animal welfare body?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, research using dogs has been conducted in the animal operating theatres of the Institute in the last five years. Prior to 1978, approximately fifty beagles were used and, since then, approximately 180 beagles have been operated upon. An unknown but small number of greyhounds were operated upon by Sir Dennis Patterson's team from the Adelaide Children's Hospital prior to 1978, but they were removed after operation to that hospital, only the Institute's operating facilities being utilised.

The beagles have been used for:

- (i) Training of vascular surgeons prior to operations on human patients.
- (ii) The formation of an artificial oesophagus from the colon (large bowel). This was a highly successful research project prior to creation and repair or replacement of an artificial oesophagus. A non-functional oesophagus was usually a fatal disease.
- (iii) Sir Dennis Patterson's research on the hastening of bone re-unification and repair by electrical stimulation.

In all cases, beagles are housed in cages immediately post operatively and are then allowed to run freely on the floor. Some periods in the cage are extended depending on the condition of the animal and the nature of the operation. Early experimentation in (iii) above revealed some difficulties when two beagles suffered fractures during the weekends. As a precaution against recurrence, bed boards were lowered and hardboard was used to cover the mesh floor. Hardboard too proved to be unsatisfactory because it became slippery when wet and had a very limited life owing to swelling. It also absorbed urine and faeces and militated against good hygiene. The cages had 1" mesh which has been a standard for animal cages, but these floors have now been covered with a 1 cm mesh since early 1978 and no further fractures have been noted. This improvement may be attributed to the position of the bed boards, the mesh or more diligent animal handling. All experiments performed in the Animal Theatre are supervised by the Animal Ethics Committee.

2. The Acting Director of the Division of Veterinary Pathology did complain that there was inadequate post-operative supervision of animals and suggested fuller veterinary supervision because such supervision was partly his responsibility and he could not give adequate time to it. At a meeting, held between those responsible for the animal operating theatre, the Acting Director indicated he was prepared to take the matter to the R.S.P.C.A. He was warned by the Director that disciplinary action would follow if this procedure was adopted without first giving the Institute the opportunity to resolve existing problems, which course of action is the formal one laid down in these circumstances.

The operating theatres were closed until the Acting Director's recommendations could be implemented. There is now an enlarged and properly constituted Animal Ethics Committee to supervise these matters. The Council of the Institute instructed the Director to reprimand the Acting Director for releasing a copy of an internal memorandum in these circumstances.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1076 asked in the last session of Parliament.

I.M.V.S.

170. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: Has the Government provided money to the I.M.V.S. for the maintenance of the Division of Forensic Pathology and if so:

- (a) how much and when was it provided;
- (b) has all this money been spent on the said division and, if not, has the I.M.V.S. directed part of this money to other divisions and, if so, which ones;
- (c) has any been spent in the Division of Tissue Pathology; and
- (d) has any such money been directed to other divisions with the knowledge and assent of the Government?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows: There is no "Division of Forensic Pathology". This is a section within the Division of Tissue Pathology. Funds, with the exception of a few thousand dollars, are provided from State Government Grant.

- (a) For the past two years the funds provided have been: 1978-79, \$241 000; 1979-80, \$246 000 (estimated).
- (b) Yes. All money has been spent in the Forensic Pathology Section.
- (c) Yes, but only in the Forensic Pathology Section
- (d) No.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1078 asked in the last session of Parliament.

FORENSIC SUITE

171. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What is the estimated cost of the forensic suite in the building on the corner of Wakefield Street and Divett Place, Adelaide?
2. When was it completed?
3. Is it yet occupied and, if so, when was it, and, if not, why not?
4. What is the value of the equipment in this suite, is any of it being used and is any of the equipment provided for this suite being used by other divisions of the I.M.V.S., and, if so, why?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. \$797 000.
2. July 1978.
3. Yes, the Forensic Biology Section was occupied in August 1978. The forensic pathology personnel are still based at the I.M.V.S. premises within the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Although less convenient, the section is operated more economically as at present, using existing laboratory staff and facilities. Provision has been made in the institute's budget for 1980-81 for the necessary rental charges and staff salaries.

4. \$130 000. Most of it is being used while some is being held in store at Divett Place awaiting occupancy of the building. None is being used by other divisions.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1079 asked in the last session of Parliament.

INSTANT MONEY GAME

173. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What inquiry, if any, has been made to establish whether children under the age of 16 are buying tickets in the Instant Money Game, when was it made and what were the results?

2. Does the Government propose to take any, and, if so, what action either to prevent or to discourage (and which) those under the age of 16 from buying such tickets and, if not, why not?

3. What is the policy of the Government on the purchase by children of such tickets?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. A survey to establish whether children under the age of 16 were buying tickets in the Instant Money Game was conducted by the Lotteries Commission within the first few months of the introduction of the game. In addition, upon coming to office in September last year, I arranged for the Minister of Community Welfare to examine the social implications of this form of gambling and in particular, the purchase of tickets by minors. In both instances the survey revealed that very few children purchased tickets, and in most cases those who did were under the supervision of parents.

2. No amendment to existing legislation is proposed at present.

3. See 2.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1097 asked in the last session of Parliament.

FINGERPRINTING

174. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the taking of persons' fingerprints by the police?

2. What is the present practice of the police in requiring persons to have their fingerprints taken?

3. Do the police refuse an arrested person police bail unless that person submits to fingerprinting and, if so, why, and, if not, what action do the police take to persuade such persons to submit to fingerprinting?

4. Are the fingerprints of persons found not guilty destroyed and, if not, why not and, if so, when are such fingerprints destroyed?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The policy regarding the taking of a person's fingerprints by police is detailed in section 81 (4) of the Police Offences Act, as amended, which reads as follows:

When a person is in lawful custody upon a charge of committing any offence any member of the police force in charge of a police station or of or above the rank of sergeant, may take or cause to be taken all such particulars as he deems necessary for the identification of that person, including his photograph and fingerprints and may use or cause to be used such reasonable force as may be necessary to secure those particulars.

2. The present practice of police is as implied in section 81 (4) of the Police Offences Act. In essence, all persons arrested for any offence are fingerprinted but General Orders detail two sets of circumstances under which this practice can be varied:

(a) If a person, known to be a reputable citizen, is arrested for a minor offence the taking of fingerprints can be waived. In practice police generally do not arrest persons for minor offences and therefore this order is rarely used.

(b) The fingerprints of a person under 16 years of age are only taken if it is considered that the offender is likely to lapse into a career of vice and crime. In such cases approval to take fingerprints must first be obtained from a commissioned officer. Police members must also obtain permission from a commissioned officer before arresting any person under 18 years of age.

3. No. On the few occasions where an offender initially refuses to be fingerprinted the provisions of section 81 (4) of the Police Offences Act are explained to the offender. After this explanation the offender usually voluntarily submits to fingerprinting.

4. Yes. Destruction procedures are initiated as soon as official advice of the outcome of proceedings is received at the Central Records Section, Police Department.

This information was supplied by letter in response to Question on Notice No. 1098 asked in the last session of Parliament.